PUBLIC PULSE ON NEWS OF TODAY REVEALED BY COMMENT

PORTLAND, April 1.—(To the Editor.)—Would you permit a grandmother to say a few words on the much-discussed topic of birth control?

It seems to me that since there is a division of opinion among Christian ministers, those to whom we look for guidance, we should have recourse to reason and common sense.

Some ministers speak and write at length on the benefits to accrue to the family and the Nation, when we shall have stemmed the brutal tide of babies, which are the cause of so much poverty and suffering; while others assert the practice of birth control is destined to bring about the extinction of the American people, the old Puritan stock, because the women of this class repudiate motherhood.

One speaker warned his audience that they had good reason for their fear that Roman Catholics would one day control this country, for they are in a fair way to do it. Not through the Machiavellianism of the Pope, nor the machinations of their bishops and priests, but through the Catholic women, who alone are willing to bear children.

When people marry they must expect children. They are the Natural consequence and whatever is natural is right.

Any means employed to circumvent this law of nature, I believe to be inhibitory alike, to the physical and moral well-being of both man and woman.

The additional cost of a few children to the family is very slight. The blessed babies bring with them a goodly supply of food, but, of course, the bottle is more popular today.

Again, children are an incentive to work and economy. They take the selfishness out of the hearts of both parents.

If there were fewer childless homes, there would be fewer divorces, for the strongest links in the hymenial chain are forged by baby hands.

S. E. W.

HOPE IS DECLARED WITH T. R.

Mr. Hughes Not in Touch With Common Folk, Says Writer.

OAK POINT, Wash., March 31.—(To the Editor.)—A constant reader of The Oregonian, I have read many letters therein in regard to Mr. Hughes and Mr. Roosevelt as candidates for President in the coming election, and I judge by the tone of these letters and the general expressed opinion of the press that either Mr. Roosevelt or Mr. Hughes will be nominated.

Now, if that be so, Mr. Roosevelt will be the nominee of the Progressive and Republican parties. Why? Because Mr. Hughes will not accept the nomination so long as there is the least possible chance for Mr. Roosevelt. Say you gratitude cuts no figure in the game when the pawn is the greatest office in the gift of the people? Take it from me that Charles E. Hughes will never double cross the man who has never failed to help him when he needed help, no matter how much pressure is brought to bear on him.

The authors of some letters say that if the Republicans nominate Roosevelt they will knife the Republican party by voting for Wilson. Have they forgotten that about 4,000,000 of us left the old party in 1912 because we were free born, thinking American citizens who refused to let any political machine cram a man down our throats whom we did not want? Have you ever stopped to think how these 4,000,000 people are going to vote if the party leaders refuse to try and right the wrong done us in 1912 by nominating Mr. Roosevelt in 1916?

Some say that if the Republicans nominate Roosevelt he will surely be defeated and Wilson will be elected. We do not think so. But we believe that if they nominate Roosevelt it will unite the old party, and we are sure it can be done in no other way. We are equally sure that if they refuse to nominate Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson will surely be our next President and the two wings of the Republican party will be farther apart than ever.

Now I am an old man—a lifelong Republican and very anxious to see the old party united. I have nothing to do with the personal quarrels of politicians. I believe the rank and file of the Progressive and Republican parties are much alike. One is just as good as the other if not a little better. It is conceded by all thinking men and women that if Roosevelt had been nominated in 1912 he would have been elected with a whoop. And it is a fact that with nearly all the big newspapers doing their level best to down him, he received nearly two-thirds of all the Republican votes cast. I will venture to say that if the big newspapers had been on his side and against Taft that William Howard Taft would not have received enough votes to make a decent showing at a school meeting in a sparsely settled mountain district.

Taft never got in touch with the common people, of which I am one. Neither will Hughes. Common people, everyday people, are something they do not understand.

C. S. HILL.

SOLDIERS' ALLOWANCES ARE CUT

Vancouver Regular Says Sergeant Gave Wrong Impression.

VANCOUVER, Wash., March 31.—(To the Editor.)—In regard to an article in The Oregonian, written by a retired Quartermaster Sergeant, I wish to state that if you took the trouble to verify the amounts that you would find his figures far from correct.

In the first place, the United States Government allows for clothing, for four years, a total of $144.98, whereas the Sergeant's article states that a man receives a total of $270 for three years. Some difference.

A man's allowance per month is $3.025; but his first year's allowance is $69.21, so he really has $2.10 a month for clothing during the rest of his enlistment. A man might save a little on his allowance while in the garrison. Notice, I say might. But never in the field. The men on the border have to dig into their pay to buy clothes.

If a man on his first enlistment saves on his allowance, you will generally find that he has been buying clothing from a soldier being discharged, or having them made by a tailor. For which he pays out of his $15 per month, thereby saving on his allowance, because he won't have to draw if he has the clothing on hand.

Mostly he is from $1 to $6 in debt when the six months' settlement comes around. You see, the Government checks up every six months. If a man has drawn over the amount allowed for that period, he has to pay it back to Uncle Sam out of his $15 pay on the pay day following.

