MANY PROBLEMS OF THE DAY BRING OUT ASSORTMENT OF VIEWS

Questions Before City, State and National Governments Discussed by Various Writers Who Seek to Shed New Light on Situations.

MR. COREY STICKS TO CHARGE

He Still Maintains Farmers Don't Get Enough for Wheat.

SALEM, Jan. 26.—(To the Editor.)—In answer to The Oregonian's editorial, "Where Is the Lost Seventeen Cents," may I state that the statements contained therein do not differ materially from those contained in my letter to the Baker Herald, notwithstanding you accuse me of purposely misquoting facts. I do not find wherein your editorial shows one instance in which I have done so.

Based upon the rates and quotations contained in your editorial, do we not find the following result?

I believe we agree that the price the farmer should receive for his grain is the Liverpool price less the freight. Based upon grades of grain usually commanding the same market quotations, we find Liverpool price $1.21 per bushel less boat rate, 17 cents, and including insurance and commission, 1.1 cents, total 18.2 cents, Portland to Liverpool, as stated in your editorial, should fix the price of the wheat at Portland at $1.13¾ as against the quotations of January 18, of $1.08 at Portland, or $1.12 at Chicago and $1.10 at Seattle.

Portland price, $1.13¾, less freight rate per bushel, Pendleton to Portland, 11.1 cents, should fix the price for the farmer at Pendleton, $1.02. I find, however, Portland's offer on No. 1 white club wheat on January 18 at Pendleton to be 93 cents. Why this discrepancy?

On the other hand, for the sake of argument, I accept the quotation of $1.08 as being the correct price at Portland, and deduct the freight rate per bushel, Pendleton to Portland, 11.1 cents. Do we not get a price of 97 cents that the farmer at Pendleton should receive instead of the 93 cents offered? And a price of 92 cents at Baker instead of 88 cents offered?

Does not the Portland quotation of $1.08 on No. 1 white club wheat and Liverpool $1.21 allow for the stated 5 cents a bushel deducted on club and Forty-fold wheat at Portland, due to alleged inferiority of Oregon grain, as stated in your editorial?

Another matter that the grain grower would like to have explained is a reason for Seattle quotations on like grades of grain being invariably higher than Portland prices, notwithstanding the fact that we have the lower down river haul rates to Portland.

In your editorial of December 2, 1919, you stated:

"The people of the interior have as much interest in the matter as those of Portland. The excessive rates which they now pay through having the water grade rates raised to a parity with those of the mountain roads reduced their profits by the amount of the excess. The price of the farmers' wheat is fixed at Liverpool, or it will be again when the government no longer guarantees the price, and he receives that price less freight.

In the light of current quotations, therefore, will you kindly explain to the interior farmer the Portland-Seattle quotations in their relation to the Liverpool market as fixing the price of his product at Pendleton and Baker, for example.

Are not the principal differences in our calculations apparently caused by the fact that you have used the proportional Chicago to Baltimore instead of the local rate used by me, and which I insist is the correct rate to use when computing Portland and Chicago prices on wheat?

In the example quoted by you in which the Portland dealer broke just even on his sale at Liverpool and received net $1.09, the quotation price on soft, white wheat on that date, did the farmer receive for that wheat the Portland rate, $1.09, less the rail haul charge, or did the farmer receive several cents less than that amount as was being offered at Pendleton and other interior points on January 18?

True, your figures only amount to some 4 to 8 cents per bushel, but on the annual 100,000,000-bushel crop moving through Portland it would total $4,000,000 to $8,000,000, which would help some toward paying the farmer's annual taxes.

I still maintain that Portland enjoys an advantage over Chicago in rates on grain to Liverpool as follows:

Chicago to Liverpool, 21¼c per bushel (including insurance and commission).

Portland to Liverpool (your figures), 18c (including insurance and commission).

Difference, 13c per bushel, the disposition of which has not been accounted for. H. H. COREY.

"POOR DANCER" HAS PROTEST

Mr. Whealdon Doesn't Want to See "Dance Bootleggers."

PORTLAND, Jan. 27.—(To the Editor.)—Personally, I am unalterably opposed to dancing in all its devious forms and ramifications. I am opposed to all dancing—public and private, chaperoned and unchaperoned, so-called proper and improper. In short, I am against the whole institution. I have good and valid reasons for this undying opposition. I am a miserably poor dancer. I have tried for many years to become a good dancer—and without any modicum of success. It is possible that there are others like me. We have a right to be heard in opposition to dancing along with our esteemed contemporaries—the Methodist brethren—although on slightly different grounds.

At most social functions which I am privileged to attend my friends insist upon dancing—and not only insist upon dancing themselves but insist that I "attempt" to dance with them—to my great embarrassment and to their great amusement. Unquestionably an institution that tends to make a stable, law-abiding citizen and taxpayer the laughing stock of his friends has no place in democratic society. Dancing should be abolished not because it is unmoral but because it is undemocratic. It places a premium upon physical agility rather than mental equipoise and soundness. Dancing should be abolished not because of its immorality but because of its intricacy and difficulty in performance.

