Oregon Journal

AN INDEPENDENT NEWSPAPER.

C. S. JACKSON.....Publisher

Published every day, afternoon and morning (except Sunday afternoon), at The Journal Building, Broadway and Yamhill streets, Portland, Or.

Entered at the postoffice at Portland, Or., for transmission through the mails as second class matter.

TELEPHONES — Main 7173; Home, A-6051. All departments reached by these numbers. Tell the operator what department you want.

FOREIGN ADVERTISING REPRESENTATIVE
Benjamin & Kentnor Co., Brunswick Bldg., 225 Fifth Ave., New York. 1218 People's Gas Bldg., Chicago.

Subscription terms by mail or to any address in the United States or Mexico:
DAILY (MORNING OR AFTERNOON)
One year.....$5.00 | One month.....$ .50
SUNDAY
One year.....$2.50 | One month.....$ .25
DAILY (MORNING OR AFTERNOON) AND SUNDAY
One year.....$7.50 | One month.....$ .65

America asks nothing for herself but what she has a right to ask for humanity itself.
—WOODROW WILSON.

Millions for defense, but not a cent for tribute.
CHARLES C. PINCKNEY.

Mad wars destroy in one year the works of many years of peace.
—Benjamin Franklin.

FAIRBANKS VS. FAIRBANKS

IN HIS Portland speech last night, former Vice President Fairbanks claimed that President Wilson has not kept us out of war. He claimed that the landing of American sailors at Vera Cruz was war and that accordingly President Wilson is entitled to no credit for keeping us in peace.

Mr. Fairbanks ought in some way to make his speech harmonize with Mr. Hughes' speeches and Mr. Roosevelt's speeches. Mr. Hughes and Mr. Roosevelt are denouncing President Wilson because he kept us in peace and Mr. Fairbanks is arguing that he did not keep us in peace.

Mr. Fairbanks ought also to make his present speeches harmonize better with his speech before an editorial association in Indiana in 1913. In that address, delivered when he was not a candidate for the vice presidency, Mr. Fairbanks uttered one of the most emphatic indorsements of President Wilson's Mexican policy that has been heard. Among other things, he said:

I have no doubt that the disturbances in Mexico during the last few years have been due, in a greater or less degree, to an effort on the part of ambitious, cunning men to force intervention and possibly annexation to the United States.

The exploiters of public utilities and of the mineral and agricultural resources of our neighbor have undoubtedly thought that they would gain much if they could force intervention by the United States. There are soldiers of fortune in Mexico who would undoubtedly welcome such a contingency.

Sensationalists are adding to the confusion of the situation and making more difficult the solution of the problem. Intervention in Mexico is, of course, not a matter to be considered lightly; for intervention means war, and war means the destruction of human lives and the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars.

These were Mr. Fairbanks' views as to the Mexican situation at a time when his utterances were not influenced by partisan politics. They are his real views. He said then that he had no doubt that the troubles in Mexico are due to "the efforts of cunning men to force intervention and possibly annexation to the United States." He said then that "exploiters of public utilities and of the mineral and agricultural resources have undoubtedly thought that they could gain much if they could force intervention by the United States." That is what President Wilson has said. It is what everybody knows to be true. That is what is at the bottom of the whole clamor for war on Mexico.

In his address to the editorial association at a time when he was not a candidate for office, Mr. Fairbanks further said:

If our speculators in Mexico suffer pecuniary loss as the result of recurring revolutions, that is a matter for future consideration, when stable government and peace are fully established in that country. It is no warrant for shedding the blood of Americans.

To sacrifice the life of one soldier for all of the dollars investors or speculators have ventured in Mexico would be the supremest criminal folly.

Without a deliberate affront on the part of the Mexican government, whether it exists de jure or de facto, is no ground on which we would be justified in sending our armies beyond the Rio Grande.

President Wilson is dealing with it as best he can. We may not entirely agree that his course is better than that of his distinguished predecessor, nevertheless, we should endeavor to uphold his hand.

There should be no difference of opinion as to that. By doing so we shall make his path a comparatively easy one.

It is not an hour for either little politics or sensational journalism.

The clamor of the jingoes should not be allowed to drown the voice of rational, deliberate statesmanship.

It is a pretty safe rule when we come to deal with grave international problems to put our faith in the president of the United States and follow where he may lead.

He speaks for the country when we come to deal with international affairs. The president of the United States is a safer guide than sensationalists and soldiers of fortune who come to the surface whenever international controversies arise.

When he was not a candidate, Mr. Fairbanks' words rang true. There was eternal truth in his statement then that "to sacrifice the life of one soldier for all of the dollars investors and speculators have ventured in Mexico would be the supremest criminal folly."

Mr. Fairbanks' speech as a candidate is made absurd by his speech when he was not a candidate.