The Government allows 24 3-10 cents per day for ration money, which we will call 25 cents, and a month 30 days; therefore, one man's allowance is $7.50 per month.

Now then, the soldier costs Uncle Sam, on his first enlistment, $15 cash pay; $3.02 for clothing; $7.50 for rations, which amounts to a total of $25.52 for one month, where your article states $62. Some difference again.

Now, after a man completes his enlistment, he is given transportation back to the place of enlistment at the rate of 2 cents per mile, if he takes cash, and no allowance for expenses. Do you think you could travel on 2 cents a mile and have money enough left to eat on?

If he takes the ticket, which the Government allows him, he has to take a certain route. He is allowed $1.50 for rations per day.

We used to be allowed 4 cents per mile, which gave about the right allowance to travel on, but this was cut down to 2 cents in 1912.

The reason, I would like to see you print a corrected statement of the amounts in the Sergeant's article is this: The general public reading the article would get a very wrong idea in regard to the actual allowance the Government makes to the enlisted man.

Also our Congressmen have been in the habit of taking a crack at the enlisted men's allowances every time they try to figure out some way to lower expenses. They lowered the clothing allowance at the same time the transportation was cut down.

There is an article in a recent issue of the Army and Navy Journal stating that the Government is considering doing away with the cash clothing allowance and will issue clothing to men when needed, because the allowance is too small for men in the field.

A. SOLDIER.

TOO MUCH CENSORING FEARED

American Idea of Humor Is Degenerating, Thinks Writer.

PORTLAND, April 1.—(To the Editor.)—How much and how far is the censorship idea, prevalent in educational and legislative circles today to extend into the body politic?

The National censorship on reading matter has recently culminated in a suit, that of Margaret Sanger for writing on birth control, in a manner that has aroused the people to the possibility of further curtailing of the rights of free speech. The suit is admittedly unpopular even in Government circles.

Now comes the House committee on legislation with a bill for National censorship of moving pictures. It is barely possible that in our anxiety to shield children from too much actual knowledge of the world there is a tendency toward Government dictation of our amusements.

Few film producers or film fans will object to a censorship that merely eliminates the obscene and depraved. The critics of moving pictures, however, are going much further. They wish to eliminate scenes of poverty and suffering from the pictured drama. It is true that the motion drama has quickened the impulses of the younger generation. It is thrusting viewpoints upon them that make them men and women before their time. It is thrusting desires and hopes upon them that should not come normally until several years later in life.

The issue, however, in case the bill passes Congress, will be in a word, whether the state is to handle the appalling job of restricting the children to certain amusements or whether the parents of the children shall exercise this function.

We should not compel the moving-picture producers to eliminate scenes which we would tolerate on the spoken stage. Would it not be just as wise to throw on the screen the morbid as well as the joyous, the failure in life as well as the success?

Our critics have devoted most of their film clipping to the feature film. Doubtless, there are fully as objectionable scenes in the slap-stick-comedies and the American public through these is acquiring a perverted sense of humor implying that a comical situation necessitates that someone shall be clubbed or kicked in the face.

At least we cannot make a very serious mistake in permitting considerable latitude for the scenario writers and the producers, for it is fatal for them to give the American people other than what they want.

J. B. COTTINGHAM,
395 Gilsan.

DR. LOVELAND IS ANSWERED

Views Voiced on Birth Control Are Criticised by Mr. Barzee.

PORTLAND, April 1.—(To the Editor.)—Press reports of Dr. Loveland's talk before the Business Men's Club on birth control leaves us in doubt, unless we attribute to him gross ignorance of economics, of what "birth control" he was talking about, that is, whether birth control of ideas or of human beings.

We fail to understand how limiting the number of human births will more than proportionately reduce the number of unemployed when it is these unemployed—poor and rich—who must compete for the surplus created by those who are unemployed, in order that their employment may continue; since the surplus of production of the things we need and use comes of improved machinery and not of the "crime laid to fathers" who give us these beings that are doing the useful work of the world. If one man, woman or child can, by the use of improved machinery, create enough to supply the needs of ten, how will the elimination of human beings, through birth control, change this proportion as long as one of the ten continues to operate the machine?

Now, if Dr. Loveland was talking about birth control of ideas that give us improved machinery and wishes to take the ancient Chinese mode of eliminating them by killing those who invent and make labor-saving machines, we are not left in doubt with regard to his plan for relieving unemployment through "birth control"—of ideas. This, however, would not agree with his statement that we should "give to the child the right to live," which implies that each should have the right to produce and get what he produces. His talk on this point is badly mixed.

I am thinking, while having no bouquet for one of these gentlemen over the other, that Father O'Hare, with his knowledge of labor conditions, unemployment and economics in general, will be able to straighten out the kinks that appear in Dr. Loveland's talk; and if he really means birth control of human beings, to somewhat sterilize his mind with regard to economics and the unemployment problem.

