Characters in Congress.

SNAP SHOTS OF PERSONALITIES

The house of representatives has become so large a body that the average individuality is sunk in it. Only here and there do members specially notable for physical or moral traits stand egregious, attracting attention by reason of eccentricity of one sort or another, often, when their mental stature or oratorial ability would not render them conspicuous. Many a man of moderate parts in this world has won reputation by making himself a little different from his neighbors, and in public life it is better, perhaps, to be regarded with disapproval than not to be noticed at all.

There is no man in the house who pays more attention to his costume than Joe Bailey, of Texas, the erstwhile democratic leader, notwithstanding the fact that he professes such a lofty disregard of matters of the sort, even refusing to attend receptions at the White House because he would be obliged to wear a dress suit. His special fad in dress is the picturesque, which he deems preferable to the merely fashionable, and in this respect he is unrivalled by any other congressman. The great expanse of shirt front and hat with flaring brim are features of attire carefully studied out for their effectiveness to the eye, particularly from the point of view of the ladies; for the fiery young statesman is emphatically a ladies' idol. In this respect he is hardly matched by John Wesley Gaines, of Tennessee—he of the striking neckties and prematurely gray hair.

Bailey wears his raven hair long to help out the half-piratical effect for which he strives. It is a fashion rarely seen in congress nowadays, though formerly much affected by Southern members, some of whom had locks of such length as to fall upon their shoulders—most commonly greased, also. That geography has its relation to the beard is palpable enough when one looks over the great legislative assembly from a vantage point in the gallery. Nearly all the men from the North and East are either clean shaven or wear a mustache only; the chin beard with shaven cheeks is Southern, while the beard without mustache belongs almost exclusively to the Northwest.

The biggest beard in the house is the property of "Cy" Sulloway, of New Hampshire. It is a cadaverous beard of iron gray hue. But the most luxuriant hair belongs to Landis, of Indiana. His is a leone mane, gray and very straight; when its owner is in an excited mood it is tossed wildly. On the other hand, if one looks for the baldest member, one finds him in Hoffnecker, of Delaware, who has practically no hair at all. The biggest head belongs to Sulloway again, as well as the largest feet; but then, you see, he is a very remarkable person, being six inches over six feet in height, so that his extremities are not out of proportion nor his beard extravagant.

The smallest man in the house is Sam Smith, of Michigan. That state has three representatives in congress named Smith, but this is the only Sam. He is only three inches above five feet in height, and is thin, weighing hardly more than one hundred pounds. Sulloway is the biggest member; it seems impossible to get away from him for very long. He belongs up in Manchester, N. H., and his wife was formerly a Salvation lassie. In fact, he himself is a leader in the Salvation Army movement, having been drawn into it through an accident. The Salvationists visited Manchester a dozen years ago, and the sober sided citizens wanted to lock them up in jail. The Salvationists employed Sulloway as counsel, and he was thus led to join their organization.

There is always some dispute as to who is the best dressed man in the house, but in the last two Congresses Bennett, of Brooklyn, who was recently made secretary of the senate, was pretty generally acknowledged as the proper holder of the title. Now that he has departed, the laurel wreath may safely be replaced upon the head of Harry Bingham, of Philadelphia. Bingham is a "swell" clear through, with not a bit of pinchbeck about him. As a rule, Philadelphia and New York send the best dressed men to congress. When it is a question of the worst dressed member, there is no doubt that Frank M. Eddy, of Minnesota, takes the premium; and yet it is probable that no other man in congress spends more money on his clothes than he does. If he gets a new suit, he buttons the lowest button into the top buttonhole, and inside of forty-eight hours that seventy-five dollar costume looks like an arrangement in "hand-me-downs."

Eddy is an example of the man who wants to be a "howling swell," but cannot succeed somehow. He was born 'way up in Minnesota when that part of the country was a wilderness, and as a boy he worked in a brickyard. The most unpretending of men and jolliest of good fellows, he is exceedingly popular. The people of his district worship him, and no wonder, inasmuch as when he goes out on an electioneering tour he wears a blue shirt and a pair of tall boots, "buys the bar" at every crossroads saloon he comes across, hires a brass band to help along the enthusiasm, and talks to the lumbermen in the logging camps in their native Norwegian.