Aside from my personal prejudices this burning question of the day is deserving of comment.

In so far as the moral features of the issue are concerned I am fully in accord with the sane and sensible position taken by you in your editorial in The Oregonian January 20. Your position on this important social issue is highly commendable. It is to be hoped that the school board and the warring factions will take a saner view of the situation and evolve a constructive solution of the problem that will tend to elevate dancing in Portland, both in and outside the public schools.

It is not only possible but probable that evils have attached themselves to modern dancing, which evils should be rigidly suppressed. Otherwise this holocaust of smoke, criticism and invective against dancing generally would not have burst forth. The remedy lies, however, in regulation and not in abolition.

In all sincerity, it appeals to the writer that our good Methodist brethren have lost all sense of proportion in their forays against dancing. According to press reports the sensational charges of immorality attendant upon dancing in the schools have fallen flat and have in effect been withdrawn. This being the case, there should be an end to the controversy. It is proposed, however, to continue the attack—not against evils which may or may not exist—but against dancing itself. The Methodist clergy will not succeed in their attempted innovation. They should not succeed. As long as the attack was confined to evils that may or may not exist the effort was commendable. It now deserves censure and suppression.

Dancing is a fact and not a theory. It is a legitimate form of social intercourse and has a proper place in the social life of the schools. It cannot and should not be abolished. So long as the individual is possessed of the poetry of music and the symmetry of motion, people will dance. If a proper opportunity is not afforded the boys and girls in our schools to satisfy this normal, wholesome craving under proper safeguards, it will certainly be satisfied under less savory conditions. Ban dancing from the schools and you will certainly substitute the public dance of questionable character. I desire to enter a solemn protest and warning against an innovation that will make "dance bootleggers" of clean, wholesome young men and young women in this city.

C. L. WHEALDON.

REDUCTION OF JUDGES URGED

At Least One-Third Could Be Dispensed With, View.

ROSEBURG, Or., Jan. 26.—(To the Editor.)—The attention of the writer has been called to a letter published in The Oregonian January 5, relative to the necessity of the reduction in state expenses.

The writer would suggest another way in which there can be and should be a very material reduction in the amount of money which the taxpayers are required to dig up in order to defray an unnecessary burden upon them.

There are now 25 circuit judges in Oregon. These judges are paid $4000 per annum, and in the aggregate $100,000 each year. One-third of them could be dispensed with and the court business could be transacted almost as expeditiously, and probably as efficiently as with the greater number.

Lake county now comprises one judicial district and Klamath county another. These two counties adjoin and the population of the two combined does not exceed that of Jackson county. One judge could attend to all of the court business in the two counties and still have at least six months in each year to rest.

Clackamas county is in a district by itself. Until a few years ago, the district comprised Clackamas, Clatsop and Columbia counties. One judge did the work required of him for all of these counties and he was not seriously overworked, at least, no judge resigned because he could not attend to the business.

Marion and Linn comprise one judicial district but have two judges. The traveling expenses between the two counties is not great and there will be no trouble in finding a judge who will agree to transact all the business in the two counties for the salary which is now paid one.

Baker county is a district by itself. Business has evidently increased in that county to occupy the attention of a judge all the time for a whole year. There was a time when Baker was associated with several other counties as a judicial district and one judge attended to the business.

Everyone who is at all familiar with legal business in Oregon knows that business has fallen off instead of having increased, and the reason is very plain. A considerable amount of the work that until a short time ago was in the court, is now handled by the industrial accident commission. These commissioners also draw substantial salaries from the state.

The courts until the commission was established by law, were filled with actions against the railroad companies, sawmills and other concerns, on account of the accidental deaths or injuries to employes and others. This business is now handled by the commission.

Multnomah county, with six circuit judges, can easily dispense with at least two of them, and there need not be any delay in the business of the court. There is not three times the business in that county when only two judges at $3000 did the work required.

A saving of more than $20,000 each year can be made without in any way injuriously affecting the right of a litigant to have his cause determined by the court and a jury of his peers. The judges will not be overworked and taxes can to some extent be reduced.

It is apparent to every one who has noted the rapid increase in public expenditures that a halt is absolutely necessary or the people who bear the burden, in a short time will be unable to meet the increased demand.

TAXPAYER.

NAGGING ANNOYS SERVANTS

Woman Says Mistresses Interfere Too Much in Work.

PORTLAND, Jan. 27.—(To the Editor.)—I have been reading The Oregonian most of the time since I came to Oregon about 17 years ago. Lately I have been greatly interested in the social and wage question carried on in the correspondence page. I have had to work out a good part of my life for my own support, and I must say working in other people's homes is very trying to say the least. I worked when a young girl, a good many years ago, and lately, the experience was just about the same. They will fly at you at everything you do and say: "I do not do it that way, and it must be differently done."

