

Oregon Daily EMERALD

The OREGON DAILY EMERALD, published daily during the college year except all Saturdays but Junior Weekend, Sundays, holidays, final examination periods, and the Monday preceding Junior Weekend in May by the Associated Students of the University of Oregon. Entered as second class matter at the postoffice, Eugene, Oregon. Subscription rates: \$5 per school year; \$4 for two terms; \$3 per term.

Opinions expressed on the editorial page are those of the writer and do not pretend to represent the opinions of the ASUO or of the University. Initialed editorials are written by the associate editors. Unsigned editorials are written by the editor.

ANITA HOLMES, Editor DON THOMPSON, Business Manager
LORNA LARSON, Managing Editor BARBARA WILLIAMS, Advertising Manager
TOM KING, KEN METZLER, DON SMITH, Associate Editors

Assistant Editor: Sam Fidman
News Editor: Norman Anderson
Wire Editor: John Barton
Sorts Editor: Pete Cornacchia
Assistant News Editors: Marjory Bush, Gretchen Grondahl, Jackie Pritzen
Circulation Manager: Jean Lovell
Assistant Business Manager: Shirley Hillard
National Advertising Manager: Bonnie Birkemeier
Layout Manager: Martel Scroggin
Portland Advertising: Karla Van Loan
Zone Managers: Fran Neel, Jean Hoffman, Virginia Kellogg, Don Miller, Val Schultz, Harriet Vahey.

Up With Your Salary--Maybe

Higher wages for student workers at the University of Oregon may become a reality if the State Emergency Board grants salary increases to state employees.

Tuesday the State Board of Control declared it will ask the State Emergency Board for salary increases for all state employees.

This action must be taken, according to state officials, to stop the "alarmingly" high rate of resignations by state employees. The Associated Press reported that if resignations continue at the present rate, half of the 15,000 employees will have resigned at the end of the year.

A state Federation of Labor committee has asked the board to recommend a \$30 monthly increase for all state employees. This would be in addition to the average \$10 monthly increase which the State Civil Service probably would recommend.

So far as student workers at the University are concerned, this is a step in the right direction. Students here are being paid at an alarmingly low rate.

With certain exceptions, student employees cannot be paid more than 75 cents an hour. The exceptions are for those students who are skilled in certain fields, such as stenographic work.

Rates for comparable jobs outside the University pay an average of from 75 cents to one dollar an hour.

The 75 cents an hour paid by the University is the maximum. Normal hourly rates usually run about 65 cents.

A \$10 monthly increase for state employees would sift down into a five-cent hourly increase for student workers, according to Lyle Nelson, director of information.

An additional \$30 increase may mean further increases for students.

The State Emergency Board meets Nov. 2. If the board approves the increase, it would probably run until Feb. 1 at which time the legislature can decide about making it permanent.

If the increase goes through, students must make sure they receive their just share.—K.M.

Four C's in a Pod

A snowball of another color has been rolling around the campus the last two days. It's a bundle of confidence and criticism, complaint and commendation... all in the football, rally-rally vein.

Complaint...

About the Emerald's Wednesday announcement that this morning's assembly had been called off. False-announcement—but the misinformation came from a member of the rally board, so we'll not take the blame.

But we will shout to the student body that the new morning assemblies must have backing, or they'll die young. Save an assembly at 11:15 this morning.

Commendation...

To the organizers of the green-and-white shirt section for Saturday's game.

Confidence...

In Aiken and his boys. Inquiring Reporter and letters to the editor have uncovered a surprising show of "we'll back 'em—win or lose."

Criticism...

Of the send-off rally last week.

Better that we let sleeping rallies lie, and just remember to go snowballing Friday night.

THE DAILY 'E'...

to the University Co-op for awarding five scholarships to foreign students. A fine touch of America.

THE OREGON LEMON...

to Jack Beyers and his Skull and Dagger members for failing to dunk a single beardless sophomore man. Last week, no water in the pool. What's this week's excuse?

Initiative 316, 317

Prohibition of Liquor or Advertising?

Prohibition again? Or is it only a measure to dispose of some liquor advertising?

Those are two of the questions posed by an initiative measure which will be on the Oregon ballot November 7.

A representative of the Lane County Women's Christian Temperance Union has written for the Emerald her organization's reasons for supporting the measure.

Pro: WCTU

This law controls the sale of the product advertised, that is alcoholic liquor, but it does not prohibit liquor advertising, or is not a prohibition measure. The liquor ads can give the name of the producer, trade name or brand or product, place and price where sold, but if liquor is advertised promotively, then those beverages cannot be sold in Oregon. But national magazines or newspapers with promotive ads can still come into the state.

Many alcoholic beverage ads have pictures of home life as in the "Home Life in America" series. The brewers claim that through this series alone they have increased their sales from

56,000,000 barrels annually to 80,000,000 barrels in five years time. Their ads suggest that not only fathers and older sons should drink, but mothers, daughters, and even children. The sale of liquor to minors is illegal. More than 150 million dollars was spent last year in the United States in the advertisement of alcoholic liquors.

An ad in a recent magazine under the caption "Beer Belongs" shows a group of young people in a living-room drinking their beer while watching a magician perform.