Tastes differ where beauty is concerned, but the friends of Gayle, of Kentucky, claim that he is the handsomest member. Gayle, who succeeded Settle, is tall and well built, with a smooth face. It may be mentioned incidentally that there is one negro in the present house—White, of North Carolina. He is a mulatto. The colored man of the last congress was George Washington Murray, who was as black as the ace of spades. Viewed from the gallery at a full session he suggested the idea of a huckleberry in a pan of milk.

The youngest man in the house is Martin H. Glynn, of Albany, N. Y., a brand new member. He is only twenty-eight years of age. The oldest is Galusha A. Grow, who was born in 1823; his hair and full beard are snowy white. But the father of the house is Harmer, of Pennsylvania, who is the only member failing to record the date of his birth in the Congressional Directory. Through fourteen congresses he has served, and at present he is so much indisposed that he has not answered to roll call since the first day of the session.

Among the greatest smokers in the house are Speaker Henderson and "Uncle Joe" Cannon, of Illinois. The latter is addicted to domestic cigars, while the former sticks closely to a mild imported weed. Joy, of St. Louis, is extremely fond of cigarettes, but will not carry them on his person because he knows that they are not good for him. Occasionally, however, he will say to a friend:—"Give me a cigarette, old man, and I will give you a good cigar in exchange for it." In this congress the rule against smoking while the house is in session is strictly enforced, and if anybody attempts to break it a page walks up to him promptly and stops it. Hitherto the regulation has not been regarded very seriously, so that on any day one might see fifteen or twenty members smoking on the floor, a match being lighted here and there almost every minute. The deprivation is a serious one from the viewpoint of the inveterates.

TWO VIEWS ON THE SUBJECT OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE

SUPPORTING AND OPPOSING.

THE SUPPORTING VIEW.

Much has been said recently concerning the seeming failure of Christian Science to heal some of its cases. Many of these cases were not treated by Christian Science at all, but by what is termed Divine Healing, Faith Cure, and so forth.

It is obviously unfair that Christian Science should be made the synonymous term for all that is included in the phrase, "without medical attendance."

It has been most carefully estimated that 90 per cent. of all who have turned to Christian Science for help from their many distresses have been those who have failed to obtain relief from the various medical systems. It is also estimated that 70 per cent. of this class have been restored to health and happiness through Christian Science.

Every new and advanced idea or system has to pass through the crucible of intellectual and jealous criticism, and Christian Science will stand the test because it is Christian, and because it is Science and has its basis in a Divine Principle and relies absolutely on God. When a practitioner in any science, whether mathematics, music, or Christian healing, fails to make his demonstration in one instance, and succeeds in a hundred others, does it seem fair that the practitioner and the whole system should be condemned for this one failure? Science can never fail.

Galileo was accounted a heretic and the promulgator of a dangerous doctrine because he dared to thrust Science in the faces of the unscientific and the unprepared thought, yet today, every man, woman and child in the land knows that Galileo was right.

The same may also be said of homeopathy. It has passed through the same denunciation, but has finally taken its place as an acknowledged system of medicine.

We know, in Christian Science, that the children of God are no longer to be accounted as children of chance and circumstance, but that they take, what they are daily proving to be, the demonstrable position of working in harmony with all that is loving, noble and true, knowing that these have the preponderance of power over their opposites, disease, evil and falsity.

The Psalmist says: "The upright shall not be afraid of evil tidings; his heart is fixed, trusting in the Lord." And he further says: "The wicked shall see it and be grieved; he shall gnash with his teeth, and melt away; the desire of the wicked shall perish."

The invitation of the Christ to all is "Come upto me, all ye that labor and are heavily laden, and I will give you rest. Ask and it shall be given unto you." Jesus further stated: "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." Who shall say that all shall not rely on God, who made all that was made, and made all good, and who is the giver of every perfect and good gift?

Christian Science, according to the teachings of its textbook, "Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures," by Mary Baker G. Eddy, is based on a demonstable principle, and thousands upon thousands have proven this beyond cavil, including the most conservative, thinking in our land.

There have been strenuous efforts made by some to brand Christian Science as religious franzy and fanaticism, but this is because they do not understand it. The attitude of Christian Scientists is, true charity toward all and malice toward none, and, above all, to follow in the footsteps of the Master.

The query has often been presented: "Why do not Christian Scientists reply to the attacks made through the press?" We can only say in the language of St. Paul: "The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds."

The only weapon of a true Christian is love, and St. John says: "Love is the fulfilling of the whole law."

