

ADVANTAGES OF PROTECTION TO OREGON SHEEPMEN POINTED OUT

Secretary of Growers' Association Declares That Removal of Duty on Product Would Make Small Difference in Cost of Clothing to Consumer—Industry Affects Thousands.



OREGON RAINS IN THE FEEDLOT, EATING THE HAY AND BARLEY RAISED BY THE FARMER.



OREGON RAINS BRAZING IN THE NATIONAL FORESTS. THIS IS THE ONLY PRACTICAL WAY OF PREVENTING FOREST FIRES.

By F. W. McCLURE, Secretary National Woolgrowers' Association.

GODING, Idaho, Sept. 22.—If any one believes that the sheep industry is not one of Oregon's most important industries, he should refer to the report of the last census. The census, now a year old, shows that the total number of sheep and lambs in Oregon on April 15, 1910, was 2,694,778. Unfortunately, the census includes no animals born after that date, and it must be understood that fully 50 per cent of Oregon's lambs are born after April 15. Therefore, in order to arrive at the exact number of sheep in Oregon, it is necessary to add 500,000 additional lambs. This gives us a total of sheep and lambs of 3,194,778. Based on the value determined by the census the total value of sheep in the state of Oregon is \$13,392,592.

On account of the sheep's connection with politics, more vicious, scandalous stories have been spread abroad by its enemies than have been started against all other agricultural callings combined. In fact, it is the common custom of many to assert that the sheep industry has been the cause of a few sheep barons in the Western country, that it is limited in scope, and of no concern to a large portion of our people.

Industry Is Varied. This argument is refuted by the statistics gathered by the last census, for these statistics show that in the United States there are over 800,000 individual sheepmen, and that in the state of Oregon alone sheep are owned on 6318 farms, or 14 per cent of all the farms in that state is devoted to the propagation of sheep.

While the census shows 6318 farms reporting sheep, it does not show the actual number of individual owners. But every one acquainted with the sheep industry, especially in Eastern Oregon, knows that many, if not a majority, of the sheep ranches are owned by companies representing many individuals. Let us assume that in the sheep industry there are just 1000 owners in the state of Oregon whose ownership does not appear in the census report. This would give us 7318 individual owners. This does not include the banks or the hundreds of private individuals that have money loaned on an annual basis to the sheep industry, but the owners of the sheep devoting their time to the industry.

Many Dependent on Sheep. It has been the average sized family in the state of Oregon consists of four persons. Therefore, if we have 7318 wool growers having an average of four people, it gives us 29,272 residents of the state absolutely dependent upon the sheep industry for their livelihood. This is a creditable showing for the industry, but it is not all, for in gathering statistics for the Tariff Board we found that the range flockmaster employs for the entire year an average of one laborer for every 425 sheep.

Assuming that in Eastern Oregon we have 2,694,000 sheep, and one man is employed for every 400, this would give 6735 as the number of laborers required to care for the sheep of Eastern Oregon alone. Many of the men employed on sheep ranches are not married, but if we assume that one man in six is married, and has an average sized family of four people, this would give us 2800 additional people dependent upon the sheep industry for their livelihood. Next we have the laborers and their families amounting to 23,472. Next, a total of 23,472 people directly dependent upon the sheep industry of Oregon for their livelihood.

This is a large per cent of the population of the state, and should indicate to sensible people that before any injury is brought to the sheep industry as a result of tariff tinkering these 30,000 people are entitled to have their industry thoroughly understood.

Labor Is Well Paid. The collection of data for the tariff board also shows that the Western flockmaster paid on an average of \$1 per head to labor for all the sheep he

owned. We must not forget that the labor upon the sheep farm is the best paid agricultural labor of any in the Nation, these herders receiving from \$10 to \$60 a month and their board. If the labor cost of running sheep, namely, \$1 a head, holds true in Oregon as it does in other states, then Oregon sheepmen pay to labor alone the sum of \$2,694,778. This relates solely to the labor caring for the sheep, and does not include the cost in the store or bank, or the employee of the railroad, or the dozens of other employees whose prosperity is dependent upon the prosperity of the sheepman.