C. W. BARZEE.

WAGE BIRTH CONTROL FACTOR

Doctor Explains Benefits From Limitation of Offspring.

PORTLAND, April 1.—(To the Editor.)—Much has been written recently in the local and general press both pro and con, by the clergy and laity, regarding the limitation of offspring, or birth control.

The kingpin point, or the essence of these discussions as the writer views it is, is it right or wrong to limit the offspring, or rather is it right or wrong to place at the command of the laity, such means as will limit their offspring and what effect will these means of limitation have upon the morals of our people.

Positively better than 90 per cent disregard all divine and civil law—disregard, ignorantly or otherwise the consequence of whether it is right or wrong, are practicing some means of birth control.

This status of affairs has not come upon us just during this last decade; it is no new fad; it has been growing for the last 50 years, and what the ultimate outgrowth will be remains to be seen. Now, why are the people of this country, as well as some other civilized countries facing apparent depopulation? Probably the most important, among many other reasons that enter into the equation, is one of finance, and to the poor and middle class this matter of finance is quite impossible to reverse, and with no apparent future solution.

A compilation of financial statistics, however discouraging they may appear, are nevertheless true, has this information to impart—that in these United States 66 out of every 100 people that die leave no estate whatever; that out of the remaining 34 only nine leave estates larger than $5000, and that the average of the balance of 25 is a little less than $1200; that at the age of 65 97 out of every 100 in America are partly or wholly dependent upon relatives, friends or the public for their daily bread, for their clothing and a roof under which to sleep; that, according to Government statistics, 98 per cent of the American people are living from day to day on their wages, and that a loss of employment would mean pauperism for all but 2 per cent of us. Do these statistics signify anything? Have they any direct bearing on birth control?

Question the fathers and mothers of middle life, why they have not a large family, and await their response.

Non possimus for the ordinary wage-earner to rear a large family and provide them with the necessary requisites that our every day competition demands.

Much, indeed, is demanded of the mothers nowadays, and in too numerous instances she is not accorded the same consideration and treatment that the animals of lower type receive; not only must she become a mother every 18 months to two years, but she must be cook, housekeeper, maid, teacher, seamstress and laundress, and all other requirements that go to mould character of her offspring. Contrast her with any of the females of our domesticated animals (whose worries are nil) and it will readily be seen that the breeders of the latter are scrupulously careful in the selection of their material when the very best results are obtained, with only an occasional pregnancy. Granting this to be true of the lower animals, why also is it not true of the human?

It would seem from reviewing the above that placing in the hands of the laity some harmless means of limiting the number of their offspring would at least be a boon to the wife, if not a blessing from on high to birth.

The general practitioner of medicine, above all other living mortals, appreciates most fully the grave importance in some families the necessity of birth control or, better still, absolute sterility.

It is agreed almost unanimously that children well born and properly reared are the factors conducive of wresting from our selfish natures the best that is in us. However, all that may be said, both pro and con, on this vital subject, the fact still remains that the slogan of today is: Few children, better bred, better born, better fed, better clothed, better housed, better trained, better educated, better prepared when maturity arrives, that they may better cope with the struggle and battle of existence. It is more true today than in Darwin's time, as this is truly an age of the "survival of the fittest."

G. W. TAMIESIE, M. D.

SWISS MILITARY PLAN LIKED

Correspondent Declares for Adequate Amount of Preparedness.

PORTLAND, April 1.—(To the Editor.)—I wish to thank you for The Oregonian's attitude on preparedness.

This is a time when all citizens should let their sentiments be known on this vital question. A trained citizen soldiery and plenty of munitions is the bulwark of a republic. A well-nigh perfect guarantee of freedom from insult or invasion.

An old Swiss told how they were trained, and as he entered into detail regarding the method in vogue when he was in Switzerland (he had been an American citizen more than 30 years), I understood as never before why Switzerland Swiss had maintained her independence and been free from aggression, although hemmed in by monarchies. Every able-bodied man was a trained soldier ready, at a moment's notice, to report in uniform, with three days' supply of ammunition and rations, at his company's post.

Outside of the protection afforded their country, should danger threaten, what a splendid training for loyal and efficient citizens!

I have waited and scanned your pages, hoping someone would bring to your notice the action taken by the ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic assembled in National convention in the city of Washington, September 27, 1915, in indorsing the following:

"I pledge myself to think, talk and work for patriotism, Americanism and sufficient National defenses to keep the horrors of war far from America's homes and shores forever.

"In these days of world strife and peril I will strive to do my share to awaken our Nation and our lawmakers to the dangers of our present undefended condition, so that we may continue to dwell in peace and prosperity and may not have to mourn states desolated by war within our own borders.

"Insofar as I am able, I will make my home a center of American ideals and patriotism, and endeavor to teach the children in my care to cherish and revere our country and its history, and to uphold its honor and fair repute in their generation."

ARDEL K. LAWRENCE.

PIONEER EDUCATOR HONORED.

Early Activity of Dr. George H. Atkinson Is Recalled.

