

Oregon Daily EMERALD

The Oregon Daily Emerald is published five days a week during the school year, except during examinations and vacation periods, by the Student Publications Board of the University of Oregon. Entered as second class matter at the post office, Eugene, Oregon. Subscription rates: \$5 per school year, \$2

BILL MAINWARING, Editor
MARCIA MAUNEY, Editorial Page Editor
SALLY JO GREIG, SAM VAHEY, Associate Editors
JACK WILSON, Sports Editor
DOROTHY BARKER, Ass't Adv. Mgr.
LORETTA MEYER, Business Manager
KEN NIEHANS, Adv. Mgr.
CORNELIA FOGLE, News Editor
CHARMION FORD, Office Manager
EDITORIAL BOARD: Bill Mainwaring, Marcia Mauney, Sally Jo Greig, Sam Vahey, Chuck Mitchelmore, Cornelia Fogle, Jack Wilson, Al Johnson.
Chief Make-up Editor: Al Johnson
Ass't News Editors: Cay Mundorff, Joan Dennis, Nancy Castle, Pepper Allen.
Feature Editor: Phil Hager
Photo Editor: Brant Ducey
Nat'l Adv. Mgr.: Jo Anne Milligan
Classified Adv. Mgr.: Arlene Krauss
Women's Editor: Dorothy West
Circulation Mgr.: Sam Vahey
Asst. Sports Editors: Jerry Ramsey, Jim Larimore
Executive Secretary: Geri Gobel

Provision for Write-in Votes Necessary?

A provision for write-in voting in campus elections should be made in the ASUO constitution, said Charles W. Stevenson in a letter to the editor Monday.

Here is a new idea which deserves some attention.

The Emerald is not in complete agreement with Mr. Stevenson's letter. We do not feel the lack of such a provision is part of a plan to deprive students of democratic government. Nor do we feel that the matter is of earth-shaking importance, considering the ease with which anyone can get his name placed upon the ballot.

Mr. Stevenson had engineered a write-in campaign which produced more votes for his candidate for graduate representative than were obtained by the winner, Gordon McLeod. Naturally he was irritated to learn that his results weren't even officially counted, since the ASUO constitution has no provision for such voting.

The letter writer had assumed, since there was no notice to the contrary, that write-in votes were legal, even though there is no place on the ballot for such voting. But if the election of his candidate had been of great importance then someone should have checked this before the end of the filing period.

Our reason for not placing too much importance on the whole incident is that anyone with a 2.0 GPA has only to write his name on a petition to become a legal candidate. This takes but a few minutes.

But a provision for write-in voting might be a good addition to the ASUO constitution. This idea is certainly worth looking into before the next ASUO election, when the twice-defeated proposed amendment of last week will probably once again be considered. If Mr. Stevenson feels the matter is of sufficient importance we suggest that he present his ideas to the ASUO senate.

New Living Organizations Tax Unfair

Fraternities, sororities and co-ops must begin paying a tax upon such personal property items as furniture, rugs and dishes, according to a recent ruling by the Oregon State Tax commission.

If this ruling goes into effect, the estimated cost to University of Oregon students would be \$3,500 per year. Naturally, house bills would have to be raised to cover this new expense.

Led by groups at Oregon State and Oregon's Interfraternity council, this ruling is going to be contested.

Houses are not denying their obligation to pay real property taxes. They already pay a property tax which averages about \$1300-\$1500 per house.

But they do object to paying a special tax which is levied on hotels and apartment houses but not on private homes. Personal property owned by the user is not taxable; personal property owned by a "landlord" is taxable.

Apparently the issue is whether or not the members of our campus private living organizations do or do not own the personal property. In most cases, technically, they do not. Most houses are owned by corporations, distinct from the active membership,

and controlled by alumni or their national organization. Technically the members do not own the property, but they generally control its use just as if they did.

Based on the law as it now stands, the houses will probably lose. The next step would be to carry the fight to the legislature.

In spirit at least, houses are owned by their members and should not be required to pay this tax. We hope and believe that the legislature will agree.

Footnotes

Upon the subject of OSC-Oregon football, we have gleaned these excerpts from the "experts":

Associated Press: "The balance of their conference schedule sends Oregon State against what looks like two easy touches, Idaho and Oregon." — oh, yeah?

United Press: "If they (OSC) can get by Stanford Saturday, they should make it to Pasadena, because only Idaho, and Oregon, both comparative weaklings, remain after that."

Thanks, fellows. We'll see Thursday!