Just last spring, being unable to get other work, I took a job at housework. The woman needed help badly and should have sat down and taken her rest, but she was so sure I would stop if she took her eyes off me that she worked harder than if I had not been there for her to boss. She would start up at everything I did and say: "No, that isn't the way I do it."

What are the odds if it comes out the same? Deliver me from any such life, and give me a job washing windows in some man's office.

A woman with children can hardly do housework. It is an all-time job. There are very few places she can keep them with her, and there is no time for her to leave her job and go home to see about them, and there is not enough pay in it to hire someone else to see to them. Office hours are shorter and better paid. She can afford to hire someone to care for them while she works. Then she is home with them nights.

As to the men who advertise for housekeepers, I have answered some of them. They either want to get married to save the expense of paying the housekeeper or something a great deal worse. I don't say all men who advertise for help are like that. I am just giving my own experience. I have known a good many others who came out about the same.

ONE WHO KNOWS.

FINANCIAL AID HELD VITAL

Policies of Government Reserve Bank Declared Too Narrow.

PORTLAND, Jan. 27.—(To the Editor.)—I was reading in The Oregonian an article relating to the disposition of the American gold surplus by investing it in European parts, and I'm just wondering what the people's sentiments are on the question of credit, and just what they think and how they feel about financing Europe in the face of America's obvious need.

We all know that the greatest curse of the times takes form in men's limitations of grasp on large things. As a matter of fact the nation's capital resources were, on July 1, 1919, $203,932,000,000, and it paid $35,000,000,000 of income. The average yield was 6.75 per cent. The per capita wealth, or income, was approximatey $250 per annum.

The gold surplus is going abroad because America cannot give it the support it should have, and America cannot give this gold proper support because her discount facilities are too limited. They are woefully lacking in two respects: First, in their volume of ready cash, and second, in the time limit for maturity.

If we trace our money to its source we will find that the issuing medium—the treasury department and the reserve banks—limits the nation's capital to a discount privilege amounting to but 10 per cent of capital invested in negotiable and salable goods. This being the case, such a narrow margin as is provided by the people of America anent and through their government organization, they are compelled to go where the greatest consideration is afforded for investments. Surely no man can reasonably chide American capital for not taking chances such as our government forces upon them. It simply throws American business upon its own resources and compels it to serve and support the nation the best way it can. And such being the case, I believe that any man may clearly understand the reasons for the present situation throughout the nation. While the federal reserve board controls the situation, and faces the greatest opportunity of the age, it does not recognize its power and ability to take the entire load of non-discountable paper—non-discountable because of the shortage of private capital—off the American business man's shoulders and carry it for him at a minimum rate of 3 per cent. The board could do this and give business a chance to get together 100 per cent and it would injure no man nor private financial institution, because the dates of maturity would be so far away that private capital could obtain many turnovers in the interim and meet the federal reserve board's demands easily.

In the meantime business could hum. Also, where private capital would serve as an intermediate resource the government could provide the basis for unheard of development throughout the nation. Thus accord and harmony and support of each other might obtain.

Eventually this will come about, but why wait? Everything depends upon a credit basis for future operations, and the government stands ready. It could finance the reconstruction of the entire world at a very low interest rate. To do so would give us everything we could possibly want. But still the "board" does nothing—doesn't know its real strength.

THINKER.

JUDGE BENNETT WANTS TRUTH

He Asks Why Wheat Price Higher in Chicago Than Portland.

THE DALLES, Or., Jan. 26.—(To the Editor.)—I notice in The Oregonian an editorial entitled "Where Is the Lost 17 Cents?" in which you criticise rather severely a letter from Mr. Corey to an eastern Oregon paper in which he seems to have argued that the farmers of Oregon were not getting from the exporters in Portland a fair price for their wheat, as compared with prices paid in Chicago for the same grades of wheat.

At the outset I wish to disclaim any thought that you intend to be unfair in the matter or that you intend to defend any injustice to the farmer, if there is such injustice. Your valued paper is patronized by the farmers and represents them as well as other classes. You no doubt wish to see the hard-pressed tillers of the soil get a fair chance to accumulate some of the wealth which their industry produces.

I also disclaim any attempt to pose as an expert in these matters or to assume any peculiar knowledge thereon, which would give me a right to speak authoritatively. On the contrary, I am writing this with a view of obtaining information and clearing up the true facts.

I have not read Mr. Corey's letter, but I infer from your editorial that he was contending therein that, although the combined rail and shipping freight rates from Chicago to Liverpool and other European points are about 17 cents per 100 pounds higher than the rates from Portland to the same points, yet the buyers in Chicago, buying for export to these same places, are paying about 7 cents per bushel more for wheat than our buyers. If this is true, I cannot help but think with Mr. Corey that, by a combination of the buyers on the Pacific coast, a great wrong is being done to the farmers here.

You suggest in your editorial that the comparison should be made with the prices in Liverpool rather than with the prices in Chicago, but Liverpool is so far away, and the opportunity of the average farmer to get the prices there for comparison, or to obtain the true conditions which surround these prices, or to measure the difference in exchange and in wheat measures and in the denominations of money, and there is so much opportunity for manipulation of figures, that such a comparison could hardly be made to or by such farmers and are naturally received with a good deal of doubt.

