

Oregon Journal AN INDEPENDENT NEWSPAPER PUBLISHED EVERY WEEK DAY AND SUNDAY MORNING AT THE JOURNAL BUILDING, BROADWAY AND Tenth Street, Portland, Oregon.

Published every week day and Sunday morning at the Journal Building, Broadway and Tenth Street, Portland, Oregon.

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

Subscription Rates: By Carrier, City and Country Daily and Sunday \$4.00 per week.

Foreign Advertising Representative: Benjamin & Kentner Co., 125 E. Madison Street, Chicago.

The Oregon Journal reserves the right to reject advertising copy which it deems objectionable. It also will not print any copy that in any way violates reading matter of that cannot readily be recognized as advertising.

These rates apply only in the West. Rates to Eastern points furnished on application. Make remittances by Money Order, Express Order or Draft. If your postoffice is not a collecting office, 1 or 2-cent stamps may be accepted. Make all remittances payable to The Journal, Portland, Oregon.

THE DENVER MOB THE people who, for their own protection, should be most concerned about the survival of free speech and a free press, are the great working mass. All the privileges of free action and free government that they have won by free speech.

When there were no books or newspapers as medium of free discussion, there was no free government.

At the inquest on the death of George N. Pattison there was a different atmosphere. Seven attorneys were there, there with a realization that they were convened for serious business.

At the inquest on the death of George N. Pattison there was a different atmosphere. Seven attorneys were there, there with a realization that they were convened for serious business.

At the inquest on the death of George N. Pattison there was a different atmosphere. Seven attorneys were there, there with a realization that they were convened for serious business.

At the inquest on the death of George N. Pattison there was a different atmosphere. Seven attorneys were there, there with a realization that they were convened for serious business.

At the inquest on the death of George N. Pattison there was a different atmosphere. Seven attorneys were there, there with a realization that they were convened for serious business.

At the inquest on the death of George N. Pattison there was a different atmosphere. Seven attorneys were there, there with a realization that they were convened for serious business.

At the inquest on the death of George N. Pattison there was a different atmosphere. Seven attorneys were there, there with a realization that they were convened for serious business.

At the inquest on the death of George N. Pattison there was a different atmosphere. Seven attorneys were there, there with a realization that they were convened for serious business.

At the inquest on the death of George N. Pattison there was a different atmosphere. Seven attorneys were there, there with a realization that they were convened for serious business.

At the inquest on the death of George N. Pattison there was a different atmosphere. Seven attorneys were there, there with a realization that they were convened for serious business.

At the inquest on the death of George N. Pattison there was a different atmosphere. Seven attorneys were there, there with a realization that they were convened for serious business.

At the inquest on the death of George N. Pattison there was a different atmosphere. Seven attorneys were there, there with a realization that they were convened for serious business.

At the inquest on the death of George N. Pattison there was a different atmosphere. Seven attorneys were there, there with a realization that they were convened for serious business.

At the inquest on the death of George N. Pattison there was a different atmosphere. Seven attorneys were there, there with a realization that they were convened for serious business.

At the inquest on the death of George N. Pattison there was a different atmosphere. Seven attorneys were there, there with a realization that they were convened for serious business.

At the inquest on the death of George N. Pattison there was a different atmosphere. Seven attorneys were there, there with a realization that they were convened for serious business.

At the inquest on the death of George N. Pattison there was a different atmosphere. Seven attorneys were there, there with a realization that they were convened for serious business.

At the inquest on the death of George N. Pattison there was a different atmosphere. Seven attorneys were there, there with a realization that they were convened for serious business.

At the inquest on the death of George N. Pattison there was a different atmosphere. Seven attorneys were there, there with a realization that they were convened for serious business.

the Non-partisan League of Montana and the Montana Labor League. The Montana Labor League and the Non-partisan League are working together. The labor league is composed of railway employes, miners and other workers. It is the political branch of the Montana Federation of Labor.

In Washington the triple alliance, the strongest branch of which is the Non-partisan League, is to place a Farmer-Labor ticket in the field for the elections this fall. The Non-partisans are expected to enter candidates in the Republican primaries and because of their admitted strength plans are under way by the Republicans to hold an elimination convention before the primaries to narrow the candidates to one who will run against the Non-partisan.