Land Value Increased.

It is impossible to find just the amount of money that the sheep industry brings to Oregon every year, but a conservative estimate would place the figures at between \$1,000,000 and \$3,000,000. This is a large sum of money, but it is important to your state when it is understood that a good portion of it is produced upon lands that would be absolutely worthless for any other purpose. If in order to produce \$3,000,000 the sheep crowded out some other industry that would produce an equal amount, we would talk about displacing them, but when we understand that our sheep are grazing in the mountains, in the waste places of the earth, consuming weeds and trash, during the grazing season, and then producing an income of \$3,000,000, we will appreciate the importance of maintaining this industry in a prosperous condition.

The sheep have contributed more to the well-being of the farmers in the arid sections of Oregon and other states than all other domestic animals combined. Take Idaho, for instance, on the Carey act land. Hundreds of thousands of tons of alfalfa were produced and the only market it found was the Idaho flockmaster. The same is true in Oregon. The farmer or home builder who comes to your state and settles at some distance from the railroad finds that the sheep flockmaster who affords him a profitable market for the products of his farm, who accounts for the distance from transportation could not otherwise be disposed of.

Profit Cuts Factor.

Many people, especially those living in the cities, have got it in for the sheep and its owner. I am unable to understand why this should be, but the press has contributed to this ill-feeling by assuring these people that the tariff upon wool increases the price of their clothing. Now let us see just how much the flockmaster is getting out of a suit

of clothing at present prices. A suit of all-wool clothes for the average-sized man requires 35 yards of cloth. The average weight of cloth for Summer, Fall and Winter wear is 14 ounces a yard.

Therefore, the cloth required to make this average suit would weigh three pounds. Oregon wool, as it comes from the sheep, shrinks in scouring about 67 per cent. Again when the wool is made into yarn and the yarn into cloth, another waste is encountered. So that to make a pound of cloth it requires an average of 2 2/3 pounds of Oregon wool.

Therefore, to make three pounds of cloth it will require just 11 pounds of Oregon wool as it comes from the sheep. The average price of Oregon wool this year was not to exceed 15c per pound, and as 11 pounds are required for a suit we find that the Oregon woolgrower is receiving the sum of \$1.65 for his share of the suit.

Wool Values Small.

This suit contains neither shoddy nor cotton, and your storekeeper will charge you from \$20 to \$25 for it, and your tailor will charge you from \$10 to \$15. Still the Oregon woolgrower receives as his share \$1.65. In order that you will not think that this is an exceptional suit, I will state that at present prices it is almost impossible to produce a suit of Oregon wool into any suit of clothes, regardless of what it may sell for. This \$1.65 that your woolgrower gets for this suit of clothes includes all the tariff on wool, what he paid to labor for looking after his sheep, what he paid to the farmer for hay and grain, what he paid to the state and county for taxes, what he paid to the banks for interest, what he paid to the Government for grazing privileges, what he paid to the railroads for transporting his wool, in fact, every charge incident to the handling of the sheep for one year of 365 days.

To those who talk about the tariff on wool increasing the price of a suit of clothes let me say that if the Oregon flockmaster gave his wool to the mill for free of cost it would just reduce the price of a \$40 suit of clothes \$1.65. But, you ask, what influence then the tariff on wool has. I would reply that for the past 18 months it has had positively no influence whatever, for at any time during this period our wool could have been exported at as high a price as was obtained for it in our domestic markets. Therefore, during the past 18 months the tariff on wool has certainly not reached as far as the cost of a suit of clothes.

The fact that our tariff has not been effective is due to the agitation for tariff reduction, and to the fact that the manufacturers take advantage of every opportunity to beat the American woolgrower out of his protection.

Shrinkage Is Factor.

