

The News-Review

Entered as second class matter May 7, 1930, at the post office at Roseburg, Oregon under act of March 3, 1973.

CHARLES V. STANTON, Editor and Manager

ADDY WRIGHT, Asst. Bus. Mgr.

GEORGE CASTILLO, Asst. Editor

Member of the Associated Press, Oregon Newspaper Publishers Association, the Audit Bureau of Circulations

Represented by WEST-HOLLYDAY CO. INC., offices in New York, Chicago, Detroit, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Seattle, Portland, Denver

Published Daily Except Sunday by the News-Review Company, Inc.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—In Oregon—By Mail—Per Year, \$12.00; six months, \$6.50; three months, \$3.75. Outside Oregon—By Mail—Per Year, \$13.50; six months, \$7.50; three months, \$4.25. By News-Review Carrier—Per Year, \$12.00 (in advance, less than one year, per month, \$1.25).

OBJECTIONS HEARD

By Charles V. Stanton

The State of California has "nothing against the good people of Idaho and Oregon," but Californians can rejoice that "they do not have to pay part of their light and power bills," says the *Los Angeles Times* in a recent editorial.

The *Los Angeles Times* newspaper was commenting on the failure of the Hells Canyon bill to gain approval in Congress and, in answer to claims that the federal project would provide cheaper power for Idaho and Oregon, says "this cheaper power would have been a gift from their fellow taxpayers."

The project was analyzed as follows:

The Hells Canyon scheme, which Senators Morse, Neuberger, et al., say they devised to stop a "giveaway" of the people's resources, "was actually a giveaway of taxpayers' money for the political benefit of Senator Morse (D) Ore., and a couple of Congressional candidates in Oregon."

The scheme, which was defeated in the Senate by a 51-41 roll-call vote, was to authorize a \$455,000,000 federal high dam at Hells Canyon, the spot which the Snake River has cut for our use between Oregon and Idaho.

Senator Morse says this federal power site was a "precious natural resource," which is being turned over to private capital for exploitation. But if it was such a resource, why did not the public power advocates get it recognized as such all during the Truman administration? In seven years they were never able to convince mainly Democratic Congresses that it was precious.

Rate Subsidy Charged

The *Los Angeles Times* points out that the Federal Power Commission held exhaustive hearings and then decided that the best way to develop the project was by a series of three dams, as proposed by the Idaho Power company at a cost of \$133,000,000, "none of which will come from the taxpayers."

Opposed to this private development, it is pointed out in the editorial, the federal high dam would have cost \$485,000,000, or more, as federal projects always cost more than estimates, and the entire cost would fall upon taxpayers. California's share in the development would have been approximately \$43,000,000, the *Times* reports.

And "what would the States of Oregon and Idaho get?" the *Times* asks. It gives as an answer:

For one thing, somewhat cheaper power for the reason that the federal project would have paid no state or federal taxes whereas the Idaho Power company will pay both.

Senator Morse says the Idaho Power company would have passed the taxes on to its ratepayers, a statement somewhat inconsistent with the usual "liberal line" that the "liberals" would make the corporations pay the taxes. However, why should Morse try to be consistent? The "liberals" have been getting away with this reverse line of talk for years, and it is probably good for more elections.

The California paper then declares that the cheaper power would "have been a gift from their fellow taxpayers."

Delays Are Cited

It is pointed out also that "the people of Idaho and Oregon would have paid a price for this cheap power too—the price of having some part of their local affairs run by a bureau in Washington."

The *Times* summarizes: This is a real victory for the people against the Socializers; a victory of the taxpayers against those who, like Senator Morse, would give their money away. The people of Idaho and Oregon need power. For their failure to get it long since, they have such busybodies and public power fanatics as Senator Morse to thank; for the politicians have delayed the Hells Canyon projects for years.

Public power will be dragged into the forthcoming campaign in Oregon as one of the chief issues. Republicans will be accused of innumerable giveaways of public natural resources. But the sentiment expressed by the *Los Angeles Times* is not isolated opinion. Taxpayers in other parts of the country are getting tired of subsidizing power development in the Pacific Northwest. Particularly do they object when private capital is available.