The implication is that beer is harmless. But what is the truth? A bottle of four and one-half percent beer, an ordinary glass of wine or an ounce of whiskey contain the same quantity of alcohol (by weight) although the amounts of liquid are different, so the driver of a car gets the same effect from the beer as the others and the pedestrian he hits will be just as dead.

Just as happened to the husband of a friend of mine who a few years ago was killed by a young driver of a car on the corner of 13th and Alder streets in Eugene. It was brought out at the trial that the driver had only had beer to drink.

This bill will make promotive advertising which is designed to create more and more drinkers unprofitable.

So if you want to keep our young people from forming the awful drink habit and likely becoming confirmed alcoholics if not criminals, vote on November 7th. 316—Yes.

(Written for the Lane County WCTU by Miss Pauline Walton.)

An especially clear editorial from The Dalles Chronicle gives the opposing view.

And the measure itself: **MAKING SALE OF PROMOTIVELY ADVERTISED ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE UNLAWFUL—Purpose: Making unlawful the sale of alcoholic beverage promotively advertised through posters, circulars, newspapers, periodicals, or radio broadcasts,**

Emerald's Stand

Oregon Daily Emerald Vote is 317—NO.

If the measure is intended to curb harmful advertising of liquor, we're against it because adverse effects of liquor will remain regardless of advertising or not.

If the measure is intended to curb the sale of liquor, we're against it because the people should have their say on prohibition out-and-out, not through this indirect approach.

You might say it's like trying to shorten a giraffe's neck by cutting off his legs.

originating within the state or otherwise. Advertising is all forms of publicity except the name of producer, trade name or brand or product, place and price where sold. Exempting alcohol for scientific and pharmaceutical preparations, sacramental wines and liquors prescribed by physicians for medicinal purposes. Oregon liquor commission to enforce act. 316—Yes. 317—No.

Con: The Chronicle

Purpose of the bill, as announced by the committee, is "to stop sale of glamorous promotive liquor advertising by making such advertising unprofitable."

The words "glamorous" and "promotive" could well have been eliminated from that statement. There is good reason to believe that ALL liquor ads would be ruled out. The sponsors, however, take the position that the measure would control the sale of the product advertised but would not prohibit liquor advertising.

The federal government requires that all advertisements of distilled spirits, wine or malt beverages indicate identity and qual-

ity of the product. This is for the protection of the purchasers, a consideration the authors of the present Oregon bill apparently did not deem important.

Federal law also requires that liquor be labeled as to percentage of alcohol and, if a blended whiskey, the percentage of neutral spirits. Here again, state and federal regulations would be in conflict, since labeling presumably is a form of advertising and its wording would be restricted by the anti-advertising measure.

Although such intent is disclaimed by the measure's sponsors, the back door has been left open for re-entry of prohibition under the guise of an attempt to de-glamorize the liquor ads. Anyone who wants prohibition and its inevitable by-product—bootlegging—has every right to campaign in its behalf, but the ballot test ought to be forthright and frank.

Approval by voters of any proposal which could accomplish that result, without advance understanding that such was a possibility, could not be considered a true expression of opinion.

Apart from all this, the thinking behind the bill is dangerous. It is a challenge to one of America's freedoms in its attempt to prevent the public from informing itself about perfectly legal products which are available over the counter in stores operated by the state itself.

(The Dalles Chronicle)

Letters

The Campus Answers

No Scapegoat, Aiken

This is a letter that should have been written sooner. The talk regarding the supposed inefficiency and all-around inadequacy of Jim Aiken as a football coach has gone far enough. It's time for the student body, the alumni, and the state as a whole to sit down and give mature consideration to the idea that Oregon's poor showing on the gridiron this fall might be due to something other than poor coaching.

As it is—Aiken has been pushed, most unjustly, into the role of scapegoat by persons who seem to take a certain perverse pleasure in crying over lost glories.

Here are some facts worth considering. After the great season in 1948 Aiken had the heart cut out of his line and lost a great quarterback by way of graduation. Still he produced the highest scoring eleven in Oregon history, a team that could draw 78,000 to California's Memorial Stadium.

At the end of the 1949-50

school year he lost what little he had left and had to start virtually from scratch. He hasn't one back that can perform well with the consistency which comes with experience. The same holds true with almost every lineman. Can Anderson, Stelle, Daniels, and Lung win the games all by themselves?

The Frosh team is loaded, so to speak. The team we have this year will shape up a lot next fall, that is if they don't easily take offense at a little rough treatment. Aiken is as fine a coach as can be found anywhere, like it or lump it, and he's going to see to it that this University has winning teams if he has to keep faces buried in the mud of the practice field for three years.

He can do it and the team can do it if we'll just have a little patience and quit feeling sorry for ourselves. They need encouragement, not picayunish criticism, and we need to grow up.

Bud Hurst

The Second Cup

Weep no more, lady, weep no more, Thy sorrow is in vain, For violets plucked, the sweetest showers will ne'er make grow again.—Percy.

On the present—

The present contains nothing more than the past, and what is found in the effect was already in the cause.—Bergson.

The present can be happy only in direct proportion to the near past and the immediate prospects for the future.—Anonymous.

On the future—

I know of no way of judging the future but by the past—Patrick Henry.

I never think of the future. It comes soon enough.—Einstein.

There was the Door to which I found no key; There was the Veil through which I might not see—Omar Khayyam.

Can anyone be so elegant as to have few wants, and to serve them one's self?—Emerson.