The Bremerton man who ran seven miles rather than be late to his work, and then died of heart failure, furnishes a portentous illustration of what happens to a man when he gets to be too industrious.

MOTHER JONES

IT SEEMS odd that a figure like Mother Jones should come to the front in American life. In this land of equality and opportunity there should be no reason for the furies of the French reign of terror to reappear with stringing hair and mad eyes urging on the mob to murder.

Mother Jones shrieked to her audience of women in New York the other night that they ought to rush out upon the streets and "play hell." Some of them took her advice literally and the traction strike grew somewhat more gory for her words.

Mother Jones has been engaged in our civil wars for many years. We call them "industrial difficulties," but historians will unhesitatingly call them civil wars. In these furious contests a woman could hardly be expected to retain her poise and tolerance, no matter how mild she might have been to begin with.

It is a little peculiar, now that we stop to think of it, that it snowed round about Eugene almost coincident with the arrival of Charles Warren Fairbanks in the vicinity of that highly psychological city.

ON THE FARM

GOVERNOR BRUMBAUGH of Pennsylvania may have found the true reason why boys and girls desert the farm for the city. He makes the suggestion that it is due to the lack of courting facilities and in order to prevent the flow of the rural population townward recommends that every farm house should have a parlor where Huldy might receive and entertain her "company" free from the deterrent influence of other members of the family.

The shyness of the rustic lover is traditional and real. His Amaryllis must be alone before he can summon up courage to go in.

If he has no chance to tell his story he will either never marry or else go sparking some town girl.

Meanwhile the practical farmer would be amused with this governor's recipe for a great "back-to-the-farm" movement were the conditions that cause the migration to the cities not a tragedy.

The true reason why the boys and girls have not remained on the farm is that farming has not been a paying business. The farmer has been the most exploited individual in America. He has had to pay 8, 10, 12 and even 20 per cent interest together with bonuses, brokerage commissions, abstract fees and lawyers' fees on short time loans. The mortgage held his nose to the grindstone. He couldn't get rid of it. It hung around his neck like a millstone.

Others got loans at 4 to 6 per cent interest and on long time, but he couldn't. He was plucked by middlemen until he has been quitting the farm and gone to the city in the despairing hope of bettering his condition.

Could it be said, when a Portland policeman in attempting to restore a fainting wife to consciousness allowed her erring husband to make a get-away, that the escape was due to civil service?

COORDINATED RELIEF

THOSE who have had to do with the charity work in Portland in the past will see much common sense in the suggestion of County Commissioner Holman for the consolidation of all charitable work under one head.

No one will attempt to gainsay the humanitarian and beneficent work that has been done in the past by the charitable organizations of the city. But there are too many of them. There is too much duplication of effort, too much overlapping of relief in one place and overlooking of relief in another. There are too many generals and too many armies to do the work that unfortunate circumstances demand shall be done.

There is no question of the earnestness of effort and the honesty of purpose of those who are the sponsors for and the executives of the existing charitable organizations. It is not a question of intention but of results that has doubtless caused Mr. Holman to suggest that one central organization be provided to take charge of this most important task.

The prime consideration in carrying on the work coming before charitable organizations is to give the greatest amount of needed relief to the largest number of people possible from the funds or materials at command. The more overhead that can be eliminated, the more duplication of effort and relief that can be avoided, the greater the success that will result.

PEACE OR WAR--WHICH?

IF PRESIDENT WILSON and his policy of peace should be repudiated, doubt and fear would at once begin to run through the business and industrial life of this nation. Even the guardianship of the federal reserve system could not save business and industry from fear of consequences of a calamitous war with America involved.

A fundamental in our present transcendent prosperity is the fact that we are in peace and that so long as the present helmsman is in the White House, we are likely to remain in peace.

Nobody can say that the warring nations of Europe are prosperous. Instead of having prosperity, they are driving headlong in the direction of national bankruptcy.

They are piling up mighty burdens of debt. These debts must be paid by the toil of the people. A nation or a man mortgaged to the utmost limit of value is not prosperous but a bankrupt.

The warring nations are burning up their wealth in explosives. The product of their factories is snuffed out in bursting shells. Their industries, like their people, are bleeding to death.

The peace in which we have been wisely kept, has given us the chance to become prosperous. But we are told that President Wilson is to be condemned for keeping America in peace. In his Chicago speech, Mr. Hughes said in an attack on the German and Mexican policy of President Wilson:

If anything in the campaign is real, it is that we are now facing the question whether we WANT WORDS OR WHETHER WE WANT DEEDS, WHETHER WE WANT THAT WHICH IS WRITTEN AND SPOKEN OR WHETHER WE WANT AMERICAN ACTION.

There can be no two opinions on what Mr. Hughes' language means. Though President Wilson was so strong in his notes to Germany that he brought this country to the verge of war, Mr. Hughes says the president was not strong enough and that the "real" issue in this campaign is whether "we want words or whether we want deeds."