And if these Liverpool figures make it appear that at a given date a buyer in Portland can only afford to pay a cash price of $1.10 per bushel, and yet we find that Chicago buyers on the same day are buying for that same market and paying $1.19 cents for similar wheat and paying a much higher freight rate, and that this discrepancy in price has been maintained with approximate constancy for many months, it seems to become almost a certainty that the Liverpool figures are either manipulated or misunderstood.

Chicago is the great wheat market of the United States. A great proportion of the wheat bought there is bought for export and we may safely assume that the export price governs.

I can see no reason why there is not a comparison between the prices paid there for export and here, which is both convenient and fair.

In The Oregonian, January 18, the preceding day's cash prices for wheat at Chicago are quoted as follows: "No 3 red, $1.19; No. 3 dark northern, $1.25."

At the same time the cash price for hard white wheat in Portland is quoted at $1.09 to $1.10, and all other varieties are quoted still lower. And there has been approximately the same difference in favor of Chicago for a long time. It seems safe to assume that Chicago buyers have been making at least a fair profit on the wheat they have been buying and exporting to Liverpool and other places. If they can afford to export wheat and buy it at $1.19 to $1.25 and pay 17 cents higher freight than Portland has to pay, why cannot our exporters pay the same, or even a higher price, and still make a fair and reasonable profit?

Of course we could hardly expect them to admit it, but does it not seem that the Pacific coast wheat buyers are making enormous profits? It is hard to make it seem right, at least from a farmer's standpoint, to have the grain buyers accumulating millions out of the grain business, with a minimum of effort and industry, while the most careful and industrious of the farmers, who produce the wheat, are constantly drifting towards bankruptcy.

I admit that there may be qualifications which modify the conclusions which seem so plain upon the face of the figures; and there may be conditions of which I have no knowledge, which might justify a more or less different conclusion. If there are such qualifications I should like to see them presented so that myself and other farmers might intelligently understand why wheat prices are higher in Chicago than they are in Portland if the freight rates (as seem to be conceded) are lower to the markets of the world from Portland than they are from Chicago.

A. S. BENNETT.

CONSUMER PAYS FOR FRILLS

Fancy Packages and Kindred Ills Held to Increase Prices.

YAMHILL, Or., Jan. 27.—(To the Editor.)—The article in The Oregonian, January 22, "Cost of Service in Goods Largest," is very misleading, as well as false in many statements made.

Only 37 cents of the retail dollar goes to the farmer, according to the article; the public demands high quality and first-class preparation of commodities, continues the article.

Representative Anderson says the middleman only gives the consumer what he wants and and when he wants it; and further, the simple consumer is willing to pay almost 50 cents for the service. Where he was once content to buy his sugar in sacks by the 100 pounds and other foods in like manner, today he demands his sugar in crystal cubes. His apples he wants polished and expects to pay 5 cents each. His cereals, such as breakfast foods, he wants put up in fancy painted packages and waxed. Then this wonderful article tells us if we would not insist on fancy packages and be content with the cash-and-carry system, instead of delivery, prices probably would be less.

Now, I am one of these consumers, a farmer by occupation. I deny in its entirety the truth of the quoted accusations. They are false in every particular as far as the consumer demanding, or even asking, for his food products to be put up in waxed fancy packages; furthermore the consumer—farmers, mechanics and laborers of all classes—buys his 1922 sugar not in crystal cubes, but in 100-pound sacks, and when in small amounts, in simple brown paper bags—the same kind our ancestors handled.

I make this assertion: The consumer never demanded and never asked for free delivery, fancy tinseled packages, nor anything of the kind, though he does pay for it.

Then who did originate this beautiful package carton

Echo answers, "Who?"

Why the manufacturer of the goods, of course. Competition is the word. He wished to put one over on his rival by doing up his strong butter in a beautiful little box, something his neighborhood merchant had not thought of. So the free delivery of goods was originated.

Why shouldn't he fix 'er up, nicely? The fool consumer paid the bill.

We consumers pay for free delivery (when we get it); we pay for the fancy cartons; we pay for the advertising of goods.

Let me say a word on this last, to the manufacturer: Don't you know, my lord, that glaring headlines and full page advertising, cut no figure with the consumer when he buys his food? He buys his wheat flakes on merit, not because the package so fanciful and pretty. Do you more believe we, the consumers, want to buy polished apples at 5 cents each? Not much, my lord. It is like the entire package business, forced on the consumer and well he pays for it, too.

Now, I go to our merchant here in Yamhill to buy butter, wheat flakes, tea, etc. Do I buy these things to get the pretty box they are contained in? Not a bit of it. Some of these pretty packages contain some very poor foodstuffs; some plain ones, excellent.

JOHN JOHNS.

WOMAN'S SIDE IS HEARD

Quite Often Wives Aren't Crazy About Husbands, Is Assertion.