PORTLAND, April 1.—(To the Editor.)—Atkinson School, erected on the block bounded by North Tenth and Eleventh and Couch and Davis streets, at a cost of $10,500, Goodnough & Clark, contractors, was first occupied in September, 1868, and known as "Public School No. 3." This designation continued until 1871. From that year until 1890 it was called the "North School." That year, at the suggestion of Dr. Thomas L. Eliot, of the First Unitarian Church, it was called the "Atkinson School," the name it bears to this day. The present day reader of the press naturally will inquire the reason. It is as follows:

Dr. George H. Atkinson, after whom the school was named, arrived at Oregon City, June 21, 1848, from Boston, and brought with him the first school books known in the territory, aside from a few that were brought across the plains by families.

Upon the arrival of General Joseph Lane, the first Governor of Oregon Territory, March 2, 1849, Dr. Atkinson laid before him the importance of the early adoption of a definite school system, and as a result of this interview he was invited to prepare that portion of his inaugural message relating to education which was delivered to the first session of the Legislature on July 16, 1849. In addition to this he was requested to draft a school law to be submitted to the Legislature for consideration. This law is among the statutes of Oregon to the present day, save and excepting such amendments as have become necessary to meet the needs of an increasing population.

Dr. Atkinson was the first School Superintendent of Clackamas County in 1850, the area of which was bounded as follows at that time: South, by the northern line of Marion (then Champoolick County) extended to the summit of the "Rocky or Oregon Mountains," as shown on a map issued in 1838 by a Philadelphia firm, and "compiled by the best authorities"; east, by the mountain range just alluded to; north, the Columbia River from the confluence of the Willamette to the point where it is crossed by the 46th parallel, and thence to the Rockies; west, to the Willamette River. That part of Multnomah County east of the river was in Clackamas County up to January, 1855.

Dr. Atkinson removed to Portland from Oregon City in June, 1863, and at the election a year later he was chosen Superintendent of Schools for Multnomah County. Early in the '70s he suggested to the School Board of Portland that it would be wise to add manual training to the public school curriculum, and at his own expense investigated this plan where it had been tried in another city and shown to be an excellent thing. The School Board, however, did not agree with him at that time, and it was not until 1912 that the School of Trades was established, and the experience of four years has demonstrated its practical value in training young people in the use of tools. And now it seems eminently fitting that the building which has for more than a quarter of a century borne his name should be known as the "Atkinson School of Trades."

From the date of his arrival in Oregon in 1848 to the close of a useful life February 25, 1889, Dr. Atkinson was always a man of great influence in educational circles, including private as well as public schools; indeed, his career in general is most fittingly expressed in the words of the late Harvey W. Scott, editor of The Oregonian for 45 years, whose acquaintance with the subject of this sketch began in 1859. In a tribute to the memory of Dr. Atkinson Mr. Scott said, among other things:

"In all the industries of life Dr. Atkinson saw forces that contributed to the growth of the kingdom of God. He recognized it as a demand of this, our mortal life, that human energy should exert itself in every direction to promote the growth of mind and soul, and part of his large idea was to refine, to spiritualize and to exalt the multiplying activities and efforts called forth in the endless differentiation of modern life. . . . He worked for material objects in order that he and others might turn them to spiritual account in the growth and development of man. All things with him were means to ends, and, though he was one of the most spiritually minded of men, he never forgot that he lived in a world of affairs.

"Therefore, throughout all his ceaseless work for education, for morals, for religion, for the kingdom of God in the soul, this many-sided man was among the most earnest and active men of these (of the press) the advantages of developing the natural resources of the Northwest, of planting industries, of establishing commerce, of extending and improving agriculture, of turning to account the great natural wealth of the country in timber, minerals, soil and water power. He never wearied of showing, through private talks, public addresses and articles contributed to the press, what could be done here in these innumerable lines of industry and effort, and how to do it. He was not satisfied to keep pace with the natural development of the country. His mind outran it, and upon its great future he held forth with the voice of a prophet. Nor was this the case merely during these later years, since the growth began that is seen by everyone; it was the habit of his life. He saw the possibilities of the Northwest from the day of his residence in it, 40 years ago, and he spoke and wrote of its coming greatness during all these years of the country's isolation and remoteness, when such voices were few. He was a student of the operations of nature, as well as of the affairs of men. He was among the first to note the peculiarity of our climate and other physical conditions, and to draw right conclusions therefrom. Long before the great region contained within the basin of the Upper Columbia began to be settled and while it was still regarded mainly as a desert, he pointed out, through articles widely published, how the conditions of climate and soil would surely be changed by tree planting, by the plow and by the harvest that would gradually increase as the country was settled with an industrial population. . . . The elaborate articles published by him on this subject many years ago, read now in their fulfillment, would be a record of prescience and forecast every way remarkable, and certainly without a parallel here.

"All this work, as all the work of his life, was done without ostentation, without any kind of study to produce startling effects. The effort he put forth was never to display. He was a plain, simple and practical man, who harbored no visionary ideas, from whom no indiscreet utterance escaped, whose speech and action harmonized always with a quiet, yet firm, demeanor. He feared God and he regarded man."