This country stood still and held its breath after the sending of each of the several notes to Germany. We were for many days a nation of serious-faced men and women, fearing the worst but hoping for the best. Stocks declined in the markets and business enterprises everywhere were filled with fear.

But Mr. Hughes says President Wilson's "words" were not strong enough medicine and that we want "deeds." In New York, condemning President Wilson's peace policy and arguing for a war policy, Mr. Roosevelt said:

No man has a right to claim a spiritual kinship with Abraham Lincoln if he is too proud to fight.

Mr. Hughes sat on the platform with Mr. Roosevelt and approved and applauded this argument against President Wilson's peace policy. On the public statements of both men, we are assured that in their view of President Wilson's long struggle to keep this country out of war, Mr. Hughes and Mr. Roosevelt are "in perfect accord."

At Battle Creek, Mr. Roosevelt said:

The men who now with timid hearts and quavering voices, praise Mr. Wilson for having kept us out of war, are the actual heirs of the Tories of 1776.

No stronger attack could be made upon the president for keeping us out of war or upon the people for desiring the president to keep us out of war. Mr. Roosevelt denounces them as "Tories" for not wanting war. He ridicules them as men "with timid hearts and quavering voices" for desiring peace. And this is what Mr. Hughes declared at Chicago and in many other speeches to be the paramount issue, the "real" issue of this campaign.

If on such a line-up President Wilson and his peace policy should be repudiated, the election will bring a shock to the business and industrial life of this country. Mr. Hughes will understand that his election would mean the people's indorsement of his war policy. Mr. Roosevelt would insist that the verdict meant the people's demand for Mr. Hughes' war policy instead of President Wilson's peace policy. Indeed, President Wilson's supporters themselves would be compelled to admit that the people had voted for "deeds" instead of peaceful diplomacy.

The business, the finance and the industry of America would be forced to accept the same conclusion. The business, the finance and the industry of the whole country would be driven to a realization that the people had voted against peace, and would instantly recall that war has not made Europe prosperous.

Business cannot remain stable and optimistic with a crowd of war chiefs around the White House and in the cabinet. Mr. Roosevelt, as secretary of state and thereby head of our foreign policy, sniffing the blood and battle from afar, would be mad with thirst for military glory, and nobody knows how soon he would embroil us in the foreign inferno. "I would instantly have taken possession of every German ship interned in this country," is one thing he said he would have done when the Lusitania was torpedoed. That is a step which when Portugal tried it brought an immediate declaration of war against her by Germany.

We cannot have prosperity without peace. If any doubt it, let them behold Europe's wealth and life bleeding to death.

Letters From the People

[Communications sent to The Journal for publication in this department should be write ten on only one side of the paper, should not exceed 300 words in length, and must be accompanied by the name and address of the sender. If the writer does not desire to have the name published he should so state.]

"Discussion is the greatest of all reformers. It rationalizes everything it touches. It robs principles of all false sanctity and throws them back on their reasonableness. If they have no reasonableness, it ruthlessly crushes them out of existence and sets up its own conclusions in their stead."—Woodrow Wilson.

A Lincoln Republican.

Portland, Oct. 6.—To the Editor of The Journal—I am not surprised to read in your helpful paper of the sentiment of the people for Woodrow Wilson, who is the greatest president the American people ever had. I have been a Republican all my life, but could not stand the standpat leadership any longer. I am for President Wilson. His opponents are stunned at the legislative accomplishments of President Wilson in three years and a half, for the people, while those previously in power did scarcely anything after Lincoln's time.

Candidate Hughes stated in his Milwaukee speech that he, if elected president, would undertake to wipe out all the legislative accomplishments of President Wilson. Such bomb throwing as that from Hughes should drive the people solidly to President Wilson. Candidate Hughes has great ability for hindsight, while President Wilson has great ability and capacity for foresight. Mr. Hughes and his campaigners are doing nothing but misrepresenting.

Mr. Hughes did not show brightness, or he would not have chosen Roosevelt and Taft for his advisers.

The people must be on hand this coming election and roll up a big vote for President Wilson. It is the wrong time to change. When President Wilson puts in another four years the standpatters will be of the past. The people don't want Wall street to run the government, as it always did before Wilson's administration.

If Hughes is elected you can look for war, as Roosevelt will be the high functionary of the administration.

Hughes, Roosevelt and Taft, if defeated, need not ever expect to become supreme judges of the United States courts in the future and perform such acts as they have to President Wilson, the greatest man that ever strove for the cause of the people. J. L.

"Always Right."

Cosmopolis, Wash., Oct. 5.—To the Editor of The Journal—I once knew a man who apparently was a standpatter on religion, as well as a preacher of it. He had his ideas and opinions. No doubt many of them were good convictions, but the point is that, as regards those ideas, he was extremely dogmatic, and his sermons smacked of egoism. He was right! Anyone who did not concur with him in his beliefs was positively wrong, and the preacher laid great emphasis on that "fact."