PULLMAN, Wash., Jan. 27.—(To the Editor.)—I read with amusement the letter from V. L.

Certainly I agree with him in this "man is a polygamist," but where does he get the idea that women have such single-track hearts?

If it were possible to look into the hearts of wives you'd find as many women who were tired of their husbands as it is the other way round.

The stumbling block in the way of women is the high cost in things most dear to her.

Suppose she grows tired of the man she married (I don't expect men to consider that possible) and desires another man?

If she follows her desire it costs her her reputation and her children and, strangest of all, the respect of the new man.

A man can chase around all he pleases and he is still fit to associate with his babies.

Let a woman step aside from the "way she should go" and she is treated as a leper.

The court will take her children from her and give them to their pure-hearted father.

That is not justice, and we all know it.

However, it has always been the man who ruled, so they have taken privileges for themselves.

Men as a whole seem to think a man is justified in killing his wife if he finds her with a lover.

When one thinks of the conduct of men it is to laugh.

If we all could experience real love for the person we married it would last. That is something that seldom happens. I'm afraid.

Surely there are some good, clean men, who expect to live as they would want their wives to.

I don't wish to give the impression that I believe in immorality. Considering it from no angle but that of health even, it is too dangerous; but I hate to see men hugging the foolish conceit that women are so easily satisfied.

Quite often the woman a man thinks is crazy about him calls him a bore and fool to his back.

A WOMAN.

EXPOSITION PLAN OFFERED

Formation of Stock Company and Later Use of Buildings Urged.

PORTLAND, Jan. 27.—(To the Editor.)—As there has been much controversy in regard to the 1925 world's fair, especially about financing and location, permit me to offer a few suggestions. We all realize it is a big undertaking and requires a great deal of thought, time and an enormous expenditure of money. How to raise the money and get the proper location seems to be the all-absorbing questions. This fair is something we all should be interested in, especially a citizen and a resident of Oregon. I take it for granted that any thought or idea would be appreciated by our fair board, which is laboring day and night trying to solve the problem of how best to finance and also to locate as to the best advantage.

This thought occurred to me: First, as to financing, make it a stock company, sell stock to the amount of $4,000,000, buy the proposed site outright; locate it on some spot where it can be utilized for factory purposes, near railroad and waterway, so lay the grounds out that the large buildings may be retained for factory purposes.

The most of the foreign countries and states that will exhibit would, no doubt, rather leave the buildings as they stood than to try and salvage and clear the ground. Having been a resident of St. Louis, Mo., at the time and after the world's fair in 1904, I saw some of those large buildings dynamited and burned to get rid of the rubbish, while others were salvaged and sold. Large dimension timbers, all you could haul with a team, for 50 cents a load, in order to clear the land. This fair was held on the site of Forest park and private property adjoining containing about 2000 acres. The destroying of those buildings was an extravagance and great waste which should be overcome. My idea would be to retain those buildings for factory purposes. Now you have the site and buildings to offer as an inducement to factories to come to our town. The improvements, as well as the site, is property of the world's fair board. At the close of the fair you have something to salvage. On the other hand, if you lease you simply improve other people's property and have nothing to salvage. Now, if you have not enough capital with the $4,000,000, you can very easily bond the collateral you have for enough to complete the site. It has been estimated that at least 2000 acres would be required for the fair site, parking grounds and aviation fields. Such a site I have in mind, at what is known as "Columbia Highway Butte site," or, more familiarly known as "Rocky Butte."

The committee who get the data on the above-mentioned site claim that they have two thousand (2000) acres or more available. This site has railroads running through it and also has a frontage on the great Columbia river. Taking this 2000 acres, I am sure could be purchased for an average of about $800 an acre. Included in this site is a natural place to display the "hydro electric powers," as the butte offers the finest spot in and around Portland for such a display. Bear in mind, you are improving all the while your own property, not filling in someone's frog ponds and spending the people's money for special interests. This is one great opportunity for Portland, Oregon, and the great northwest.

THOMAS W. WINES.

SCHOOL DANCE DEFENDED

Churches Held Not to Be Condemned Because of Hypocrites.

PORTLAND, Jan. 26.—(Tothe Editor.)—I am a visitor in Portland and cannot speak from personal knowledge of the condition surrounding the young attending school dances, but will say that I believe "High School Girl" is nearer right than the critics from the knowledge I have of conditions in my home town as pertaining to public dances.

Supervision of dancing is the thing for parents and friends of the young to interest themselves in if they wish to benefit the rising generation.

Ministers and church people have handed out wholesale condemnation of the dance for hundreds of years. Has it been of any benefit? If a parent attended dances with their children or young people (as should be done) they were spoken of as "under the influence of his satanic majesty," and many, far too many parents let the young people go alone under protest rather than face the storm or tell their brethren that God gave them their children to protect and care for and to him would they go for permission to do so.

Shall we condemn all church members as hypocrites because we find many not living up to their precepts as Christians, perhaps not even to a sufficient extent that any one could tell that an effort had been made?