GEORGE H. HIMES.

MAN SAYS WAR IS GOD'S WILL

Even Human Body Lives by Strife, Declares Writer.

PORTLAND, April 1.—(To the Editor.)—While the whole civilized world talks of and yearns for peace, it is worthy of note that from time immemorial the human race has never ceased from war. According to the Book of Books, war began in heaven.

We are told that "Michael and his angels fought against the devil and his angels," and won a victory as far as the devil's status in the celestial sphere was concerned. The scene of conflict, however, was merely shifted to the world where, as churchmen know, it is still raging.

Everyone admitted into the fellowships of the church is enlisted as a soldier. He promises to fight under Christ's banner and "to continue Christ's faithful soldier and servant unto his life's end." While this lifelong warfare on the Christian's part is, of course, essentially a spiritual one, it is to be noted that from the earliest times it has been the "casus belli" of many of the most sanguinary wars in the world's history.

While the founder of Christianity bequeathed peace to his followers ("Peace I leave with you; my peace I give unto you"), he, at the same time predicted that his religion would be in itself a cause of war. A multitude of passages in the Bible refer to God as the lord of hosts, "the lord is a man of war," etc.

So the question arises: Is not the warlike spirit engendered in the human race by the divine will? The biologists tell us that the essence of our very existence, our health and weilbeing is built upon the warfare that is being waged in the blood corpuscles of every human being, of every animal, in fact.

Nay, even in the inanimate world a struggle against the elements that make for decay and corruption goes on unceasingly. In our euphemistic way we speak of "the battle of life," and everyone knows that it is indeed a fierce struggle in which millions, as the Teutons so often tell us, "are easily repulsed."

Who shall say that it is not the will of God that man shall be a soldier, always either fighting or getting prepared? We know that this tendency to fight has always prevailed on this continent.

Twenty thousand years ago, according to an eminent archaeologist, a terrible battle was fought on the banks of the Arkansas River, in what is now the Indian Territory, between the Mound Builders and the Mayas, in which over 75,000 warriors bit the dust.

The scientist, Professor Walters, reached this remarkable conclusion on account of his investigations of a prehistoric burying-ground in the Choctaw Indian country, over 20 years ago, if my memory is not at fault, which he found to contain 75,000 skeletons.

His attention was first called to this great battle-ground by the men who built what was then known as the Kansas City, Pittsburg & Gulf Railway. Their grading brought to light tons of human bones and an immense number of implements of savage warfare.

"The skulls were pierced with darts or arrowheads, one specimen containing 13 moss-agate arrow-points."

Of course these poor benighted creatures hadn't learned about poisonous gases or liquid fire and had to do the best, or worst they could with tomahawks, clubs, arrows and darts. So the conclusion was inevitable that they had all died in battle.

And what a battle that was! The bloodiest battles of the great European war cannot rival this record of 75,000 dead in one field. It was perhaps the fast of a long series of sanguinary conflicts between these wonderful old Mound Builders and the Mayas who came from Central America and sought to gain possession of North America.

And as it was 20,000 years ago, so it has ever been, a fight for the land. The 14 nations of Europe are at it for the same old cause today. It is God's will. He permits it. He encourages it.

The royal psalmist says: "He teacheth my fingers to fight, nine arms shall break even a bow of steel." Perhaps the peace that mankind yearns for is the peace that follows conquest. It is well expressed in a verse translated from the Russian national hymn:

God the all-terrible King, who ordainest
Great winds thy clarions, the lightnings thy sword,
Show forth thy pity on high where thou reignest,
Give to us peace in our time, O Lord.

So shall thy children, in thankful devotion,
Laud him who saved them from peril and sword,
Singing in chorus from ocean to ocean,
Peace to the nations and praise to the Lord.

JAMES IRVING CRABBE.

COST IS QUESTIONED

Correspondent Criticises City Engineer for Action on Greeley Extension Plan.

PORTLAND, April 1.—(To the Editor.)—In The Oregonian March 22 you publish a set of questions from the North Portland Commercial Club, with answers by the City Engineer, in regard to the cost of the so-called Greeley-street extension, which seem to me to either evade the questions or misrepresent the cost of the extension. For instance, I quote question No. 2: "What will be the entire cost of right of way therefor?"

"Answer: The estimated cost is $113,766."

"Question No. 4—"What is the estimated amount of yardage and what is the probable cost of excavation?"

"Answer (omitting details): Excavation, $121,113.90; embankments, $31,112.04."

"Question—What is the probable cost per lot for the whole, including pavement?"

"Answer (omitting preliminary details, he says: 'For your information, however, I will say that if each lot (assuming that there are 17,934 lots) was assessed equally the assessment for street extension proceedings would be $6.34 per lot, provided the proposed vacation of the St. Johns road was not considered . . . this reduction would make an average assessment of $4.11 per lot, instead of $6.34.'"