But eventually there came a change! He just merely "flopped." With a breath-taking suddenness he announced that he no longer was a ———, but had become a pastor in the ——— church. His views had undergone a change terrific. They were now just the opposite from what they had been. And still that preacher put on enough effrontery to appear before the people and continue to cry that he was right! Listen! He was right before, and when he adopted opposite views, he was still right, and those who did not agree with him were wrong! He was positive of that.

That, I consider, is a case of helpless dogmatism. But, briefly, let me cite another case.

Theodore Roosevelt was absolutely right, to hear him talk, when he bade goodbye to trusts and the big bugs, and formed the Progressive party. He was right when he asserted that the Republicans had degenerated into a party of crooks and porch climbers.

And now that he has again affiliated himself with the gang that had so degenerated—listen! He is still right! If a person does not believe that Roosevelt is right, no matter what he believes or preaches, or whom he supports or condemns, all he has to do is to read Roosevelt's speeches and find out.

When Colonel Roosevelt assailed Taft, he was right! Taft was wrong! Now Roosevelt has slipped into the money clique alongside of Taft, and still, Roosevelt is right. But Taft hasn't changed a bit.

No matter what he does or believes, no matter whom he attacks or greets with warmth, and no matter what he preaches and shouts, Roosevelt has the effrontery to lay emphasis on the constant claim that he is right.

Such dogmatic inconsistency is sickening, and I do not believe people will be deceived by it. Wilson, the true and the consistent, for them.

FRED H. WINSOR.

The Money Power Considered.

Portland, Oct. 6.—To the Editor of The Journal—I hear that many think if Hughes is elected "good times" will follow immediately, and if Wilson is the choice of the people "bad times" will continue. Is it not a fact that the worst panic this country has had was under Roosevelt's administration? Why is it that voters do not inform themselves as to cause and effect of past financial legislation?—mostly legislation which began with the issuance of the greenbacks, at which the bullion brokers of Wall street and other depositories balked, because the greenback, as first issued, was good for all debts, public and private.

But the bullionists did not want the greenback that way. They did not want the interest on the public debt (the bonds) paid with cheap money like paper. Interest must be paid in something which had intrinsic value—gold, for instance. So the bullionists pestered congress until they got the word "except" placed before "duties on imports and interest on the public debt" (bonds), depreciating the cheap money to 43 cents on the dollar, with which they bought bonds, and sold said bonds for 100 cents, or par, pocketing 57 cents on the dollar. Those patriots of that time paid off our veterans of the Civil war in the 43 cent dollars.

Thad Stevens said at that time, "I have a foreboding that we are about to consummate some cunningly devised scheme which will carry great injury and loss to all classes of people throughout the United States. It (the bill) now creates a depreciated currency. It makes two classes of money, one for the banks and brokers, and another for the people."

The above was act 1 in the financial game. That we have been in bondage to the money power all these years no one can deny.

Money, according to the constitution, is a medium of exchange, and never intended for anything else. The banks are overflowing with gold, but there is no market for it, so it is hoarded to the detriment of all business, and for no reason on earth only to make money hard to get hold of. It is no wonder food products are soaring.

We should make our votes demand, first, to take the property provisions out of money. Next, make it a crime to sequester over $100,000 for any one person. Let us stop building up money lords to the detriment of the working class. This will make good times, and nothing else will do it. This may seem revolutionary, but I see no other way to equalize the situation. Turn the surplus over to those who earn it. HATTIE YATES BELDIN.

Calls Near Side Stop Mistake.

Portland, Oct. 5. — To the Editor of The Journal—If the commissioner who conceived the near side stop for Portland had served an apprenticeship on the streetcar he would never have made the mistake he has. It would look as though, after the thing had been tried out in this city and had proved unsatisfactory, it would have been wisdom to put the matter to a popular vote before instituting a change.

If "safety first" is the argument for the change the most of the people will be "from Missouri." If uniformity is the plea, it does not now and probably never will secure that.

There are several reasons why the plan ought to be abolished:

It is unnatural. The natural place for one to stand on coming to a carline is at the intersection of the side walk with the street. Why run down the block?

It is inconvenient. It is very often the case that one can by running make the car he wants to take, and if the car stops on the far side of the street the party can be seen by the motorman and the car stop on signal, but if the party comes to the near side of the street just as the car is passing he cannot get the car, as it is already past the place of stopping and may not stop on the far side of the street.

It is damaging to the parking of the streets. We haven't too much beauty along our streets. But we are trying to induce the setting out of shrubbery in the parking and this ordinance is destructive of the best results in that line.

To run down the walk and then tramp across the parking, and especially in wet weather, is to tramp all the grass down and to ruin the shrubbery and to discourage the owner of property in his attempts to make the city beautiful. It also affects the passenger, for often he will have to rush through rose bushes or other shrubbery, tearing his clothing.