Of course we have a tariff of 11 cents a pound on wool, and as it requires 11 pounds of wool to make a suit of clothes the enemy of the sheep industry immediately says that the tariff increases the price of the suit \$1.21, and this is ridiculous since the flockmaster only receives \$1.65 for all the wool in the suit. Now while there is a tariff of 11 cents a pound on wool it is ineffective, as is clearly understood by everyone who has investigated the sub-

ject. Oregon wool shrinks in scouring 67 per cent, and if a pound of foreign wool was brought in which shrank 67 per cent, and if it paid a duty of 11 cents per pound, then there would be every reason to believe that the tariff did increase the price of Oregon wool 11 cents per pound. But this never happens. When the wool tariff was enacted in 1887 foreign wool was sold at about the same as Oregon wool now shrank. But through schedule K, and through the machinations of the importers, foreign wool as now imported shrinks on an average of about one-half of what your Oregon wool shrinks. Therefore, your protection would be just one-half of 11 cents or 5 1/2 cents per pound. But unfortunately it is not even this high, for we imported in 1910 21,000,000 pounds of class II wool from foreign countries that averaged less than 20 per cent in shrink. This displaced your Oregon coarse wool shrinking from 50 to 55 per cent, and the actual protection against this wool was about 4 cents a pound.

We imported in 1909 27,000,000 pounds of wool from South America shrinking less than 20 per cent, which displaced the Oregon wool shrinking 67 per cent, and gave your flockmasters an actual protection of about 4 cents a pound. During the same year we imported from New Zealand 20,000,000 pounds of the same shrinkage, so that when everything is considered the tariff on wool increases the price of our wool during ordinary years when tariff agitation does not exist, about 4 cents a pound.

Tariff Not Cause.

We showed that it required 11 pounds of wool for the suit of clothes, and if the tariff increased the price of that wool 4 cents a pound then it increased the cost of the suit approximately 44 cents. In estimating this do not confuse this suit with any \$10 or \$15 suit of clothes that you may get in a store, for it is an all-wool suit made of the best wool in the world, and will cost you from \$20 to \$30, depending upon where you purchase it. Of course the 44 cents with I have shown that the tariff increased the price of wool does not obtain this year, because as before shown our wool is selling at foreign prices. The American woolgrower believes that if the tariff on wool was removed or reduced it would not in any way reduce the cost of clothing.

This 44 cents which we have found, we believe, would be divided up among the manufacturer, jobber and retailer, so that by the time the suit reached the consumer the price mark would be the same. I am wearing a suit of clothes that cost in Oregon \$27.50. The Oregon wool grower received \$1.50 for furnishing all the wool that was required to make it. You cannot convince me that if the tariff had been removed this Oregon storekeeper would have sold me this suit for \$27.50 as a result.

Protection Is Necessary.

The tariff on wool, when figured to the final analysis, has not cost the American consumer a single penny. It has been clearly demonstrated that wool cannot be produced in the United States without protection, and every time our protection has been removed or reduced the production of wool has been seriously interfered with. Therefore, we feel that it is necessary that a tariff is necessary for the profitable production of wool in this country.

The American woolgrower is producing annually \$25,000,000 pounds of wool under the protection of this small tariff. Without this supply of wool would be reduced, if not ultimately destroyed. This domestic wool supply interests the consumer because it can be clearly proven that American wool when made into cloth will wear from 25 to 50 per cent longer than cloth made of imported wool.

Now, Mr. Consumer, do not forget that when you destroy the American sheep industry you are destroying the largest supply of wool in the world, and when this is gone you will purchase your clothing at exactly the same price, but it will be made of South American and South American wools, which will give you from 25 to 50 per cent less wear than you obtain from your clothing made of American wool. There is no question about this quality of wool, and I am willing to make the statement and stand by it that Western Oregon is producing a better wool than England ever did produce, and Eastern Oregon is producing a Merino wool from 25 to 50 per cent better than the wools of Africa, South America or New Zealand.