Oregonians should realize that the public power advocates, who contend that power generation should be the exclusive province of the federal government, are obstructionists to a needed and obtainable development without taxpayer cost.

Hal Boyle

NEW YORK (AP)—A young schoolteacher's wife who never took a writing lesson in her life may become a literary sensation of the year when her first novel appears next month.

"I feel pretty sure of one thing—it'll probably cost my husband his job," said Mrs. Grace Metalious cheerfully.

(In Gilmanston, N.H., it was learned that her husband has already lost his job as a grade school principal. School officials denied his dismissal was connected with Mrs. Metalious' book, but said it stemmed from a "personal" matter between the official and her husband. Metalious said he has obtained a high school teaching position in Stow, Mass., at a higher salary.)

The novel, "Peyton Place," already causing an advance stir in publishing circles, brings "Tobacco Road" up north and gives it a Yankee accent. Mrs. Metalious, called by publishers a "Pandora in blue jeans" (she likes to do her housework clad in jeans and a hunting shirt), set out to lift the lid off a small New England town—and wound up by pulling it off its hinges.

With a Freudian frankness she unveils the high-level brutality and low-level squalor, the hidden vices and illicit romances, the petty meanness and quiet heroism which she says underlie the surface of any placid New England town. She includes a few love scenes that might raise Ernest Hemingway's eyebrows or cause Kathleen Winsor to blush. It's an odd book to come from the typewriter of a plump, 32-year-old mother of three children. But Mrs. Metalious is no ordinary housewife.

She and her husband, George, were only 17 when they married after graduating from high school. She wanted to become a writer and turned out dozens of short stories while he served as an artilleryman overseas in the Second World War.

She wrote dozens more in the years she and her husband, but three children subsisted on \$129 a month while he studied at the University of New Hampshire to become a teacher.

"But I didn't try to sell them," she said. "I just wrote them and tossed them into a trunk."

Two years ago George got a \$3,000-a-year post as principal of the grammar school in Gilmanston, N.H., a town of 488 registered voters. Grace decided to write a realistic novel about a small town not a portrayal of Gilmanston, but a composite of all the small New England towns she had ever known.

To a tourist these towns look as peaceful as a postcard picture," she said, "but if you go beneath that picture, it's like turning over a rock with your foot—all kinds of strange things crawl out."

"Everybody who lives in town knows what's going on—there are no secrets—but they don't want outsiders to know."

After completing her novel, Mrs. Metalious did what many be-

By A. ROBERT SMITH
News-Review Correspondent
(Second in a series on the record of the Eisenhower administration)

WASHINGTON — President Eisenhower has been taking advice from some people whom labor leaders regard as hostile to organized labor, and simultaneously the labor leaders who had easy access to the White House under Roosevelt and Truman are no longer the intimate advisors of the president who has held office since 1953.

This is all a manifestation of a difference of concepts. Union leaders tend to equate unions and all laboring men, although union membership is a statistical minority of labor. The Eisenhower administration has a broader concept of labor and acts accordingly, although to many union leaders this is regarded as anti-union.

The record shows that the administration has dealt with unions and respected many of their demands. But it has not dealt with them exclusively.

When Eisenhower first formed his cabinet he chose a labor executive, Martin P. Durkin, as his labor secretary—a selection pronounced "incredible" by the late Sen. Robert A. Taft, co-author of the Taft-Hartley act which labor opposes. This gesture toward the unions soured in seven months.

Durkin had worked out a program of 19 changes in the Taft-Hartley Act which he believed Eisenhower endorsed. Other advisors persuaded the president differently, and when Eisenhower wouldn't back Durkin the labor leader quit, declaring the president had broken his word.

To succeed Durkin, Eisenhower chose James P. Mitchell, a New York department store executive who has won the confidence of some labor leaders, but gained

gainers do. She went to the public library, looked over a list of literary agents and wrote one. Most professional literary agents give unknown writers a polite brushoff. Luckily, Mrs. Metalious picked Jacques Chambrun, an agent who has writers like Somerset Maugham in his stable but likes also to discover new talent. He told her to send along her manuscript and a few days later she was surprised to receive his flat reply:

"I'll sell it."