It makes for a slow schedule. Imagine a woman with several children and passengers with luggage and old people who have to walk the length of the car before the conductor can give the signal to go and then note whether it is conductive to promptness.

The only specious excuse for the change is the fact that Seattle has it that way, etc., etc. Can you imagine the series of whereasing that preceded the introduction of this ordinance? It looks sometimes as though Portland wasted too much time waiting until Seattle did something and then either giving itself up to mourning over the thought that the city on the sound stole our opportunity while we were asleep, or breaking our necks to ape what she has done.

It will be said that many of the cities in the east have such an ordinance and that your critic has not traveled. Yes, he has, and will again and in fact he is traveling some now. But the trouble with those eastern cities is that they have not come west. Why should the star of empire turn again east?

As I have stopped in the cities of the effete east I have often reflected that Portland has had hitherto the best—positively the best—car service to be found, as respects the courtesy of its car men and the convenience of its service, and I hope there will be a general protest against the ordinance in question, and that it will result in a return to the old order of things which pleased both the public and the car men. W. N. COFFEE.

Oriental Thought.

Vancouver, Wash., Oct. 2.—To the Editor of The Journal—I have read your editorial in The Sunday Journal regarding oriental philosophy as expounded by the illustrious Tagore. Some years of sojourn "east of Suez" has put me in touch with able expounders of this thought. Its consistency, or naturalness, is particularly appealing and convincing. It differs from occidental thought from the fact that it is monistic.

The oriental does not seek cause. The word to him is meaningless. It is a veritable will o' the wisp. There is always a cause preceding a cause, therefore cause is infinite, and when those of this school arrive at the infinite they stop short. They never hope to think the unthinkable, know the unknowable, or conceive the inconceivable. To them nature is eternal, therefore without cause, and is the one all-in-all problem. They find within the realms of nature a field amply spacious and interesting to occupy their thought and they realize that the hope of our race depends on our intelligent conception of nature.

READER.

In Reply to Mr. Frank.

Portland, Oct. 4.—To the Editor of The Journal—In last Sunday's Journal O. E. Frank is again to the front, rejoicing over the loss of half a million men for the allies in the "big push." There is nothing strange about either the loss or Mr. Frank's elation. Germany gained the territory she holds by a surprise rush through the country of a peaceful and neutral neighbor. It has taken unprepared England two years to raise and drill an army to combat this invasion, during which time Germany has been entrenching and fortifying herself by every device that her ingenuity could devise. But for nearly two years she has gained nothing. Failing to take Paris in the allotted three weeks, the kaiser made one of his greatest efforts to take Calais, but failed. What chance has he now? Germany derided England's "despicable army." She always contended, and probably made herself believe, that no army raised from grown civilians could ever be made the equal of her military forces. They could not be taught the goose step. I am sure it must affect the German morale to have to flee before this same army.

In regard to England drawing other nations in, how about Bulgaria and the unspeakable Turk?

And as to Britain's tottering empire, it was never more united. How many Germans have fallen before the gallant Australians, New Zealanders and Canadians?

England is really the only one of the big nations that is fighting an entirely defensive war, for she is fighting to keep what Germany is fighting to take. With command of the sea in German hands, England could be starved out in a few weeks. And would Germany hesitate? C. B. PYE.

PERTINENT COMMENT AND NEWS IN BRIEF

SMALL CHANGE

The one person to whom the price of the loaf makes no difference is the loafer.

Quebec bridge has a good big lot on London bridge for it has definitively fallen down.

Perhaps the Vancouver ferryman wouldn't so much have minded that broken shaft after the opening of the Interstate bridge. But such is the jinx.

Boston is in Massachusetts. Brooklyn is in New York. Doesn't that give the interstate commerce commission jurisdiction of this world series ticket scalping? There ought to be a law.

Toward the finish of the season it must make the leaders want to murder the tailenders when they think of their losing to teams that are loafing along in the middle of the column.

Governor Brumbaugh of Pennsylvania says 95 per cent of the girl graduates of high schols don't know how to cook. But on the other hand, 95 per cent of the cooks aren't hep to any of that high school stuff.

But suppose there is an embargo on wheat. Won't those who control the bread supply charge the prices that would prevail if there were no embargo? Or—since nobody can tell what those would be—just a little bit more?

White and colored men fight in Montana. Two white men are killed. Five colored men and two white men are jailed. There was a time when such combats were called "race riots," though it is not likely that many of them ever were such.

Granting that the 10-cent loaf is to be equal to two 5-cent loaves, your opinion of the change will depend somewhat upon whether you like or loathe stale bread. Also, in some cases, whether or not you can dig a dime about as easy as a nickel.

OREGON SIDELIGHTS

The physical geography class of the Elmira high school is planning to build a sun dial on the school campus.