In Minnesota a full Farmer-Labor ticket comprising for the most part the league candidates beaten at the recent Republican primaries will be in the field. Should the supreme court sustain the decision of the lower court in ousting the Rev. O. J. Kvale, league victor over Congressman Volstead for renomination, it has been announced that Kvale will run again in the elections against Volstead on the Farmer-Labor ticket at the general election.

In the few instances in North Dakota where the leaguers lost the Republican nomination, the defeated candidates will run again at the general election on a Farmer-Labor ticket. In Wisconsin, South Dakota, Colorado and Nebraska the Non-partisan League has complete state tickets.

In Wisconsin the success of the league ticket hinges upon support by Senator Robert M. La Follette. La Follette has been ill for some time and up to the present has not declared himself in favor of any of the state tickets.

Some very good salaries are paid by the Milwaukee railroad, as revealed in The Journal's news dispatch yesterday from Carl Smith, its Washington correspondent. President Earling was paid \$75,319. H. E. Byram, who also appeared on the salary list as president as a result of a change in officials during the year, got \$60,000 as president of the Milwaukee, and \$22,600 as vice president of the Burlington. The salary of each was in excess of that of the president of the United States. Has private management of the roads shown results commensurate with such salaries?

EFFECTIVE PUBLIC ACTION

CITY and state law enforcement officials are deserving of commendation for the changed conditions at coroner's inquests on killings in automobile accidents. An atmosphere of ignorance of details, indifference and loose investigation has been supplanted by vigorous and thorough probing into the causes of fatal collisions and a sincere effort to effectually fix responsibility.

In the early days of the accident prevention campaign, coroner's inquests were next to farcical. No traffic officers were present to throw light on accidents. Public prosecutors were frequently absent. No one, save the coroner, was there to protect the interests of the public. Many a significant point was never brought to the attention of the jury. Facts were ignored, except those brought out by the attorneys for the defense. As a result, negligent drivers were released, one after another.

At the inquest on the death of George N. Pattison there was a different atmosphere. Seven attorneys were there, there with a realization that they were convened for serious business, the business of fixing responsibility for a death. An expert from the traffic office was there. He gave comprehensive testimony. Two competent attorneys, one from the city attorney's office and one from the district attorney's, were present to care for the public interest. All points were brought out and presented to the jury effectually. After the evidence was in, the jury acted and acted quickly.

The entire investigation was one of grim and thorough business. Through the work of the coroner and other public agencies, motorists are coming to know that lives cannot be wiped out without a reckoning. They are coming to realize that it will be their portion to answer for criminal negligence. It is made plain that their neighbors are to sit in grim judgment on those who participate in fatal accidents.

To date, grand juries have not found sufficient cause to hold erring motorists to the courts. It is unusual in the light of frequent verdicts of coroner's juries in which drivers have been held to blame. Are all the facts comprehensively laid before them?

In seeking a divorce, a deaf and dumb wife complained that her husband swore at her in the sign language. Why didn't she look in the other direction, or, if it was in the night, turn off the light?

GREASE, SPARK AND FIRE

PHILADELPHIA had a \$1,000,000 fire recently. Scores of girl employes escaped from flaming buildings by jumping into outstretched blankets. Firemen were forced to slide down ropes to safety as walls crumbled. A dozen or more firemen were slightly injured. Nine firms suffered heavy losses.

Here is a report on the way the fire started: "When an electrically propelled cutting machine on the second floor of the six-story building housing the Philadelphia Blanket Company blew out a fuse, sparks darted out and

started the blaze. The inflammable nature of the greasy woolen fiber in the blanket company's plant was responsible for an almost simultaneous outburst of flame the length and breadth of the big room."

That is the way dozens of immensely destructive fires originate. Greasy rags, oily substances and other inflammable materials are left about. It was only a few weeks ago that an apartment house was fired in Portland when a greasy rag was deposited on a table. A match or an electric light touched it, and occupants of the street hurried into the streets for safety.

In another instance an electric light was left burning near linen in an apartment house. A fire started and again residents were forced to seek safety from the flames.

Inflammables left about, especially oily materials, need not come in contact with a match to start a conflagration. Electric lights, stoves, friction and heat from any source will soon fire them. And then the Philadelphia scenes are enacted, girls jumping from the heights to be caught or not caught in blankets, firemen sliding to safety from crumbling walls, bodies burned and property destroyed.