Shall we condemn all the religious colleges and academies because some of the ministers they turn out are most anything but what a Christian leader should be?

As to myself I will say that I am a member of the Presbyterian church and am trying to live an everyday conscientious Christian life. I have taken part in dances when young and enjoyed them. I enjoy going to the dances and watching the young people and, yes, the older ones who take part, but not where booze was on tap.

My husband and I have five daughters grown and holding responsible positions, thanks to his guidance and care. We settled the question of cards and dancing as pertained to our children, according to the best of our knowledge and ability and I think some ministers' families would be better off if said ministers were permitted to get out of church ruts.

C. E. W.

MOTHER DEFENDS DANCING

Spooning Declared Cause of Girls' Downfall in Most Cases.

SILVERTON, Or., Jan. 26.—(To the Editor.)—May I, a woman of 50 years, who has danced all her life, say a word about dancing? It is as natural for young people to want to keep time to music as for lambs to frolic or birds to sing.

I had danced for years before the thought of sex—while dancing—ever entered my heart, and then it was suggested by reading an article written by a Methodist minister. I watched myself then to see if there was anything in it—but I have never been able to discover the slightest sensation.

However, I think there is a chance of the well-meaning clergy doing much harm by suggesting such possibilities to our young people. Furthermore, I firmly believe that the ministers who make those suggestions do not speak from experience.

I am a Christian woman and I love purity and I love truth and I want to tell you right here—it is not dancing that makes girls go wrong—it is "spooning"—the pernicious habit some girls have of allowing caresses from every Tom, Dick and Harry, or even just Harry.

Ask any girl who has gone wrong, and nine out of ten will tell you their downward path was prefaced with spooning, not dancing.

Do not think I approve of the position most of our young people take in the modern dance—in fact I think in some instances it is most disgusting. Anything approaching a caress should be tabooed, not only by the public but by the girls themselves.

But—do not condemn dancing as an amusement among social equals—rather teach your daughters the proper respect for their bodies and the slogan of "hands off" under all circumstances and—dance with them, fathers, mothers and teachers, and personally see to it that conditions are right—and then they can go on dancing until the crack of doom and their morals will be just as clean as yours, from whom they were inherited.

MOTHER OF SIX.

MEN AT DANCES BLAMED

Many Young Girls Said to Be Forced to Yield.

ALBANY, Or., Jan. 26.—(To the Editor.)—For seven years I have been studying dancing—studying it not only that I might deal understandingly with my own family, but because it is one of the great questions before us.

To this end I have attended dances on all occasions—in our Oregon college towns, at the beaches, at great dancehalls in the cities up and down the coast. I have had no opportunity to visit the low and obscure little places, only those frequented by the better class. I have not seen essentially high school dances, but have seen large numbers of our students on the floors. I have declined to act as patroness and have placed myself in a balcony or other sightly place, commanding a full view of the dancers.

While on every floor there are numbers of clean young couples dancing with their own set, enjoying the music and the rythm, there are always many, many cases too revolting to be described. I have seen many of your best young men, secure in their prominent family connections, whose over-powering sexual desires were disgustingly evident. These fellows are usually able to dance with the best girls, and I have seen many girls try hard in the beginning of a dance to hold them steady, but the powerful sexuality seldom fails to conquer before the dance is done, and the scarlet cheeks, flaming eyes, the "give" of the body, show that she had to yield. Few girls have courage to make a scene on the floor, especially as these cases are frequent. I have never seen one of these suspectable beasts put off the floor. They are skilled in knowing just how far to go. Of course, many girls are equally guilty. Watching these things an entire evening, no mature, reasoning person doubts the outcome. And our high school dances take the young people in adolescence, when the untrained young passions can scarcely be controlled under the best conditions.

I know many girls who have danced for years, absolutely clean; but these are girls of high principles, rather deficient in sexuality. I am not able to make the same assertion of the boys—and the double standard is the curse of humanity.

As to patronesses and chaperones, I have studied numbers of them, along with the young people. Their only thought seems to be that the young people must have a good time. I have in mind one, a member of my own church, who thinks "dancing is a beautiful amusement for young people." She enjoys being a patroness, sitting in evening dress in a coterie of choice spirits, sipping her punch. But if she could sit with me and see her daughter's body mistreated as I have seen it—if Mrs. —— could see it, I say; but she never sees those little things.

I am sorry to deprive our young people of any enjoyment of youth. I have no wish to hold up the eternal "Thou shalt not." But I crave for them all the best in this life and in eternity; and I cannot forget the words of the book the world honors, "Thou shalt not commit adultery"—and to that end, "Lead us not into temptation."

A PRESBYTERIAN MOTHER.

DANCE ARGUMENT RAPPED

Day First Woman Rode Bicycle Recalled by Rider.

PORTLAND, Jan. 28.—(To the Editor)—A writer in a Portland newspaper, while discussing the question of dancing, said:

"Dancing, to young people, is like the first taste of human blood to a tame lion—they must have more at any cost. Would you put a wolf among a band of lambs? Well, a child is better than a lamb, but the dance evil is far worse than a wolf."