Friday, October 13, will be Membership day in the Pendleton Commercial club. Five teams of 10 men each will compete.

Tourists registered at the Lithia Park auto camp ground, Ashland, to the number of 1965, from May 10 to October 4.

The Astoria school board has decided, on the recommendation of the superintendent, to open the night schools on November 6.

In view of the high cost of flour, the Eugene Register remarks: "Well, Oregon is becoming a corn state, so there will always be 'pone' to fall back on."

Rhapsody suitable to the season, in Dallas Observer: "Honest now, aren't you glad hop picking is over, the county fair is over and has been a success, the state fair is gone for another year, and prune picking will soon be through? School has started; the frost is on the pumpkin; fall is here."

Encouraging real estate report in Ashland Tidings: "Real estate men state that there are as many strangers in Ashland now as there have been any time during the past summer and that inquiries concerning real estate are most numerous. Several deals have been consummated recently, outside parties being the purchasers."

A. L. McGary, a Willamina farmer who uses electricity for most of his power as well as for light on the farm, through current furnished by a power company, has purchased an electric range and installed a complete electric kitchen, by way of sharing the comforts and conveniences of electricity's use with the women of his household.

SHIPPING LEGISLATION

By Joshua W. Alexander of Missouri, Chairman, House Merchant Marine Committee.

The shipping act is one of the greatest achievements of the present administration and of the Sixty-fourth congress. The effort to enact legislation to provide larger facilities for our rapidly growing foreign commerce began soon after the beginning of the war in Europe. If the administration ship purchase bill had been enacted into law in September or October, 1914, it would have been possible to add 100 vessels of 10,000 gross tons to our American merchant marine for the oversea trade. Those vessels would have cost then not more than forty to fifty millions; now they would be worth more than a hundred millions, and the benefits to our foreign commerce would have been incalculable in the immense saving in foreign rates on wheat, cotton, and all other commodities entering into our export trade and upon which the ocean freight rates have advanced from 500 to 1000 per cent in the last two years. That bill was filibustered to death in the United States senate by the Republicans with the aid of a few Democrats.

The shipping act is framed along much broader lines. The ship purchase bill was an emergency measure; the shipping act is intended to become a permanent measure, and while many of its provisions may be amended from time to time, as experience may prove wise, it lays the foundations broad and deep for an American mercantile marine.

It will be the first time in our history that a governmental agency has been created whose business it will be to supervise and care for our waterborne commerce.

A shipping board of five members is created, not more than three of whom shall belong to the same political party, to be appointed by the president and by and with the advice and consent of the senate. The first commissioners shall continue in office for terms of two, three, four, five and six years. Their successors shall continue in office for terms of six years. No member of the board shall be in the employ of, or hold any official relation to any common carrier by water, or be pecuniarily interested therein.

The board, with the approval of the president, is authorized to have constructed and equipped in American shipyards and navy yards or elsewhere, giving preference, other things being equal, to domestic shipyards, or to purchase, lease, or charter vessels suitable, as far as the commercial requirements of the marine trade of the United States may permit, for use as naval auxiliaries or army transports, or for other naval or military purposes. Limitations are placed on the vessels that may be purchased. For instance, vessels engaged in the foreign or domestic trade of the United States, and vessels under the flag of foreign countries engaged in war, may not be purchased, leased or chartered. The president may transfer to the board such vessels belonging to the war or navy department as are suitable for commercial use, also the vessels belonging to the Panama railroad company. When the United States is at war, or during a national emergency, no vessel under American registry or enrollment may be transferred to a foreign flag, and in no event may transfer be made without first tendering such vessel to the board on terms set out in the act. The president is given power to take possession, absolutely, or temporarily, of any such vessels for naval or military purposes.

One of the most important provisions in the act, and one that has been the subject of the greatest controversy, is that giving the board the power to organize a corporation, or corporations, which the United States shall control through majority stockownership, to carry out the purposes of the act; that is, to establish ocean services to those ports and countries not adequately served by ocean transportation and where it is desirable to develop and extend our foreign commerce.

The payment of deferred rebates, and the use of fighting ships to stifle competition are expressly prohibited; also discriminations against a shipper for patronizing a competing carrier; also unfair contracts with shippers based on volume of freight offered, cargo space, loading and handling of freight, and the adjustment of claims. A common carrier by water is required to file with the board all agreements with other carriers to which it may be a party, fixing or regulating transportation rates, giving or receiving special rates, accommodations or other advantages; controlling, regulating, preventing, or destroying competition; pooling or apportioning earnings, losses, or traffic; alloting ports, or restricting or otherwise regulating sailings between ports; limiting or regulating in any way the character of freight or passenger traffic to be carried.

The board is given full power to approve, disapprove, modify, or cancel any such agreements that it finds to be unjustly discriminatory or unfair as between carriers, shippers, exporters, importers, or ports, or between exporters from the United States and their foreign competitors, or to operate to the detriment of the commerce of the United States.