Figures Are Cited.

Now, take their own figures, right of way $113,766 plus paving cost at their average cost $65,175 plus grading and filling, $152,225.94 (and this does not include right of way or grading for slopes or easements, which would cost possibly as much more), would make a total of $331,166.94, and with their figures of 17,934 lots would make very close to $18.50 per lot, instead of $6.34, and this allows nothing for engineering expenses, which, notwithstanding the fact that we pay taxes to pay their salary, they always charge a high price for anything we want them to do.

It looks as if the engineering department were bound to carry this through, in spite of protest by a large number of lot owners.

An "improvement" which is of absolutely no value to any one on the Peninsula unless they own or drive an auto. As a scenic drive in connection with Willamette boulevard, which, by the way was put through for the benefit of the auto owners or Auto Club, it would undoubtedly make a fine addition to our system of driveways, but as far as any financial or any other benefit to 90 per cent of the people below Greeley street there is absolutely nothing to it. And why the city engineering department should find it necessary to resort to misrepresentation in order to force it through is more than I can understand. Why not try a new method and let the people know that this improvement will cost anywhere from $25 to $30 per lot? Their own figures show it.

C. H. BEARD.

STATE AID FARMERS' HOPE

Political Influence at Salem Convention Suspected by Writer.

VALE, Or., March 30.—(To the Editor.)—The convention called by the Irrigation Congress and held at Salem March 9 to frame constitutional amendments for state guarantee of bonds for irrigation and drainage and a system of rural credits seems to have fallen under the influence of politicians and by separation of the subjects all three are likely to be killed.

It is true that political questions are sometimes economic; that economic questions are political, but under our freak methods and the primary method of selecting candidates, personal politics are projected into important economic questions, which is a different matter. Not only is it a different matter, but gravely unfortunate.

It is difficult for us of the older generation to realize that a new era has dawned on the United States, an era of far more serious import than appears on its face. For 100 years, when civilized rules and society's burdens pressed hard on numbers of individuals the boundless West stretched for 3000 miles, offering rich land, mines, timber and thousands of square miles of grazing. The vast domain has been turned into wealthy and populous states, which condition might have continued perhaps for another generation, but the Lord, for some unknown reason inscrutable but unavoidable, gave us Pinchot. Now he gives us Ferris and his ilk, while Oregon has an army of alleged statesmen desirous of perpetuating their strangle hold on our magnificent state.

With no other known outlet—Canada having proved a frost (this is no pun)—Mexico in the throes of war and destruction, while protection to Americans is denied and refused; those who have been unable to keep up with modern methods, who are unable to meet the high and rising cost of all commercial necessities, unable to contribute their quota to the gold-demanding water in railroad stocks, unable to put their farms in condition which continued use renders necessary (these conditions being as old as humanity as to irrigation and drainage, having no place to move where boundless nature supplies civilization's necessities; those people must view the same assistance, equal opportunity, legalized financial encouragement given to every other industry except farming or they will become a burden on society and the country must drift into a semi-monarchial or complete socialistic condition, peopled with what is called a peasant class in Europe, moujiks in Russia and peons in Mexico.

Every attempt to enter this condition is fought by two classes: Those opposed from interested financial reasons, among whom may be found mortgage companies and bankers who cannot see beyond the present. The other class is made up of politicians who are able to show that any indebtedness, or apparent indebedness, taxes the poor, and by misrepresentation hope, and generally do, ride into some office.

Such help is sometimes offered by their friends, or alleged friends, that fails for reasons carried in the affirmative argument. Thus the argument put forth by F. S. Myers as reported in The Oregonian, indicated that the farmer must not have money for less than 6 per cent because to do so would interfere with some state school fund. This reasoning makes the farmer a contributor to the state, offers a loan and charges a state commission in excess of probable cost of making the loan.

Again, Mr. Myers proposed to borrow $19,000,000 at 4 per cent, lend it to the farmer at 6 per cent, pay expenses and the surplus to go to the school fund; meanwhile increase the $12,000,000 to $38,000,000 in 25 years, and a profit of $41,000,000 in 35 years. As the difference between what he proposes to pay and what he proposes to get is only 2 per cent less the cost of transacting the business, even a farmer might wonder by what financial legerdemain this could be accomplished. Secretary McAdoo in his palmiest nights of surplus increasing fails to reach this altitude of finance, and law might have made Orleans financial ruler of the world as well as King of France with such a financial mind.

The necessity for drainage is evident in the Willamette Valley as well as in every irrigation project in the world. The white land of the magnificent valley, well drained, will produce grain in quantities rivaling the best of the country.

Portland is backing the Strahorn system of railroads in Eastern Oregon. That great and wonderful empire capable of feeding millions of people will continue a bleak and sagebrush desert for ages longer without irrigation on the one hand and drainage on the other. This bleak and sagebrush desert has more plant food waiting the advent of men with brains to develop and farming strength and knowledge to cultivate than any equal territory in the world.