It will always stand to the credit of Portland that 7225 citizens used their automobiles in carrying Shriners on sightseeing trips. The generosity of Portlanders in this respect is a common remark among visitors. It pays.

A TALKING CLOCK

PHILADELPHIA man has invented a clock that speaks the hour instead of striking. A phonographic attachment to a hand made clock works the wonder.

The clock has a 30-day movement and can be made to call the hour, half hour, quarter hour, or all of them. In addition, it will make whatever comment the inventor desires. For instance, at 11 the clock says: "Eleven o'clock; time to go home." The Philadelphian has an 18-year-old daughter whose friends are thus sent home at the proper hour.

The inventor studied clockmaking in Italy and produced the talking clock after 18 months' work. Such a device could be extremely convenient as a usual thing, but there are times when the "go home" warning could work immense havoc.

After months in which automobile fatalities were remarkably few, an epidemic of killings has suddenly appeared. Let the authorities promptly take away the licenses of drivers who figure culpably in such accidents, and let them travel on foot until they can learn to drive with prudence. The drivers' license law, administered by officials without while, will make all careless drivers careful, if in no other way, by making them all walk.

THE HEART WORKERS

YOU can hire a man to work with his hand or brain, but it isn't with money that you get his heart to work for you. That, in effect, was an epigram in the address of Vice President Marshall at the Chamber of Commerce luncheon in his honor yesterday. When you have a man's heart working for you, he added, he doesn't pay much attention to the clock.

If this incontrovertible formula could sink into the mind of every employer and be applied, the problem of hire would be half solved. Employers would thereby create an atmosphere around their institutions that would quickly be sensed by employes. And once sensed the spirit of a generous cooperation between the two principals to industry would then be open for getting the hearts of workers into their service.

On the other hand, workers themselves can greatly forward this process of cooperation by giving loyalty to the institution. After all, in working for the institution, the employe is working for himself, for the more successful the institution the more it can afford to pay for service.

There is great room for progress in getting the employe to work with not only his hand, or brain, but with his heart. The heart workers have been too often unrewarded. Also, the brain and hand worker too often tries to do as little as possible. It is a conspicuous fact that there is a trend now to do as little and get as big pay as possible.

The sooner the two sides get nearer each other and bring hearts into play in the business, the better and happier it will be for all.

But for the bitter enders, the league pact would have been ratified with minor reservations. But the little group of bitter enders by their threat of bolt, ran the senate. And though there were but a dozen or 15 of this little senate cabal, they dictated to the senate, dictated to the Chicago convention, dictated to the Republican party and are now, through Mr. Harding, asking the people of America to approve their action. And because of the delay in the final settlement of peace due to the little senate cabal, Europe is again in fire.

A PLACE OF PERIL

INTERSECTIONS are intersections. Automobiles travel cross intersections, some bound north, some south, some east and some west. Cannon drivers get it into their minds that with automobiles crossing narrow intersections in four directions and

often at unlawful speed, a condition of imminent peril is present? Can drivers not realize that two automobiles cannot occupy the same space at the same time, and that whenever that thing is attempted there will be a smashup?

Can they not realize that most of the accidents occur at street intersections as the police records show? Must it become necessary, in order to lessen killings and smashups, to pass a law requiring automobiles to come to a full stop before entering an intersection on main arteries?

CHALLENGED BY WOMEN

A State Executive Arraigned Because of Refusal to Call Special Session to Act on National Suffrage Amendment.

(The subjoined document, reproduced from the columns of the Woman Citizen of July 24, is a copy of a letter from the Vermont, from the National Woman Suffrage Association.)

A careful perusal of your proclamation refusing to call the legislature of Vermont into special session impresses upon me the feeling that you are in violation of the trust that you have doubtless told the truth, but not the whole truth. No one outside of Vermont believes you have. Perhaps you are a politician, and politicians, may read between the lines and understand, but outsiders never. In order that this generation of your fellow men and posterity may not misunderstand your position, the National American Woman Suffrage Association urges you to supplement your proclamation with replies to the following questions:

Do you believe that the federal constitution is the supreme law of this land and supersedes all state constitutions whenever the two are in conflict? Do you know that on January 10, 1791, Vermont ratified that constitution, although it had not of her own volition, by so doing accepted the precedence of the federal constitution over it and by that act was admitted into the Union as a member of the United States of America?