Just Before the Battle, Mother



"YEAH— WELL YOU SHOULD'VE SMELLED THIS LOCKER ROOM BEFORE TV."

Gulliver's Trifles

In the Land of the Lean The Fatted Man Is Prey

By KEN KESEY
 Emerald Columnist

Upon a time, once, to the south, there roamed a tribe of warlike giants and their pudgy managers. And each year when the frost was on the pumpkin and the foam on the hop this tribe would meet and do battle with the lesser tribes from the north.

And for years it was a one-sided slaughter for the giant tribes and there were even measures taken by the managers to even the battle even and increase the gate; they decreed that the southern giants should be given no more to eat than the northern warriors. And all this was fine and proper and the managers made more money.

But time (while many of the giants did not) passed. And the southern giants grew wiser and hungrier and demanded more food, and the flabby managers burped and flicked crumbs from their lavish tables to the giants on the floor.

Of course the northern warriors also grew hungrier, but the tables of their managers were not set so well; consequently, they had to be sneakier and sturdier to survive. So the southern giants, obviously hustling food beneath the table, were caught, reprimanded and swatted with a rolled-up newspaper. This didn't harm the giants, but the managers took the blow to heart and to pocket-book and raised an old howl:

"Why should we send our giants against the weaker northern warriors?" squawled the wealthy manager of the giant, Ukla, "There is no contest. No one pays to see our giants slaughter the northerners. And when no one pays I make no money!" After a few angry tries, he thrust a cigar into his mouth. He had stuck it twice into the doughy folds beneath his chin.

"And my giant, Usk," said another manager, "what competition can he find in the north? It's degrading!" From his corner Usk snorted agreement.

The meeting raged. There was mention of migrating east in search of stronger giants and bigger gates. And while the meeting raged Usk and Ukla and a red friend of theirs wandered from the room in search of excitement. When they stumbled back they found the meeting increasing in pitch and volume.

"We will go east. We won't toy with those—c'mere Usk, where have you been?—not toy with those weaklings from the north and we will—Usk, why are both of your legs broken?"

Another manager, frightened by the bloody remains of his giant, took up the cry: "We won't have anything to do with the sissies; we'll take our clubs and go home! (Red, here Red fella, nice little giant. Did oo faw down and bwoody your nose?)"

And so it went; the meeting and the retreating. The managers turned their backs on the battered ranks and ranted on about worthy opponents to be found in the east.

And in the corner huge Usk set on his injured haunches and listened to his wailing manager.

"Ya know," Usk said to a fellow cleat-pocked giant, "The boss is pullin' it purty sharp, gettin' us away from them sissies. They don't feed 'em enough up there, they is jest hungry enough to be ornery! Yessir, the boss is pullin' it purty sharp!"

Campus Capers

(ACP) With reference to the following item from the Gustavian Weekly, published at Gustavus Adolphus college in St. Peter, Minn., we might say: Don't let it give you any ideas!

The meek and mild pledges of a certain campus sorority should be thoroughly chastised for creating an irreparable soar in fraternity relations. The damage occurred at a Rundstrom hall meeting of the sorority, its pledges and the brother fraternity. The pledges served the fraternity members cupcakes which had secretly been covered with a well-known chocolate-flavored cathartic.

— Letters to the Editor —

Emerald Editor:

The inaccuracy in the Emerald's feature story about the graduate elections for ASUO Senator requires comment. In that election each of two persons received more votes than the person declared elected. The leading vote-getter is being deprived of the seat apparently upon the basis that his votes were invalid solely because they were write-in votes.

This is where your writer's inaccuracy shows up. He says write-in votes are invalid because "the ASUO Constitution does not have a provision for write-in votes." But this says

nothing about such votes being invalid either. No mention of write-ins is made whatever.

The Oregon Constitution makes no mention of write-ins, but a Supreme Court Justice was elected by just exactly that method on Nov. 6. The U.S. Constitution has no provision for write-ins, but that doesn't prevent their historic validity in a democracy.

A better ground would be that there is a provision for filing a petition and that only those who file will have their names on the ballot. There are two possible interpretations of this:

1) The requirement is pro-

cedural and merely controls what names are actually printed on the ballot.

2) The requirement is mandatory and prevents any person from being elected without approval of the University Administration.

If the mandatory interpretation is correct, there is not in any real sense a student government here nor much use for the Constitutional provisions either. This interpretation may be correct. If it is, substitution of some other ground for ruling out the write-ins is hypocrisy.

Edward N. Fadeley
 Third Year Law Student