The day when poor men can take a piece of land and begin raising crops which will support his family has passed. Stump land must be cleared, arid land must be irrigated, wet land must be drained, and neither of the three will support humanity without either time for development or money to hurry development. Of one the farmer has none and daily needs prevent his taking the time.

The real question is: Will the state and the Government give them proper aid or will they choose to have their state half desert and the remainder peopled with serfs?

JOHN RIGBY.

WOMAN SCORES BIRTH CONTROL

Self-Control Is Right Way to Prevent Large Families, Is View.

EUGENE, Or., March 31.—(To the Editor.)—In the condemnation of birth control we have dealt with but an abstract principle of evil, and no one person or persons have been aimed at through the columns of The Oregonian, no one has been condemned or meddled with, except as he has been struck with the truth of what has been said by his own conscience.

"Moral responsibility for coition, and self-repression for the standard" has been the slogan.

Christianity teaches us that we do not belong to ourselves individually, but that we form but a small part of what should be a harmonious unit; a link, as it were, in an eternal chain. To be this we must first of all adjust ourselves to the natural forces or laws, that is, God. It is not the intent of nature to pervert the will of man, but man possesses the ability, through will, to pervert the intent of nature. He has free will, that is, he is capable of doing either right or wrong.

An individual who does not recognize his moral responsibility knows not the difference of right from wrong, and we call such an individual mentally deficient. If, on the other hand, he disclaims such moral responsibility as an individual right on the part of whomsoever sees fit to do so, such person is fundamentally and legally a moral degenerate, a conscious force of evil, with evil intent and knowledge, and does wrong with malice aforethought.

No opponent of birth control advocates large families to those who do not desire it, but we say that the only moral right any individual has to limit his offspring is through self-control. Of course, if this were the only principle of control the man used the result would probably be many children where there are now none, but the theory would not be at fault. However, society does have a right to ask the individual who believes in, and uses mechanical devices, that he, for the sake of decency refrain from flaunting his viciousness in public and espouse intrinsic immorality as a modern panacea. How can a moral evil right civil wrongs? In time of conflagration we do not start back-firing until all other means of control have been exhausted. So let us right what is wrong from some different angle, on a fundamentally moral basis, otherwise we will only make what is already bad worse.

MRS. M. A. ALBIN.

NON-VOTERS RECREANT IN DUTY

Ballot Is Sovereign Weapon Entrusted to Citizen by His State.

PORTLAND, April 1.—(To the Editor.)—In the intensity of the struggle to accumulate wealth and amass fortunes constantly going on in the United States, almost two-fifths of our legal voters give little or no attention to our politics or our laws except insofar as they may directly affect their own personal business or comfort. It is estimated by political economists that only three out of five persons who vote at our elections give either the personal qualifications of the candidates or the merits of the respective measures for which they vote more than momentary or passing consideration, and this just immediately prior to the time he or she casts his or her ballot. Many eligible voters do not vote at all. This is a situation which should excite alarm and cause each and every patriotic American citizen to put forth his or her best effort to quicken the pulse of the indifferent, to combat the general apathy and to rouse the voters of the Nation and this state to interest and activity, for the inevitable consequences of ignorance or laxity in political matters on the part of the people in a free country are anarchy followed by lawlessness and mob rule and finally, the man on horseback with the iron hand of despotism.

I think that the people of Oregon are not as guilty of laches in regard to political matters as the people of many other states in the Union have been, but even the interest manifested by the people of this progressive and energetic commonwealth is not beyond criticism or reproach. Indeed, there are several instances where the indifference of the voters may be subject to severe censure. I shall not undertake to review all of these, but shall content myself by calling your attention to a single case. At the last general election, a certain gentleman was elected to the House of Representatives, although his candidacy was repudiated and opposed by every newspaper in his district, irrespective of political affiliation or belief, because of his general and notorious unfitness for the position for which he was a candidate.

Many persons look upon voting as a right instead of a duty. Each regards his or her vote as a personal matter to do with as he or she chooses without public responsibility, but this notion in respect to voting is unpatriotic. A man's vote is not his own—it is his country's—the sovereign weapon entrusted to him to be wielded in the defense of his country's welfare, and the man or woman who does not use it in a state where he or she is given the opportunity to vote is recreant to his or her trust and failing in public duty.

Rights cannot be maintained in a country where duties are neglected. It is indispensable that the people should have a high regard for their duties before the citizens can have a true conception of their private and international rights or the courage or conviction to enforce and uphold them. Rights and duties are co-ordinate, they are dependent upon each other, and in a free country, under a republican form of government, it is important that stress be placed upon the citizen's duties rather than upon his rights.

In Oregon the people have the greatest political rights and accordingly bear the greatest political responsibilities. Under the initiative and referendum system adopted and enforced in this state, the people of Oregon are virtually their own lawmakers, and this means that they are therefore the controllers of their progress and prosperity. Without good laws, there can be no progress, and consequently no prosperity. People will not invest their money in a state where poor laws are in force and without the investment of foreign capital there can be no employment of labor. The only way, therefore, that we can assure the passage of good laws in Oregon is to prepare the people against bad ones, and this, I take it, should be as much the object of a political organization as the success of its party candidates.