"JAMES A. LOGWOOD."

THE OPPOSING VIEW.

Christian Science does not seem to me either Christian or scientific. Mrs. Eddy says, "In the year 1866 I discovered the science," and in the same sentence affirms it to be a "final revelation" to her from God. Here is an evident confusion of terms. A system of thought cannot be both a revelation and a science. Revelation is the disclosure of what cannot be discovered by man's unaided powers; science is induction from facts. The terms are mutually exclusive. Christian Science is a misnomer.

Mrs. Eddy's system of thought is not scientific, because it is not accurate. Her use of words is unscientific. She employs words first in one sense and then in another. The lack of accurate definition of terms makes clear thinking on her part impossible. She is only an adept in self-contradictory nonsense. Her modes of reasoning are unscientific. For example, she says, "The fundamental propositions of Christian Science" are "four selfevident propositions;" that is, axioms. "Even if read backward, these will be found to agree in statement and proof." But a self-evident proposition," or axiom, admits of no proof. Every one who apprehends it must assent to it. Mrs. Eddy's "propositions" do not command universal assent. Take the third: "God, Spirit, being all, nothing is matter." The vast majority of men are not compelled to assent to it. It is, therefore, not an axiom. But read it backward, according to Mrs. Eddy: "Matter is nothing, all being, Spirit, God," which is nonsense. Her "fundamental propositions" thus falling to the ground, what becomes of her "science?"

In her eagerness to get rid of "matter" she denies the trustworthiness of the five human senses, which Aristotle says, "would seem to comprise all our perceptive faculties." Man, then, is a blind, deaf, dead man in a dead universe. She rejects altogether the natural sciences, though she avails herself of their discoveries when they may serve to illustrate her theories.

Mrs. Eddy is intellectually dishonest. She makes the impression of being familiar with the original language of the Bible, and then gives indisputable proof of her gross ignorance. For instance, in 1855, "Science and Health," she says "Adam is from the Latin demeus." But the merest tyro knows that the Hebrew was a dead language before the Latin was born. One might as well say that Adam was the son of McKinley. In the edition of 1886, she makes another guess: "Adam is identical with the Latin daemon." But "daemon" is a Greek word, not Latin. In 1898, her scholarship had made such immense progress that she properly says, "The word Adam is from the Hebrew Adamah," but adds, "Divide the name Adam into syllables, A-dam, and it reads 'a dam,' or obstruction." From which she argues that all matter is a dam to spirit. One is tempted to make a profane pun in reply. What reliance can be put upon the scientific statements of such a scholar?

Her use of the Bible is equally dishonest. She is either a most careless reader of the English scriptures or intentionally misquotes and misinterprets them. She does not hesitate to suppress portions of a New Testament passage, when it serves her purpose. She quotes detached texts without any reference to the context, and repudiates as "a lie" certain parts that destroy her theories. Mr. Ingersoll never used more vulgar raillery against scripture than may be quoted from her writings. She denies almost every article of the essential Christian Creed. She attacks prayer with special virulence, and allows in her services only one prayer, that which Christ especially gave to avoid repetition, and this prayer only as it is joined sentence by sentence with her own utterly irrelevant criticisms. Her view of Jesus Christ, in his person and mission, is radically different from that of the New Testament. To her Christ was simply a "natural Christian Scientist," who did not know the form of the system he was propagating; the science of the "Revelation," as to form, being reserved for Mrs. Eddy's apotheosis nineteen hundred years after Christ's birth. Shades of Mahomet!

Christian Science has no philosophy that can be intelligibly stated. Scraps of all philosophic thinking are inextricably intermingled. Now it is transcendental pantheism, then occultism, then mysticism, then a suggestion of Swedenborgianism, next mental healing, then the rankest sort of mediaeval theology against which Mrs. Eddy often rails.

Christian Science can get no permanent hold on any person who thinks accurately and knows his Bible. Like Spiritualism, Millerism, and other mental fads, which have run their day and lost their attraction, it will deceive, injure and destroy many. But it will die its death, for it is neither Christian nor scientific.

W. W. BOYD.

PROFITABLE OR UNPROFITABLE COWS.

By. W. R. Wood.

(Written for the Homestead.)

Very few farmers stop to ask themselves the question, Are my cows returning me a profit? Many are actually losing money on them every day of their lives, yet so careless are they concerning the matter that they take no pains to ascertain the facts in the case. They simply go on year after year feeding, milking the cows and making the milk into butter with no idea of how much if any money they are receiving for their trouble.