Well, then, people who constitute a dancing party are divided in two classes—lambs and wolves. Most of us will readily admit that "the party of the first part" is properly classified, but where does that place the masculine portion of society? Are the high school boys, or even those of the grammar grades, mere wolves, even tame wolves, who regard all girls as so much prey to be devoured? Where does such a wild accusation as this leave the male sex, anyway? Today there are all over this land many thousands of ministers, bishops, laymen, statesmen, inventors and many millions of high class and useful citizens, who were accused when in their teens of doing misdeeds that were contributing to the eventual "downfall of civilization."

The declaration which I have quoted is ridiculous. Its writer belongs to the class which feels itself outraged when a woman or girl appears on the streets wearing a short skirt. Why? Does it give rise in his mind to evil thoughts? And, if so, why? Had he no suspicion until that awful sight met his shocked gaze that all women are females, whether wearing long skirts, short skirts or no skirts? Then, why should he be more upset at what a short skirt reveals than at what is plainly disclosed in the first chapter of Genesis? There are a great many things that both men and women have taken for granted without making a special fuss about the matter.

So the human race is composed of lambs and wolves. Yet, they vegetate in the same enclosure and neither appears alarmed. Reminds me that about 20 years ago one of the leading girls of Salem made her appearance on the streets of Salem on a bicycle, and the straight-laced—the "ironclads"—were so shocked that the rumbling was felt and heard all over Marion county. That female bicyclist was a devouring wolf on wheels, but within a few months half the women in Salem were bicycle riders—and unhurt!

T. T. GEER.

DARWIN THEORY DISCUSSED

Writer Says Curiosity Has Turned Men Away From Bible.

PORTLAND, Jan. 27.—(To the Editor.)—I have read with interest the editorial in The Oregonian January 8, "The Origin of Life." I would like to suggest that Darwin's theory as stated by you, "that living matter was but the exceptionally complicated development of chemical and physical properties recognized in evolution," leaves us also "without even a theory to comfort us."

A theory is a "mental plan or scheme framed to agree with the observed facts and designed as a rational explanation of them." I ask, does evolution fit into that definition of "theory?" Is evolution "a rational explanation" of "observed facts" concerning the origin of life? Is not this whole attempt to explain the origin of life just exactly what Professor Bateson calls it—"obscurantism?"

For the origin of life, evolution goes back from man to the first germ of life, and then what? Why, there the wonderfully wise divide. One side tells us that the origin of this first germ was spontaneous generation (whatever that is) and the other side serenely informs us that the first germ of life came from some other planet. Well if the latter be true pity help life on some other planet, if all they could do was to throw us some germs. And anyway, is not that a "rational explanation" gone to seed? Some germ thrown off from some other planet. Where do the "observed facts" come in? Is that sort of thing to be accepted because some man talks it?

And then the other, "spontaneous generation," what sort of thing is that? What was it that spontaneously generated and produced this germ of life?

And then that germ began evolution. Was there only one germ? And where is the proof that even that one germ evoluted? Some numberless hosts of living creatures, from the myriads too small to be seen without the microscope up to the camel and the elephant, are everywhere about us, and have been for many centuries before evolution was ever thought of, and yet not an evolutionist, not even Darwin, has been able to show a single creature of any kind in transition from one species to another.

Is it not pressing matters to ask men to believe conclusions that are arrived at by "we may well suppose," which occurs in two of Darwin's principal works more than 800 times?

There is no so-called science that begins it knows not where; that does not produce one single proof of any of its assertions, that is built upon nothing but presumptions and probabilities and guesses; that asks us to believe that men were monkeys before they were men because the foetus of a child and the foetus of an ape cannot be told the one from the other, notwithstanding that there cannot be detected any difference between the single cell of a child, an elephant, an eagle, a worm or a plant.

Truly, as you say, Darwin has given direction "to the spirit of curiosity (let us say, leaving out the word scientific) for which above all others the 19th century is famed," but that spirit of curiosity has led men away from the Bible. It has turned men away from the word of God "to indulge in" and set their hopes upon "mere guesswork."

A. R. BELL.

DANCE GROUPING PROPOSED

Let Superiority of Dancers or Non-Dancers Be Proved, Is Suggestion.

PORTLAND, Jan. 27.—(To the Editor.)—There is a solution of the present controversy as to dancing in the public schools that should prove effective and productive of complete harmony. Let the opponents of dancing organize a Young People's Recreation association to provide within the public schools recreation conforming to the highest standards of psychology. Let this organization have privileges equal with those of the advocates of dancing and let attendance be optional with the students and their parents.

Then, from time to time, questions as to the relative superiority of the two plans could be answered scientifically. Possibly neither side would ever be entirely convinced. But a large proportion of the patrons would be able to make a more intelligent choice than they could by any other method of argument or investigation.