It is made unlawful for common carriers by water to give any undue or unreasonable preference or advantage to any particular person, locality or description of traffic in any respect whatever; or to charge unjust or unreasonable or discriminatory rates in favor of individuals, of ports, or foreign as against American shippers.

At the beginning of the war in Europe not more than 8 per cent of our foreign commerce was carried by vessels under the American flag. This legislation has not proved a menace to our shipbuilding industry. On May 1, 1916, there were 1,219,014 tons of steel vessels under construction or under contract to be built in American shipyards—a larger tonnage than at any other period since the Civil war. On June 30, 1916, we had 3135 vessels under the American flag engaged in the foreign trade—more than at any other period since the Civil war.

The original cost of ships is now practically equalized among all nations. The principal costs of operation of any ship are (1) overhead expenses, which include interest on capital, insurance, corporation taxes, etc.; (2) wages of officers and men, and the cost of their food; (3) fuel.

The ships to be created by the bill will have the advantage of half the interest charge on capital, and a greatly reduced corporation tax, as it is 2 per cent only in this country, compared with from 6 to 8 per cent on the ships of our leading foreign competitors. The insurance and depreciation charges are the same on similar ships, no matter where owned or operated. At present, wages on ships of all nations are about at a parity, with possibly a disadvantage of from 5 to 10 per cent on American ships in the Atlantic trade, and perhaps a considerably greater disadvantage in the Pacific. Food on American ships always has been and always will be, in all probability, better than on foreign ships, but the difference in cost is so small as to be negligible. Fuel on most ships costs frequently as much or more than wages, and here is where the new ships will benefit. Such advances have been made in marine engineering of late that a modern ship can be operated at from 30 to 50 per cent less cost for fuel than ships built five to 25 years ago. Our rivals are all burdened with ships averaging from 12 to 15 years old. We have practically none to begin with, so all of the proposed fleet will be modern and economical. It can be easily demonstrated that the saving in fuel on those proposed American ships will more than offset the additional cost for wages and food and any other disadvantages as to cost which they may have. Cheapness of timber created for us a magnificant fleet of vessels in the foreign trade during our earlier days, and the practical control of the world's oil supply may do it for us now.

With these advantages, and under the intelligent direction of the shipping board, whose whole time will be given to the solution of the problems involved, we may confidently look forward to the time in the not distant future when we shall have from six to 10 millions of tons of shipping under the American flag engaged in our foreign commerce, and shall carry not 8 per cent but 60 to 70 per cent of our commerce in American built vessels owned and manned by Americans.

President Eliot's Judgment.

From the New York World.

No finer tribute could be paid to the Wilson administration than is to be found in the fact that President Emeritus Eliot of Harvard, writing in the Atlantic Monthly, is in substantial agreement with the views of Richard Olney, recently expressed in the World. Mr. Olney spoke as a party man who has always been high-minded, independent and courageous. Dr. Eliot is one of the best representatives of that large and influential element which has no strong partisan ties and which in normal times exercises a controlling influence upon public affairs.

By the same orderly processes of reasoning from a record of legislative and administrative achievement which Dr. Eliot truly says the Republican party never equalled in five times as many years, both of these eminent men reach the conclusion that "the man chiefly responsible for this consummate service to the American people should be again made their chief magistrate."

It is no accident that brings such Americans as these into political harmony. The explanation is to be found on the side of Mr. Wilson in mighty tasks begun or accomplished, in hard duties bravely performed and in ideals adhered to unfalteringly, and on the side of Mr. Hughes in an absence of real principles, in a lack of frankness and a purpose wholly infirm except as it may be interpreted as destructive and reactionary.

Old King Cotton.

From the New York Herald.

A rise of more than $3 a bale in cotton in the last two days suggests that what the southern planter has lost in quantity on the present crop he will make up in the higher price. With the staple selling well above 16 cents a pound it is 5 cents above the low level of last February and more than double the price at which it sold after the outbreak of the war two years ago when the "buy-a-bale" appeal was made to the charitably disposed. Old King Cotton has not been dethroned.

Rag Tag and Bobtail

Stories From Everywhere

[To this column all readers of The Journal are invited to contribute original matter—in story, in verse or in philosophical observation—or striking quotations, from any source. Contributions of exceptional merit will be paid for, at the editor's appraisal.]

In the Celestial's Best Vein.

THAT "the heathen Chinee is peculiar" Bret Harte discovered a good many years ago, when California knew but few of the Celestials, and cared less for them. His experience has been verified later and more completely by policemen who have had to do with raiding opium dens and gambling houses conducted by Orientals.

Not long ago a squad set out to "get" a gambling house in the new Chinatown on North Fourth street. They were not quick enough to catch the "lookout" napping, and were forced to begin battering operations with a sledge and axe on a heavy reinforced door.