After a staid Philadelphia publisher (and an equally staid one in Boston) returned the novel at "too long," it was quickly accepted by a Manhattan firm, Columbia Pictures, is considering making it into a film, and has already taken an option, sight unseen, on Mrs. Metalious' next novel.

She has already received \$5,100 in royalties, and the first thing she did was to buy a 1951 Cadillac and four bathing suits for her neighbors' daughters.

"Three people already have cut me dead on the street, and the book isn't even out yet," she said. "And I'm afraid the school board won't want to keep as principal a woman married to a woman who wrote about the things I did."

The couple have no intention of leaving Gilmanston. They are moving out of their \$35-a-month rented house into a new home of their own.

"Why, I wouldn't want to live anywhere else," Mrs. Metalious said. "In New York or Boston there is so much pressure—even the people who have nothing to do are in a big hurry. But in a small town there is time for everything."

"The ax-mouths may talk about you, but if you want to be let alone, they'll let you alone—utterly and finally alone. No matter what crime you commit you can always go on living in a small town, that is, unless you are caught stealing."

"A parent in a small New England town would rather it be known his teen-age daughter was having an illicit romance than that she had been caught taking a nickel candy bar from a store."

Now Make Up Your Mind



SAN FRANCISCO ORATORY

FALL

CAMPAIGN

NEA Service, Inc.

Many Labor Demands Met During Republican Regime But T-H Law Stands Firm

By A. ROBERT SMITH
News-Review Correspondent
(Second in a series on the record of the Eisenhower administration)

WASHINGTON — President Eisenhower has been taking advice from some people whom labor leaders regard as hostile to organized labor, and simultaneously the labor leaders who had easy access to the White House under Roosevelt and Truman are no longer the intimate advisors of the president who has held office since 1953.

This is all a manifestation of a difference of concepts. Union leaders tend to equate unions and all laboring men, although union membership is a statistical minority of labor. The Eisenhower administration has a broader concept of labor and acts accordingly, although to many union leaders this is regarded as anti-union.

The record shows that the administration has dealt with unions and respected many of their demands. But it has not dealt with them exclusively.

When Eisenhower first formed his cabinet he chose a labor executive, Martin P. Durkin, as his labor secretary—a selection pronounced "incredible" by the late Sen. Robert A. Taft, co-author of the Taft-Hartley act which labor opposes. This gesture toward the unions soured in seven months.

Durkin had worked out a program of 19 changes in the Taft-Hartley Act which he believed Eisenhower endorsed. Other advisors persuaded the president differently, and when Eisenhower wouldn't back Durkin the labor leader quit, declaring the president had broken his word.

To succeed Durkin, Eisenhower chose James P. Mitchell, a New York department store executive who has won the confidence of some labor leaders, but gained

gainers do. She went to the public library, looked over a list of literary agents and wrote one. Most professional literary agents give unknown writers a polite brushoff. Luckily, Mrs. Metalious picked Jacques Chambrun, an agent who has writers like Somerset Maugham in his stable but likes also to discover new talent. He told her to send along her manuscript and a few days later she was surprised to receive his flat reply:

"I'll sell it."

After a staid Philadelphia publisher (and an equally staid one in Boston) returned the novel at "too long," it was quickly accepted by a Manhattan firm, Columbia Pictures, is considering making it into a film, and has already taken an option, sight unseen, on Mrs. Metalious' next novel.

She has already received \$5,100 in royalties, and the first thing she did was to buy a 1951 Cadillac and four bathing suits for her neighbors' daughters.

"Three people already have cut me dead on the street, and the book isn't even out yet," she said. "And I'm afraid the school board won't want to keep as principal a woman married to a woman who wrote about the things I did."

The couple have no intention of leaving Gilmanston. They are moving out of their \$35-a-month rented house into a new home of their own.

"Why, I wouldn't want to live anywhere else," Mrs. Metalious said. "In New York or Boston there is so much pressure—even the people who have nothing to do are in a big hurry. But in a small town there is time for everything."

"The ax-mouths may talk about you, but if you want to be let alone, they'll let you alone—utterly and finally alone. No matter what crime you commit you can always go on living in a small town, that is, unless you are caught stealing."