It is easy enough to ascertain what a cow is doing. A pair of scales and a Babcock test are within reach of the poorest farmer of us all. To weigh the milk of each animal once a week and make a test of it is not a task that requires much time, yet that alone will determine with sufficient accuracy her butter making properties.

Probably there are few herds where one or two unprofitable animals will not be found. It costs no more to feed and care for a good cow than a poor one, so why waste grain and hay on one one that does not pay for her keep? Often it will be a surprise to find what was considered one of the poorest cows in the herd showing the best test, and proportionately disappointing to find the favorite dropping behind some of the others, but remember that if properly manipulated the Babcock never errs. It is a detective which is unhesitatingly accurate in its decision, so do not think your preconceived ideas should have any weight if the test shows differently. To the man with ten cows the Babcock machine is worth the price of a cow, yes, and a good one at that. No dairyman or farmer should attempt to do business without one.

As to the standard to set, each cow should make 250 pounds of butter a year at the very least. It takes all of 200 pounds to furnish her with food for a year. This leaves fifty pounds only as a profit, but since the manure, skim milk, etc., are worth something, we may say that the 250 pound cow will pay for her keep and give a small profit.

Yet if one sets out with the determination to bring up the average above this mark he will not find it very difficult to do it. Indeed the posibilities of intelligent care combined with a good cow have rarely been realized. It is something not often attained.

Farmers, dairymen, this matter is worthy your careful consideration Do not be foolish enough to keep on year after year in the haphazard way so commonly practiced of feeding your cows indiscriminately and pooling their milk, making and selling the butter with no idea of each animal's individual earnings. Without doubt there are robber cows in your herd and these are consuming the profits which the others give. Study on this question and find out "where you are at." Ferret out the unprotable animals and dispose of them, giving the rest a chance to show what they can do. You may be surprised to find that you are getting almost as much butter as before and with a less number of cows to feed and take care of.

Genesee County, Mich.

GRAIN LOOKS FINE

FARMERS SAY FALL-SOWN CEREALS NEVER APPEARED BETTER.

Acreage of Fall Grain Not Up to Average—Deficiency in Fields Will Be Supplied by Spring Crops.

(Dialy Statesman, Salem, March 14.)

Inasmuch as the climatic conditions of Oregon and Scotland are quite similar, the old Scotch adage—"A peck of dust in March is worth a bushel of gold dust," suggests itself with peculiar appropriateness at this season. In fact the passing of a vehicle over sections of Salem's streets yesterday was attended by a visible cloud of dust. With a contimation during the remainder of the week of the weather that accompanied its introduction, dust will be in evidence on all of the highways.

It is needless to remark in this connection that the farmers are making the most of the present delightful weather which is especially favorable for agricultural work. The unseasonable weather that has prevailed a majority of the time since last September, has greatly retarded agricultural work in the valley. Ordinarily two-thirds of the tiiable acreage of the valley is seeded to fall grain but the incessant rain of last fall prevented the seeding of the usual acreage, hence a greater amount of spring seeding will be done this season. An experienced person yesterday stated that the result of the conditions would be a reduced acerage over that of last year. It is thought the fall-sown and spring-sown grain will be about equally divided this season.

Reports from all sections of the valley are to the effect that grain was never looking better than at the present time. The severe frosts of February 1st did not harm the growing grain at all and it has now attained a good healthy growth.

The shortage in the wheat acreage may have some particular significance. The instituting of several creamery plants in the valley means that some attention will be diverted from wheat raising and given to this industry which promises to prove one of considerable importance to the agricultural classes of the valley.

WILL CASE HEARD

CONTEST OVER THE WICHSER-BOOTH ESTATE IN COURT.

Arguments of the Respective Sides Before Judge Boise Yesterday on Appeal from County Court.

(Dialy Statesman, Salem, March 14.)

Judge R. P. Boise's department of the state circuit court for Marion county was in session all of yesterday, when the appeal case in the matter of the last will and testament of Verena Wichser-Booth came up for hearing on an appeal from the county court. The entire day was taken up with the arguments, the case being bitterly contested by the respective attorneys.