Among the questions that might be studied would be the following:

1. Which forms of amusement are inherently the most attractive?

2. Which conduce to the greatest interest and proficiency in the regular work of the school?

3. Which class of students exhibits the greater interest in (a) religion and spiritual values, (b) the supreme classics of literature, of art, of music, of social service; (c) the higher processes of reasoning, such as generalization and abstract thought?

4. Which class displays the greater resourcefulness in conversation and in entertainment outside of dancing and the conventional games?

5. Which class contributes the larger percentage of its numbers to the ranks of the delinquents?

6. Which class contributes the larger percentage of its numbers to the divorce courts?

7. Is there any noticeable difference between the average of the different classes in self-mastery and in aspiration for the highest and best in education, in culture, in social service?

As an opponent of dancing I firmly believe this deadly parallel would be decidedly to the advantage of the group that did not participate in the dances as compared with the group that participated in both the dances and the games, and emphatically to the disadvantage of the group that participated only in the dances. But I am willing to be convinced of error as are doubtless the advocates of dancing and as are all parents who aspire for their children attainments as far as possible above the oppressive level of dull mediocrity.

H. P. LEE.

ALL DANCING CONDEMNED

Writer Declares Spiritual Work Should Be Done Instead.

MONROE, Or., Jan. 26.—(To the Editor.)—I am very much interested in the discussion of the dance, as the issue is important. Some one is mistaken. I am a native of Oregon and first saw the light in 1850. Just a little before The Oregonian was first issued. We have grown up together and I scan daily its interesting pages. My early life was in the neighborhood where I now reside. There was a host of young people and they were regular attendants at church and Sunday school. We were taught that the dance was wrong, hence there were no dances in the community. In the adjoining neighborhood there were dances but our young people did not attend them. We did not lack for good times. We had spelling bees that drew people from other schools and there was much interest, for there were some spellers. In those days literary societies were of the best. The issues of the day were debated. Essays of a high order were listened to—declamations as well. All in all, it required about as much time as the average young person could well donate. It was in such an atmosphere that Louis Albert Banks grew to manhood. He is now one of the first authors and platform speakers of the nation. His books are widely read. Hon. M. C. Hawley took his first lessons here. He has represented his constituency in congress for a number of years. Many other men and women have proved their worth to the state. More young men and women have attended Willamette university from here than from any other point that I know of of like population. There was not a dance, a law suit nor an illegitimate child born here during the first 20 years from the beginning of this society. To assert that young people will dance anyway is a mistake. We did not dance and had no such desire. Some years ago I took my youngest son to a county fair and one of the attractions was a public dance. That was my son's first look at such a scene. It proved a very disgusting one to him. He is a clean Sunday school superintendent now doing his bit for the betterment of the world.

In all my observations I have never known a man or woman who frequented the dance, who was helpful in a spiritual task. They were about at such times if some one was on his deathbed and needed spiritual guidance. It was not the dancing master that aided them but the one who was capable of giving spiritual help. It is this viewpoint that makes the difference in the discussion of this subject. Some are looking at it from the material or worldly pleasures, others from the Christian viewpoint.

Our government was founded by Christian men. It stands today as a Christian nation, with a Christian president. One may be helpful or a menace, according as our lives shall tell for Christian ideals.

M. C. BELKNAP.

STAND TAKEN AGAINST DANCE

Pleasures Requiring Regulation Are Declared Vice-Breeders.

PORTLAND, Jan. 27.—(To the Editor.)—School Director Clark says "the ministers have proved nothing and submitted no concrete facts." Mr. Clark knows as well as any other fairly-organized man that the submission of "concrete facts" would lead to the abandonment of the dance objection and turn to a barrage of fire on the preacher, a change of attack to defense.

The chief of police, the other day in The Oregonian said, "Immorality was worse in Portland this year than last." The shakeup of the morals squad was the result. But why doesn't the chief get an order to present "concrete facts" He is allowed to pursue his course unhampered when he has not adduced a single case of immorality in the realm of the squad. Immorality is one thing that every man, woman, boy and girl will talk about, and their fathers, mothers and uncles will lie about, also, and cloud the fact if possible. The demand on the preachers was manifestly unfair.

What do we support the school for? Is the objective better citizens, mentally, physically and morally? Well, how does the modern dance contribute to the building of either of these? If Mr. Clark will give one "concrete" example of better organized brain power because of the modern dance, I will eat his hat and I have no appetite for hats, either.

Every city has passed a system of laws regulating dance halls. These laws were not passed by a board of preachers, but case-hardened politicians. Why? Because the dance is a moral disintegrator and not a high ideal builder. If the dance ran upward there never would be any regulating laws; it's because of its recognized downward tendency that it is looked after by the police. Anything that needs regulation is unsound in its make-up. There is no demand to regulate healthy things. Regulation is always called in to curb something unhealthy and unsound.

Do you notice that wherever dancing is mentioned it is coupled by friend and foe with this damnatory word "regulate?" Here is the admission that the thing is inherently dangerous. Then why do we put it in the high school?

The dance that runs down hill in a resort will not run up h