"A parent in a small New England town would rather it be known his teen-age daughter was having an illicit romance than that she had been caught taking a nickel candy bar from a store."

the enmity of some employers who regard him as "leftist." Mitchell retained the best of Durkin's men in the Labor Department.

NLRB: Eases Situation
Union leaders talk quite differently of the president's appointments to the National Labor Relations Board, which handles labor-management disputes under the labor act. After appointments changed a majority of its membership, the board limited its jurisdiction over disputes, leaving thousands of employers and employees without the protection and restraints of the labor act. This would seem to cut both ways, but it is the union side that is crying foul.

The board's interpretation of free speech has been broadened. This an employer, hoping to fend off a union invasion, has more freedom to talk to his workers without having an unfair labor charge lodged against him with the NLRB.

Unions have won many NLRB decisions, but it is clear that management is now more comfortable with this board than it ever had been. No board has ever been free of criticism from one side or another. Until recent years, it came from management, now from labor.

T-H Act Changes Stalled
The record on labor legislation is not as bad as labor feared it might be, nor as good as the administration claims. Secretary Mitchell claims that his labor program has been blocked in Congress by the chairman of the House Labor Committee, Rep. Graham A. Barden (D-N.C.), who is not friendly to labor.

No changes have been made in the controversial Taft-Hartley act, for the Republican administration and the Democratic-controlled 84th Congress have been at loggerheads over what changes would be acceptable to all sides.

The minimum hour wage has been raised from 75c to \$1—a compromise between 90c asked for by the administration and \$1.25 proposed by union leaders.

The administration has talked much of extending the wage and hour law to cover several million more employees, but the retail trade lobby has been so effective in opposing this, that nothing has come of it.

Following an announced policy of non-intervention in labor-management disputes, the administration has invoked the emergency injunction against strikes of the Taft-Hartley act only three times. But this is largely due to the fact that so few disputes resembled national emergencies. Partisans will argue whether this state of affairs was just the good fortune of the Eisenhower administration or the direct result of its economic and labor policies.

In any event, President Eisenhower has presided over an era of relative industrial peace. Wages, living standards and employment have touched new highs. Unemployment has not been a serious national problem. Prices had been stable until this summer.

Labor's Status Improved
Economically, labor has "never had it so good," as AFL-CIO President George Meany conceded last year. This is reflected in the economic statistics which show that it is spring the average factory worker had 16 per cent more spending money after taxes than he had in July, 1952. Employment in non-farm establishments went up more than 4 million in the same period, as the national economy and population expanded. And man-days lost in strikes went down 30 per cent.

In short, the administration has an economic record with a powerful political potential. It has played ball with labor leaders to some extent, but much less than Roosevelt and Truman. It has been more responsive to employer-minded advisors. It has acted on the assumption that unions are strong enough to extend their influence without White House assistance, that some workmen prefer to be unprotected and are entitled to protection of that choice, and that

Adlai Checks On 'Give-Aways' Of Republicans

By JOHN CHADWICK

PORTLAND (AP)—Adlai Stevenson and Sen. Estes Kefauver fired away at what they called the Eisenhower administration's "give-away" of natural resources after landing here on a whirlwind political tour.

The Democratic presidential and vice presidential candidates flew in here after a four-hour trip from Albuquerque, N.M., for a session with party leaders from the five Northwest states.

Stevenson, addressing a crowd at the Portland airport, said he had come here in part "to check on the Republican give-aways of our natural resources."

He said he was going to drive up to Bonneville Dam to "see if it is still there."

Both Stevenson and Kefauver beat drums for the re-election of Sen. Wayne Morse of Oregon and Warren Magnuson of Washington, telling the crowd that they hoped both men would be returned to the Senate.

Stevenson also said that in the election campaign in the Northwest this year an issue would be settled that "we thought had been settled 50 years ago."

"This," he said, "is whether the nation's great natural resources are to be conserved and developed for all or are to be given away to a favored few."

Morse introduced Stevenson and Kefauver to the airport crowd as the next president and vice president of the United States.

Kefauver urged all of his friends in the state to support the Democratic ticket and said that "Adlai Stevenson is fighting for a new America."

The Tennesseean also recalled his long service in the Senate with Morse and said that the nation and the world needs Morse, and that Morse's re-election also is needed for the development of the Pacific Northwest.