The surest and simplest method of preparing the people of Oregon against the passage of bad laws in this state is to encourage registration, for as the number of votes in the state multiply our security against the passage of bad laws commensurately increases. In this respect our Government has been likened to the erection of a building—the safest when resting upon the broadest foundation, and I think that this simile is well applied in the case of the Oregon system. What we need most in the way of preparedness at present in Oregon is a vote from every eligible voter in the state on important matters submitted to the consideration of the people at each succeeding election, and when we attain this we need have no fear for the future prosperity of our great commonwealth. Not only will our safety concerning our own Government be assured, but we will also dispel the popular illusion that now prevails throughout the country that this is merely the experimental ground for popular and fanatical legislation. We will establish a reputation for saneness and conservatism that will become Nation-wide and countless numbers of investors will therefore seek investments in Oregon.

FRANKLIN F. KORELL.

CARLINE ON GREELEY STREET

Peninsula Would Be Put 15 Minutes Nearer City by It, Says Writer.

PORTLAND, March 31.—(To the Editor.)—In The Oregonian March 29 an article on the Greeley-street extension by a certain Peninsula Advisory League purported to say that it was not the intention to have a carline on this street, that if a carline was put there it would not shorten the distance three minutes, and finally that it would not enhance the value of real estate.

There must be a carline on it; it is too valuable an artery to be kept from general use. In fact the plans call for an improved street with the driveway on one side and car tracks on the other. Should the car company refuse to lay tracks, which is scarcely possible, then the Council under Section 156 of the city charter can compel the company to extend over it.

This street, if extended, will shorten the distance over the present route via Williams avenue one and one-quarter miles. Moreover, there can be no stops south of Alberta street to delay, while there are forty intersections with the usual stops over the old route. Yet though a shorter route by over a mile and without stops, this advisory league advises that it would shorten the distance but three minutes. It is a poor League to have advisory capacity.

This same league advises to macadamize the streets as that would enhance the value of real estate 10,000 times more than would this improvement. Why not macadamize the streets if the league would profit? However, values of real estate in Portland seem in general to be based on its proximity to the center of the city. If the Peninsula district is brought nearer to the center of the city by one and one-quarter miles and over a route with few stops for the cars, effecting a saving of 15 minutes a ride, realty values affected by this improvement should rise enormously.

The Advisory League seems to go on the theory that the longest way around is the shortest way home. It is ill-reasoned advice.

O. F. T. JONSON.
Sec. Peninsula Associated Imp. Clubs.

ROOSEVELT NOT FAVORED.

Republican Fears "T. R." Would Have Embroiled Us in European War.

VERBOORT, Or., March 31.—(To the Editor.)—Will you please allow me a little space to give my opinion of T. Roosevelt for President? We had four years under Roosevelt, for which he was elected and the balance of McKinley's term, and what did he do that should give us confidence to elect him again? There are many reasons why a good many of us will not vote for him again.

It seems strange to me that people will cling to a man who has made so many promises and fulfilled none. Will any man show us where Roosevelt ever broke up any big trusts, or ever gained one point for the benefit of the poor? No, it was worse than that; he used his "big stick" to make believe with, while he was heart and hand with them.

Yes, all you Roosevelt boosters, how would you like to be in the Army in war with Germany, or with the allies? If he were President there is where some of us would be. If he did as he preaches—would any of you boosters go? I have my doubts.

We may have plenty to do in Mexico before we get through down there. While I don't believe in backing out and being the coward, I don't believe in provoking a scrap, either.

While I did not vote for Wilson, I feel that it is a good thing we have him to guide us instead of Roosevelt.

I have voted the Republican ticket always, for President. But sincerely hope I will not have to look at Roosevelt's name on the ballot in November, for I will be compelled to do something unbecoming a good Republican, if I have to decide between him and Wilson.

J. H.

SOUTHERN SUBURB IS BOOSTED

Writer Asks Why Property Owners Do Not Get Busy.

PORTLAND, April 1.—(To the Editor.)—As I have watched Portland grow from a small village when the old Failing School taught us our lessons and the old horsecar stopped at First and Sheridan streets, in South Portland, I feel I can make a few remarks for its welfare.

When Portland was first laid out the worst mistake made was narrow streets. As it grew larger, the same thing continued. Now, is there no law, no way to remedy this thing? Now, even, when some real estate firm opens a new district they first give it a name and then a team is put in and the grass or a stump or two scraped off. Then some 2x12 boards are strung along and called sidewalks. They are advertised as graded streets and sidewalks in and paid for. What a shame! Is this fair to the prospective sucker?

Wouldn't he buy just as quickly if told the truth? There are hundreds of acres of fine homesites just 15 minutes' ride south and southwest of the city lying idle. On the East Side nothing lies idle, no matter how far out; it is always being advertised and boosted. What's the cause of all this? Where are the