It was a good half hour's work, during which time the gamblers were silently hieling themselves away through secret passages to safety. Finally the door went down with a crash. Inside, overturned tables and chairs, fan tan beans scattered over the floor, capsized tea dishes and general confusion greeted them. But of gambling or gamblers there was no sign.

The discomfited policemen were standing in the center of the room cursing their luck, when a door opened in the wall and a fat, round Celestial face was thrust in. Looking around, the Chinese inquired blandly:

"Whalla malla all you fella? You wantee noodle—chop suey?"

Falsus in Uno, Falsus in Omnibus.

Bob Thompson of Portland had a little red runabout, which he sold to a friend, and the friend painted it blue with gilt trimmings, and in turn made a deal with an acquaintance who proposed to motor to California to look around a bit.

"While you're in the neighborhood," said Bob's friend, "take a squint at my farm down there. It is yours to use, for taxes." And some free tips about the farm were generously thrown in with the car.

The man bound for California then pulled out. At Milwaukie the car developed nostalgia and general obduracy. At Oregon City it balked altogether, and its owner offered it for sale at a price that caused the astute local authorities to call up its previous owner in Portland, asking if the car had been stolen from him.

This gentleman smiled and said oh, no, he had sold it all right, and refrained from dwelling longer on the matter.

The following day, however, he received this letter from his friend, en route to California from Oregon City by rail.

"Friend Wolcott: If your farm is anything like your car, I wouldn't take it as a gift."

One of the Laws of Propinquity.

Ansel R. Clark really didn't intend to make it sound the way it did—quite the contrary, because he has a profound respect for the unselfishness and thrift of the man who toils in the fields. But when he addressed the school of commerce at the University of Oregon Wednesday, he inadvertently said it, and the students fairly howled in appreciation.

"From these maps you will see, young gentlemen," said the Portland agent of the federal bureau of foreign and domestic commerce, "that while it is possible to segregate the territory which may be called centers of sheep production, of horse production, of cattle production, the same cannot be said of hog production. The hog, you may know, is a by-product of diversified farming and cannot be raised successfully in enormous herds such as are cattle or sheep. The feed must be raised on the individual farm. Therefore, you will note that hogs are to be found on every farm in comparatively small numbers.

"I may say, therefore, that wherever you find a farmer, there you will find a hog."

Mr. Clark explained afterward that he was speaking with absolute literalness and not in any Pickwickian sense.

Wanted His Pay in Money.

After considerable persuasion a fire insurance agent persuaded a thrifty old German to insure his barn for $1200, which, by the way, was twice its value. Shortly after it was insured it burned down, and the insurance adjuster offered him $600.

He shook his head and said, "The agent told me if she burns down I get $1200. She burns down, and I want my $1200."

"I'll tell you what we will do," said the adjuster. "We will build you a bigger and a better barn or pay you $600 in cash. You can take your choice."

Some time thereafter a fire insurance agent visited the old man, and finding it impossible to get him to insure his life he said, "Why not take out an insurance policy on your wife?"

He became very angry and said, "You can't fool me twice. I know what happens. If my wife die you come around and offer to get me a bigger and a better one."

Deplorable Equine Casualties.

From the Roseburg Review.

F. J. Helliwell of Cottage Grove, a relative of Barton Helliwell and E. Helliwell of this city, was the victim of a brace of accidents during the past week and nearly lost two horses as a result.

One horse bled to death on the way home from Cottage Grove after having a tooth extracted. The other horse, reaching up into a feeding trough during the night, reached too far and slipped. The animal's head was caught in the trough and twisted in such a manner that the horse was unable to help itself. Mr. Helliwell heard the struggles of the animal and went to its assistance. Just as he secured an ax to cut away the trough, the lantern went out. Working in the dark, Mr. Helliwell cut off one of the horse's ears with the ax. Although the horse had severely injured itself, it is thought it will recover.

An Act of Tender Mercy.

From the Eugene Register.

Caught in the gravel pit on the Wendling branch of the Southern Pacific, two fine mountain trout remained there all last summer after the high water last spring. Then one day last week they were transferred in a bucket to the fountain at the Southern Pacific depot by three S. P. trainmen. Owing to the lowering of the water in the gravel pits the two trout were in danger of death. The fish are now somewhat more at liberty and enjoy daily feeds from passersby who know of their presence. The fish are lively and rise quickly out of the water for good morsels. There are now four in the fountain. The trainmen who brought them down are A. F. McKenzie, H. C. Cook and G. F. McLaughlin.

Uncle Jeff Snow Says:

Robert Bruce Schlagmier, who is big enough to milk a string of cows and goes to school tagged by little Sandy, says he has been trying to figure out how many cows he will have to milk to get a million dollars, and he hasn't learned 'rithmetic enough yet to do it. I told him there was a whole lot of us Oregon farmers hadn't figured it out, neither.