Bruce Biossat

The President Eisenhower whom millions of Americans saw deliver his acceptance speech in San Francisco was a vastly different man from the newly retired general who performed the same task four years ago in Chicago.

The man who took the nomination in 1952 was a reluctant candidate, eager for battle, showing thorough mastery of the political arts. Without directly assailing his political opponents, he pounded out the articles of his political faith. He did not use the word "crusade" this time, but he acted as if he were in one.

The man who stood in the glare at the Cow Palace was the image of the fighting candidate, obviously eager for battle, showing thorough mastery of the political arts. Without directly assailing his political opponents, he pounded out the articles of his political faith. He did not use the word "crusade" this time, but he acted as if he were in one.

Mr. Eisenhower's transformation from a reluctant general to a willing politician was perhaps the most remarkable thing to be observed in watching him. But the words he uttered about peace of deferred further astonishing contrast.

IT WAS REALIZED, of course, in 1952 that he was one of the most "unmilitary" military men in American history. Not only had he spoken urgently for peace. He had branded arms preparedness a sterile, wasteful business—unnecessarily necessary in a hostile world.

But the fervor with which he called for "peace for all time" at San Francisco was unexampled. Clearly he regards this quest as his overriding mission in public life.

labor legislation is in reality labor-management legislation. (NEXT — What about the welfare state?)

In The Day's News

(Continued From Page One)

flection that indicates that the speaker's words and his OPINIONS do not necessarily coincide. Above all, he has won the unqualified approval of his great chief, President Eisenhower. And in this convention that was just adjourned the support that won him UNANIMOUS renomination was not synthetic. It was GENUINE. It wasn't just a deal among the delegates. The crowds were with him. Their applause told that rather clearly.

Yet it can't be denied that he is a controversial figure. Why?

The answer is all the more difficult to find because those who say they are opposed to him so seldom have a definite reason for their opposition. They are vague about it. For example:

Chattering at breakfast one morning with the waitress—a pleasant middle-aged woman with gray hair—I started off with the usual bromide: "How did you like the convention?"

"Oh," she said with unmistakable enthusiasm, "Isn't Eisenhower wonderful? I just love him. But that Nixon—I can't stand him!"

"Why not?" I queried. As so many anti-Nixonites do, she hesitated. "Well," she finally said, "he's so cocksure of himself."

"That," I said, "doesn't sound to me like a very good reason. The vice-president of the United States can't be wishy-washy. When he acts, he MUST be sure of himself."

She pondered a moment, as if searching her own mind. "Well," she finally said, "I suppose my real reason is that the Democrats tell us working people we must vote for Democrats because they are our friends and the Republicans are our enemies. But I'm going to vote for President Eisenhower anyway. I love him. I have faith in him. He's a good man. But I don't know about Nixon. They say he's against us working people."

I offer the incident for what it may be worth.

What of Stassen? What was he up to?

I wouldn't know. And I wouldn't go so far as to say he was wrong in what he did. This is a free country. Any man has a right to do as he pleases within the limits of the rights of others. He had a perfect right to oppose Nixon. But at this convention his popularity nose-dived because of the way he handled himself.

When he saw the error of his way and withdrew his opposition and asked to be allowed to second Nixon's nomination, his request was granted. If he had got up and laughed and said he knew when he was licked and was happy to be so, he would have been received back into the fold with enthusiasm. Instead, he took one minute to make his second statement and 19 minutes to defend himself unconvincingly for what he had done.

That cooked his goose.

Soviets Explain Colored With Van Dyke Beard

BERLIN (AP)—The Soviet air force came up Tuesday with an explanation of their colored with the Van Dyke beard who prefers "auff widersehen." (See you again) to any final farewell.

Der Abend, a West Berlin newspaper, published a picture Monday of the colored parading at a giant farewell Sunday for a Soviet air division leaving Oranienburg—presumably for home.

The newspaper published also a picture of the same bearded colored saying farewell in the ranks of another Soviet air division that was supposed to have left East Germany last June.

Today the newspaper quoted a Red air force spokesman as explaining that the colored was a member of an honor escort company that shows up at all farewell parades.

life, transcending his desire to improve life on the home front and to remake his party in a mold that fits the future.