The action grew out of the estates of the late Mrs. Verena Wichser-Booth, and that of John C. Booth, deceased. Mrs. Booth, in 1888, made a will, bequeathing all her property to her relatives, and the relatives of her deceased husband. Later she became the wife of John C. Booth, and a year or so after, died. At that time no will was offered for probate, and John C. Booth, the only heir-at-law, was appointed administrator, and came into possession of the property. Within less than one year he, too, died, intestate, and his daughter, Miss Jeanette Booth, was appointed administratrix of the estate—she being one of four children and heirs of the late John C. Booth—and at once qualified and began administering the estate. At this time the will of Mrs. Verena Wichser-Booth, deceased, made before her marriage to John C. Booth, deceased, was presented for probate. Miss Booth, administratrix of the John C. Booth estate, by her attorneys, appeared before the probate court and argued against the admission of the will, on the ground that the marriage of the testator, subsequent to the date of her will, invalidated the will, and that John C. Booth, her husband, who succeeded to the estate as the heir-at-law, came properly into possession of the property, and on his demise, it was properly his estate, and his children and heirs-at-law, were his proper heirs. The attorneys for the heirs named in the will of Mrs. Verena Wichser-Booth, argued that the will was of full force and effect, that under the statute removing the disabilities of a woman the will of a married woman, made prior to her marriage, remained in full force, until a subsequent will set it aside, and that the heirs named in the will should properly come into possession of the estate.

County Judge G. P. Terrell decided in favor of the will, admitted it to probate, and appointed F. A. Turner as administrator with the will annexed, as both executors named in the will were unable to serve. From this decision Miss Booth appealed to the circuit court, and there the case was heard yesterday. The arguments were concluded last evening and the cause submitted to the court. Tilmon Ford and W. T. Slater appeared as attorneys for the will, and J. N. Brown and Attorney-General D. R. N. Blackburn argued the case on behalf of Miss Booth. The property involved in the case aggregates $7500.

Men who have much to say use the fewest words.—H. W. Shaw.

BY THE WHOLESALE

HOP GROWERS' ASSOCIATION PURCHASES ITS OWN SUPPLIES.

Secretary H. L. Bents Predicts a Reduced Acreage for 1900—Anticipates a Lighter Yield.

(Dialy Statesman, Salem, March 14.)

Although the Oregon Hop Growers' Association has not yet succeeded in disposing of the hops that have been placed in the pool, it is proving a helpful agency to the members of the association in other ways. The association is purchasing supplies in wholesale lots which it is enabled to furnish the individual grower at actual wholesale quotations.

The opportunity to thus procure supplies at wholesale prices, is being very generally improved by the local associations. Each of the local organizations throughout the valley, ascertains the quantity of supplies that the members of such association may require and the order is sent to the officers of the state association who in turn make the purchase of a reliable wholesale dealer.

H. L. Bents, of Butteville, secretary of the association, yesterday said there would be a reduced acreage in the hop crop for 1900. He based this prediction on the fact that the depressing conditions with which growers were last year obliged to contend, would naturally have a tendency to reduce the acreage. Mr. Bents also predicts a smaller yield from a same acreage, this year, alleging that many growers will become more negligent in the cultivation of their yards which will result in an inferior quality of hops.

With the practical failure of last year's yield and the inability to realize renumerative wages for the crop that was produced, growers have become much disheartened. The state association will maintain its organization, however, and continues to do everything in its power to promote the interests of the grower, relieve the adverse conditions with which had to battle and make it possible for him to realize fair returns for his product.

It was yesterday reported, by reliavle parties, that H. J. Ottenheimer had purchased the Oliver Beers lot of hops, in Mission Botton, containing about fifty bales, at 2½ cents. Other sales were spoken of yesterday, but details are thus far lacking.

HOW TO BE GRACEFUL.

Tell a woman that she doesn't know how to ascend stairs gracefully; that she has not the slightest conception of the proper way in which to seat herself, or that she is lacking in any way in a knowledge of the little arts with which the gentlewoman is supposed to be conversant, and it is ten to one she will be indignant, and declare you don't know what you are talking about, or else she will raise her eyebrows in a supercilious sort of way and vow never to speak to you again.

It is a fact, nevertheless, that not one woman in fifty understands the poetry of perfect poise, without which knowledge it is as impossible to accomplish these things correctly, as it is for the small boy to keep out of the molasses jug when it is within easy reaching distance. Books of etiquette give us no suggestions on these subjects. In these one finds many rules: "Don't slap your visitor in the face when she asks for your mother." Don't stamp on a lady's toes to call her attention." "Never ride your horse in the drawing-room when you are making calls," and many more such, all true and the best possible advice, but scarcely useful, especially in the present instance.