If you do know these facts of common knowledge, why did you throw over your refusal to call a special session of the legislature a distortion of the alleged conflict between the Vermont and federal constitutions, which has nothing to do with the federal constitution? Do you not know that the method of amending the federal constitution has remained unchanged from the beginning, and that the Vermont constitution has supreme courts have declared that the provision is to be interpreted exactly as it reads, and in no other way? Do you not know that the federal constitution and every one of the 18 federal amendments, and yet neither Vermont nor any other state has ever instituted a movement to amend the federal constitution?

Do you not know that when a legislative act upon a federal constitutional amendment, it draws its authority from the federal constitution, and that the government has no responsible part in the transaction except as custodian of the amendment?

Do you not know that the federal constitution is the supreme law of this land and supersedes all state constitutions whenever the two are in conflict? Do you know that on January 10, 1791, Vermont ratified that constitution, although it had not of her own volition, by so doing accepted the precedence of the federal constitution over it and by that act was admitted into the Union as a member of the United States of America?

If you do know these facts of common knowledge, why did you throw over your refusal to call a special session of the legislature a distortion of the alleged conflict between the Vermont and federal constitutions, which has nothing to do with the federal constitution? Do you not know that the method of amending the federal constitution has remained unchanged from the beginning, and that the Vermont constitution has supreme courts have declared that the provision is to be interpreted exactly as it reads, and in no other way? Do you not know that the federal constitution and every one of the 18 federal amendments, and yet neither Vermont nor any other state has ever instituted a movement to amend the federal constitution?

Do you not know that when a legislative act upon a federal constitutional amendment, it draws its authority from the federal constitution, and that the government has no responsible part in the transaction except as custodian of the amendment?

Do you not know that the federal constitution is the supreme law of this land and supersedes all state constitutions whenever the two are in conflict? Do you know that on January 10, 1791, Vermont ratified that constitution, although it had not of her own volition, by so doing accepted the precedence of the federal constitution over it and by that act was admitted into the Union as a member of the United States of America?

If you do know these facts of common knowledge, why did you throw over your refusal to call a special session of the legislature a distortion of the alleged conflict between the Vermont and federal constitutions, which has nothing to do with the federal constitution? Do you not know that the method of amending the federal constitution has remained unchanged from the beginning, and that the Vermont constitution has supreme courts have declared that the provision is to be interpreted exactly as it reads, and in no other way? Do you not know that the federal constitution and every one of the 18 federal amendments, and yet neither Vermont nor any other state has ever instituted a movement to amend the federal constitution?

Do you not know that when a legislative act upon a federal constitutional amendment, it draws its authority from the federal constitution, and that the government has no responsible part in the transaction except as custodian of the amendment?

Do you not know that the federal constitution is the supreme law of this land and supersedes all state constitutions whenever the two are in conflict? Do you know that on January 10, 1791, Vermont ratified that constitution, although it had not of her own volition, by so doing accepted the precedence of the federal constitution over it and by that act was admitted into the Union as a member of the United States of America?

If you do know these facts of common knowledge, why did you throw over your refusal to call a special session of the legislature a distortion of the alleged conflict between the Vermont and federal constitutions, which has nothing to do with the federal constitution? Do you not know that the method of amending the federal constitution has remained unchanged from the beginning, and that the Vermont constitution has supreme courts have declared that the provision is to be interpreted exactly as it reads, and in no other way? Do you not know that the federal constitution and every one of the 18 federal amendments, and yet neither Vermont nor any other state has ever instituted a movement to amend the federal constitution?

Do you not know that when a legislative act upon a federal constitutional amendment, it draws its authority from the federal constitution, and that the government has no responsible part in the transaction except as custodian of the amendment?

Do you not know that the federal constitution is the supreme law of this land and supersedes all state constitutions whenever the two are in conflict? Do you know that on January 10, 1791, Vermont ratified that constitution, although it had not of her own volition, by so doing accepted the precedence of the federal constitution over it and by that act was admitted into the Union as a member of the United States of America?

If you do know these facts of common knowledge, why did you throw over your refusal to call a special session of the legislature a distortion of the alleged conflict between the Vermont and federal constitutions, which has nothing to do with the federal constitution? Do you not know that the method of amending the federal constitution has remained unchanged from the beginning, and that the Vermont constitution has supreme courts have declared that the provision is to be interpreted exactly as it reads, and in no other way? Do you not know that the federal constitution and every one of the 18 federal amendments, and yet neither Vermont nor any other state has ever instituted a movement to amend the federal constitution?