Stirred to the challenge of these tasks, Mr. Eisenhower on the convention platform did not look like a man who had to be dragged—vertically—to contend—into running for a second term.

Nor, in fact, did he seem like a man who had within the past 11 months suffered two serious bouts of illness. Though definitely thinner than of old, he appeared vigorous, firm of flesh and strong of voice. The testimony of newsmen who saw him close up suggested, too, that the TV screen did not do him full justice.

AMERICANS listening to the President could not have helped noting that in stressing America's future he was striking a chord much like the one sounded a week before by Adlai Stevenson.

The parallel was not accidental. Both men are high-minded moderates. They have somewhat different goals, but as each would approach his own at differing speeds, the net effect is to put them markedly close together.

The campaign ahead thus will be fought within a relatively narrow range. If it were left to the two contenders alone, undoubtedly it would be a "high level" affair free of questionable in-fighting.

But campaigns never are left merely to the principals. And the record of history indicates they tend to sag in quality as they move toward election day.

But Americans may at least be reassured that in President Eisenhower and Adlai Stevenson they have two presidential nominees whose eyes and minds are on the big goals ahead.

Reader Opinions

Game Commission Policy Criticized By Angler

(To The Editor)—In regard to your editorial "Confused State of Affairs," the Oregon Game Commission has used its game laws for conservation of fish and wildlife, which is fine as long as they confine those laws to the boundaries of the State of Oregon. Outside the limit of Oregon waters on the coast it is a God-given right that you should be able to keep everything that you can catch. But the Game Commission, with enforcement by the State Police, seems to think otherwise, as their record of so-called violations mounts each week.

Who are they conserving those fish for, the people of California or the people of Washington, who have a higher bag limit than we do in Oregon?

A fine testimony for the two-fish bag limit to be brought into the State of Oregon are the dead salmon caught at sea and then discarded because a larger fish was caught. Punching cards for ocean-caught salmon certainly doesn't help the records tell which streams and rivers are fished the heaviest.

I fish the coast four or five times a year and on some trips come back with nothing and on others am allowed two salmon only when I could have brought in three or four. If I have to buy a commercial license to get my fish in legally, I certainly will, unless the Oregon Game Commission can realize that the fish in the ocean are not fed nor controlled by them, and that they belong to anybody who can catch them.

Nick Kobornik
5247 S. W. Dillard Hwy.
Roseburg, Oregon.

Excessive Football Practice Questioned

It came to my painful attention last night that football practice is being carried on in the local high school, not only in the morning from nine o'clock until they get through but from eight until ten at night. After this the boys must undress, shower, dress and get home. This is being done six days a week.

This outlandish situation seems to be meekly submitted to by long-suffering parents in the name of cooperation with the school authorities.

Exploitation of the youth is exploitation whether it is done by ruthless factory owners or ruthless educators and coaches. After much difficulty child labor laws were passed. We moan and groan about juvenile delinquency but we adults might well look first to our own tendency to glamorize wastage of human assets in the name of our own ambition, under whatever name.

Horace G. Miller, M.D.
Fisher Road,
Roseburg, Ore.

Damages Asked In Beating Case

A complaint asking \$1,200 special damages and \$15,000 exemplary damages has been filed in Douglas County Circuit Court by Louis Bringsus, Drain, against Grant McCormick, Drain.

Complainant Bringsus alleges that on or about Aug. 1, 1956, McCormick assaulted and beat him on the body, head and neck. He says the alleged assault and battery caused personal injuries and was without cause. Bringsus says he suffered pain, bruises, contusions, abrasions, brain concussion, post concussion and amnesia.

He lists medical expenses of approximately \$100 currently and estimates future expenses in excess of \$500. Bringsus says he has not been able to work as a carpenter for six weeks and does not know if he will be able to in the future. For this allegation, he seeks \$600 for further damage.

Dale Lander, who contracted polio last November, has been taken to a rehabilitation center in Santa Monica, Calif., where he will remain for an indefinite period of time.

Dale's father, Henry L. Lander, and father-in-law, Forrest Losee, of Idleyld Park, took him to Santa Monica in a station wagon. Losee has returned to Idleyld Park, but Lander has remained in Santa Monica to be with his son.