HIS DILEMMA ABOUT HER.
What will Speaker Mann, or Speaker Clark—or whoever may be Speaker—do when Representative Rankin from her seat and addresses the chair? Will the Speaker recognize the "lady from Montana" or the "person from Montana"—the Constitution refers to Congressmen as persons—or merely "Representative Rankin"? These new and important questions in parliamentary procedure—to say nothing of philological practice—are agitating sundry contemporaries, which are adding the pertinent comment that some noun besides "persons" or "individuals" which will have a common gender and describe both sexes is a glaring deficiency in the English language.

The perturbed Speaker ought to have no great difficulty in meeting the unprecedented situation. Why not recognize the "member from Montana" and be done with it? It is non-committal, polite and sufficiently elegant.

But the need of singular pronoun for common designation of individuals without designation of sex is obvious, and may be made all the more conspicuous by the advent of women in public life. The other day The Oregonian, in response to an inquiry by a correspondent whose sex was unknown, had to use the awkward "if he (or she) will make himself (or herself) known, he (or she) will," etc. Which accurate but clumsy expression led an up-Valley contemporary to suggest a new pronoun to meet the grammatical urgency. If we remember correctly, the creation was "thon," or something like that.

But, alas! language cannot be artificially fabricated. It is a growth, not an invention. "Thon" is better than a thousand words of recognized orthographical standing; but no newspaper and no college can give it good repute. It must come up from the people, like slang, not down from the highbrows.