Do you not know that when a legislative act upon a federal constitutional amendment, it draws its authority from the federal constitution, and that the government has no responsible part in the transaction except as custodian of the amendment?

Do you not know that the federal constitution is the supreme law of this land and supersedes all state constitutions whenever the two are in conflict? Do you know that on January 10, 1791, Vermont ratified that constitution, although it had not of her own volition, by so doing accepted the precedence of the federal constitution over it and by that act was admitted into the Union as a member of the United States of America?

If you do know these facts of common knowledge, why did you throw over your refusal to call a special session of the legislature a distortion of the alleged conflict between the Vermont and federal constitutions, which has nothing to do with the federal constitution? Do you not know that the method of amending the federal constitution has remained unchanged from the beginning, and that the Vermont constitution has supreme courts have declared that the provision is to be interpreted exactly as it reads, and in no other way? Do you not know that the federal constitution and every one of the 18 federal amendments, and yet neither Vermont nor any other state has ever instituted a movement to amend the federal constitution?

Do you not know that when a legislative act upon a federal constitutional amendment, it draws its authority from the federal constitution, and that the government has no responsible part in the transaction except as custodian of the amendment?

Do you not know that the federal constitution is the supreme law of this land and supersedes all state constitutions whenever the two are in conflict? Do you know that on January 10, 1791, Vermont ratified that constitution, although it had not of her own volition, by so doing accepted the precedence of the federal constitution over it and by that act was admitted into the Union as a member of the United States of America?

If you do know these facts of common knowledge, why did you throw over your refusal to call a special session of the legislature a distortion of the alleged conflict between the Vermont and federal constitutions, which has nothing to do with the federal constitution? Do you not know that the method of amending the federal constitution has remained unchanged from the beginning, and that the Vermont constitution has supreme courts have declared that the provision is to be interpreted exactly as it reads, and in no other way? Do you not know that the federal constitution and every one of the 18 federal amendments, and yet neither Vermont nor any other state has ever instituted a movement to amend the federal constitution?

member? Why do you thus, in the year 1920, when the great nations of the world have enfranchised the woman, attempt to block the same legal and natural procedure in this republic?

You do not know that by your action, in the eyes of the world you impugn the good faith of your party, that party's national committee, its accredited leaders and its presidential nominee on the subject of ratification?

You owe it to the Republican party and to the world to explain your assumption of authority that belongs to your party leaders. By what right do you make this assumption? Do you think that you are the only one who can explain your assumption of authority that belongs to your party leaders. By what right do you make this assumption?

THE NATIONAL AMERICAN WOMAN SUFFRAGE ASSOCIATION. (Signed) Carrie Chapman Catt, President.

Letters from the People

(Communications sent to The Journal for publication should not exceed 300 words in length and must be accompanied by a return address in full must accompany the contribution.)

THE EQUAL SUFFRAGE CAUSE Umattila, July 22.—To the Editor of The Journal—Kindly permit space for a word of cheer to those brave women who are now struggling for the strength and talents and their means for the ratification of the suffrage amendment.

Three years ago there was carried on the following campaign by the Women's Congressional League to urge congress to pass the Susan B. Anthony amendment. The Democratic congress and the present were held responsible for the failure to pass, and the women of Oregon were urged to defeat the Democratic candidate, that they might personally in favor of suffrage or not.

State legislatures which refuse ratification of the amendment, or governors who refuse to call legislatures that would ratify it, are very much like the senator who refused to call the legislature of Oregon into the League of Nations, designed to settle international disputes, prevent wars and protect smaller nations.

What a disgraceful record for Americans who withhold the same liberties from the women of their nation as are accorded by the "Darkest Russia" of a special session of your legislature?

Do you not know that the method of amending the federal constitution has remained unchanged from the beginning, and that the Vermont constitution has supreme courts have declared that the provision is to be interpreted exactly as it reads, and in no other way? Do you not know that the federal constitution and every one of the 18 federal amendments, and yet neither Vermont nor any other state has ever instituted a movement to amend the federal constitution?

Do you not know that when a legislative act upon a federal constitutional amendment, it draws its authority from the federal constitution, and that the government has no responsible part in the transaction except as custodian of the amendment?