When one has thoroughly mastered the art of grace one will find it easy to do almost anything, from falling down stairs picturesquely to climbing a stepladder with the ease and beauty of motion of the angels in Jacob's dream. When one has learned to control the joints and muscles of the body, a little thing like a tumble down stairs ought not to cause the slightest discomfort; on the contrary, it is a very excellent exercise in calisthenics. It is only necessary to let oneself go, without the least effort at holding back, to find a tumble of a good flight of stairs a really refreshing undertaking.

However, as one must go up before one can come down, perhaps it would be as well to learn how to go up stairs beautifully and without fatigue, before attempting to descend in a tumultuous fashion. Most women are frights when ascending a long flight of stairs, for the reason that they bend the body forward, throwing all the weight upon the toes. The strain thus comes upon the back and hips, which, besides making an unlovely spectacle of a woman, is very fatiguing and harmful. The correct way to ascend a flight of stairs is to throw the shoulders back to within an inch of the perpendicular and, with the chest well raised, to rest the entire weight on the ball of the foot.

In walking the same principles should be applied as in stair climbing, and the result will be an easy, natural rhythm. The arms should be carried at the sides though they should swing only from the slight movement of the shoulders—but never of themselves. These things are not easily mastered. Few things worth knowing are, and it requires practice and constant watching of oneself to keep from falling back into the habit first formed.

To sit in a way that is artistic and at the same time comfortable one should sit a little forward of perpendicular. Either in sitting or standing, if one would have fine attitudes without thinking of them, it is necessary to put the feet in the correct position and relax the muscles. The force of gravity will make one graceful. The technique of limberness and softness of motion is acquired only through a thorough understanding of the mechanical laws which govern the body. Then, and not until then, does one realize that the use of unnecessary muscles and joints in either action or repose is always ungraceful and in bad form.

One may even cross one's limbs in sitting and be quite elegant and graceful in doing so, in spite of the twaddle given us by our grandmothers. However, one should never cross the limbs after sitting down, but, if one foot be thrown behind the other, one will find, on sitting, that the lines are both graceful and ladylike.

American women are sadly given to lounging, and in this matter of sitting are notoriously at fault. It is no unusual thing to see a girl with her knees crossed and her hands clasped over them, or sitting on a table or sprawling in some undignified attitude, with an all too evident desire to appear mannish. She certainly succeeds, but to what purpose? She doesn't elicit the admiration of the men in so doing, for mannish women do not attract men, any more than womanish men attract women.

Bowing which is another branch of this art of grace, is very interesting, and when done gracefully indicates a delicate refinement and often nobility of person. A woman who has spent a lifetime studying the principles governing our bows and tumbles says in this connection: "Notice the awkward courtesy of the uncultured man and the finished inclination of the gentleman. Nothing could be more dissimilar. In my opinion, it is nicer to judge a man by his bow than by his shoes. To mean anything, a courtesy should always begin at the head, never at the feet. In fact, such a thing is only allowable in the dance, when simply a graceful figure is required.

There is a world of meaning in a bow. Courtesy, deference, admiration, devotion and any number of emotions may be expressed, with scarcely a hair's breadth of difference in the head' inclination. To bow stiffly merely expresses recognition, a forward sweep of the head is courteous, while affection is shown if the head be inclined on the side next one, and a tilt in the opposite direction, may be understood to intimate admiration.

"If you would bow gracefully, always remember that the more points used in an action the more grace is put into it. But then, one needs to study points and their natural workings, else one is apt to appear ridiculous. The most graceful woman inclines her body from the waist, though a perfectly natural and artistic greeting may be given by a movement of the head only. It is an indignity for one to finish the bow before the person to whom it is tendered has fully passed, and when raising the head after the recognition it should assume another curve to the one on which it inclined."
—S. F. Chronicle.

AN AMERICAN.—Carl G. Wolz, a native of Germany, was yesterday admitted to full citizenship in the Marion county court, swearing allegiance to the Stars and Stripes, and he is now a full-fledged American citizen.

WORK OF A DOG.—One night recently a dog entered the barnyard of James Winstanley on his farm north of Salem, and killed six of a herd of ten sheep, including one fine buck.