Do you not know that the federal constitution is the supreme law of this land and supersedes all state constitutions whenever the two are in conflict? Do you know that on January 10, 1791, Vermont ratified that constitution, although it had not of her own volition, by so doing accepted the precedence of the federal constitution over it and by that act was admitted into the Union as a member of the United States of America?

If you do know these facts of common knowledge, why did you throw over your refusal to call a special session of the legislature a distortion of the alleged conflict between the Vermont and federal constitutions, which has nothing to do with the federal constitution? Do you not know that the method of amending the federal constitution has remained unchanged from the beginning, and that the Vermont constitution has supreme courts have declared that the provision is to be interpreted exactly as it reads, and in no other way? Do you not know that the federal constitution and every one of the 18 federal amendments, and yet neither Vermont nor any other state has ever instituted a movement to amend the federal constitution?

Do you not know that when a legislative act upon a federal constitutional amendment, it draws its authority from the federal constitution, and that the government has no responsible part in the transaction except as custodian of the amendment?

Do you not know that the federal constitution is the supreme law of this land and supersedes all state constitutions whenever the two are in conflict? Do you know that on January 10, 1791, Vermont ratified that constitution, although it had not of her own volition, by so doing accepted the precedence of the federal constitution over it and by that act was admitted into the Union as a member of the United States of America?

If you do know these facts of common knowledge, why did you throw over your refusal to call a special session of the legislature a distortion of the alleged conflict between the Vermont and federal constitutions, which has nothing to do with the federal constitution? Do you not know that the method of amending the federal constitution has remained unchanged from the beginning, and that the Vermont constitution has supreme courts have declared that the provision is to be interpreted exactly as it reads, and in no other way? Do you not know that the federal constitution and every one of the 18 federal amendments, and yet neither Vermont nor any other state has ever instituted a movement to amend the federal constitution?

Do you not know that when a legislative act upon a federal constitutional amendment, it draws its authority from the federal constitution, and that the government has no responsible part in the transaction except as custodian of the amendment?

Do you not know that the federal constitution is the supreme law of this land and supersedes all state constitutions whenever the two are in conflict? Do you know that on January 10, 1791, Vermont ratified that constitution, although it had not of her own volition, by so doing accepted the precedence of the federal constitution over it and by that act was admitted into the Union as a member of the United States of America?

If you do know these facts of common knowledge, why did you throw over your refusal to call a special session of the legislature a distortion of the alleged conflict between the Vermont and federal constitutions, which has nothing to do with the federal constitution? Do you not know that the method of amending the federal constitution has remained unchanged from the beginning, and that the Vermont constitution has supreme courts have declared that the provision is to be interpreted exactly as it reads, and in no other way? Do you not know that the federal constitution and every one of the 18 federal amendments, and yet neither Vermont nor any other state has ever instituted a movement to amend the federal constitution?

Do you not know that when a legislative act upon a federal constitutional amendment, it draws its authority from the federal constitution, and that the government has no responsible part in the transaction except as custodian of the amendment?

Do you not know that the federal constitution is the supreme law of this land and supersedes all state constitutions whenever the two are in conflict? Do you know that on January 10, 1791, Vermont ratified that constitution, although it had not of her own volition, by so doing accepted the precedence of the federal constitution over it and by that act was admitted into the Union as a member of the United States of America?

If you do know these facts of common knowledge, why did you throw over your refusal to call a special session of the legislature a distortion of the alleged conflict between the Vermont and federal constitutions, which has nothing to do with the federal constitution? Do you not know that the method of amending the federal constitution has remained unchanged from the beginning, and that the Vermont constitution has supreme courts have declared that the provision is to be interpreted exactly as it reads, and in no other way? Do you not know that the federal constitution and every one of the 18 federal amendments, and yet neither Vermont nor any other state has ever instituted a movement to amend the federal constitution?

Do you not know that when a legislative act upon a federal constitutional amendment, it draws its authority from the federal constitution, and that the government has no responsible part in the transaction except as custodian of the amendment?

Do you not know that the federal constitution is the supreme law of this land and supersedes all state constitutions whenever the two are in conflict? Do you know that on January 10, 1791, Vermont ratified that constitution, although it had not of her own volition, by so doing accepted the precedence of the federal constitution over it and by that act was admitted into the Union as a member of the United States of America?

If you do know these facts of common knowledge, why did you throw over your refusal to call a special session of the legislature a distortion of the alleged conflict between the Vermont and federal constitutions, which has nothing to do with the federal constitution? Do you not know that the method of amending the federal constitution has remained unchanged from the beginning, and that the Vermont constitution has supreme courts have declared that the provision is to be interpreted exactly as it reads, and in no other way? Do you not know that the federal constitution and every one of the 18 federal amendments, and yet neither Vermont nor any other state has ever instituted a movement to amend the federal constitution?

Do you not know that when a legislative act upon a federal constitutional amendment, it draws its authority from the federal constitution, and that the government has no responsible part in the transaction except as custodian of the amendment?

Do you not know that the federal constitution is the supreme law of this land and supersedes all state constitutions whenever the two are in conflict? Do you know that on January 10, 1791, Vermont ratified that constitution, although it had not of her own volition, by so doing accepted the precedence of the federal constitution over it and by that act was admitted into the Union as a member of the United States of America?

If you do know these facts of common knowledge, why did you throw over your refusal to call a special session of the legislature a distortion of the alleged conflict between the Vermont and federal constitutions, which has nothing to do with the federal constitution? Do you not know that the method of amending the federal constitution has remained unchanged from the beginning, and that the Vermont constitution has supreme courts have declared that the provision is to be interpreted exactly as it reads, and in no other way? Do you not know that the federal constitution and every one of the 18 federal amendments, and yet neither Vermont nor any other state has ever instituted a movement to amend the federal constitution?

Do you not know that when a legislative act upon a federal constitutional amendment, it draws its authority from the federal constitution, and that the government has no responsible part in the transaction except as custodian of the amendment?

COMMENT AND NEWS IN BRIEF

SMALL CHANGE

War news on page 1 again. 'Twill soon be open season for county fairs. Los Angeles seems to be resting easy again. Have you some little earwigs on your lawn? Ferris seems to have spilled some 'Gore' down Oklahoma.

A little rain on the asphalt pavement is somewhat of a dangerous thing. In Portland the last rose of summer will be in blossom along about Christmas time.

There's going to be plenty of gas after while, providing you have the price to pay for it. There's plenty of money in the world. The difficulty for most of us is in getting hold of some of it.

We don't blame small boys who figure that nature has provided them with the best kind of a bathing suit. Germany promises to send paper currency to this country, which should help somewhat to relieve the shortage.

In view of the increased passenger and freight rates starting the people of the United States in the face, there is the consolation that the rate of the grain rate to Europe has been reduced.

Out of the \$200,000,000 annual profit the local navy recruiting office is considering very seriously the advisability of taking a course in detective work, in order that he might more easily recognize the clever boys who try to put one over on him and get into the navy. Wednesday a lad came in to see him, for the second time in two weeks. Captain Eider said the youth denied having been in the office before, so he was given a physical test. When the finger prints were taken and examined Eider found the boy had not only been in the office, but he had been there several months ago. "I wish that boy had been old enough to take," the captain remarked.

Harry Rafferty, vice president of the George W. Bates company, returned Wednesday from a trip through British Columbia and Puget Sound cities. On the return trip he visited various points of interest in the Pacific Northwest. He will be in Portland several days, before going on to her home.

Returning from a long visit in San Francisco and Southern California, Mrs. J. M. Simpson of Spokane is the guest of her brother, George Funk, city auditor. Mrs. Simpson attended the Pacific Northwest Exposition in Seattle. She will be in Portland several days, before going on to her home.

John Speed Smith, chief naturalization examiner of Seattle, accompanied by Fred Smith, a well known, active member of the Washington County Clerks' association at Vancouver. Smith addressed the clerks Friday morning. Friday afternoon the clerks were taken for a ride over the Columbia river highway to Eagle creek, where dinner was served.

G. W. Clopton, a retired farmer of Sedalia, Mo., 80 years young, has been visiting in the city. He is a well known, active member of the Washington County Clerks' association at Vancouver. Smith addressed the clerks Friday morning. Friday afternoon the clerks were taken for a ride over the Columbia river highway to Eagle creek, where dinner was served.

John Speed Smith, chief naturalization examiner of Seattle, accompanied by Fred Smith, a well known, active member of the Washington County Clerks' association at Vancouver. Smith addressed the clerks Friday morning. Friday afternoon the clerks were taken for a ride over the Columbia river highway to Eagle creek