If adequate protection the sheep industry of Oregon can be immensely extended, and your lands will not reach their highest degree of production until the Oregon sheep is found. Your woolgrower is producing a Merino wool from 25 to 50 per cent better than the wools of Africa, South America or New Zealand.

Are Held Up To Light

Defects of Popular Government Will Appear, Despite Its Attractions, as Time Goes On, Declares Correspondent.

SALEM, Or., Sept. 30.—(To the Editor.)—In attempting any criticism of the so-called Oregon system, which includes the initiative and referendum, the recall, the direct primary law, etc., I realize that it is a subject which commands careful and deliberate consideration. The theory of self-government has ever been a popular one with the people; but however attractive it may appear, in time its defects will be detected, its fallacies exposed, and in due time the convention system restored to its rightful position.

It is claimed that the electorate do not consider they are perfectly competent to transact this part of the work, but "what is everybody's business is nobody's business," and the value of time will become of more importance to the majority of people than matters of legislation, in which they have no direct interest, and which will naturally follow that it will be delegated to representatives to perform, and then you revert to a representative form of government which has prevailed in the United States since the Declaration of Independence, of which the convention system is a natural outgrowth.

Individually, the writer is not opposed to the Oregon system in all its details, believing there are some features in it that will be commended to the people, and undoubtedly remain as part of our election laws. On the other hand, there are many complicated and cumbersome provisions that should be discarded, and thrown into the discard of antiquity, while others, perhaps with some modifications, may prove satisfactory. The more simple the system, the better it is, and it is adapted for the masses of the people. It is my purpose, therefore, to attempt to point out existing defects and suggest remedial legislation which, to some extent at least, would have a tendency to simplify existing methods. I realize that perfection on this earth has never yet been attained, nor do I know that it ever will be, but there is no question that great improvement can be secured by proper legislation on this subject, and if the same can be secured by the use of some adverse criticism in regard to having the recall apply to the judiciary, one of the principal objections

against it being that it is calculated to make cowardly out of the judges, anticipating that their decisions and opinions would be made to conform more to popular approval than upon the merits of the case. The recall, in fact, is a direct primary law, and in operation it is necessary for a prospective candidate for any office to file his name with the county clerk, who then places the two candidates receiving the highest number of votes for each office on the official primary election ballot.

This method will eliminate the possibility of a candidate ever being nominated by a plurality vote, and the additional expense, if any, will be insignificant compared with the satisfactory results that would be sure to follow. These suggested amendments regarding the direct primary law are not intended to be arbitrary in their application, but are merely suggestive, and should legislation ever be enacted along these lines it could prove necessary to add some minor features to those proposed, and possibly some additions to those already enumerated, that the law might easily be interpreted and strictly construed. The primary object sought in changing this part of our election machinery is to simplify the manner of nominating capable and qualified men for office and not leave it to the aspirant himself to eulogize and glorify his peculiar fitness for some position he has not the least qualifications to fill.

JAMES E. GODFREY.

Art Needs Sympathy.

Harriet Monroe in the Atlantic.

Great art, the highest art, comes only when profound energy of creation meets profound energy of sympathy. The latter must have his army behind him, the vast masses must hear an outcry of passion and understanding from all his world. Of old, when the poet spoke for a few, the response of the few was enough. Today, when he must speak for the many, the many must hear him, must not only hear, but understand him in their profoundest secret instincts of sympathy or rebellion; else he cannot utter the truth that is in him, and modern democracy must go uninspired.

Olivea Drop in Turkey.

London Telegraph.

Turkey's harvests in 1910 were fair, abundant, and both climatic and political conditions favored their being garnered and marketed. Among exceptions is to be noted the olive crop.

Y. M. C. A. CULTIVATES BOYDOM ALONG MANY SYSTEMATIC LINES

Scores of Clubs Are Formed to Develop Physical, Mental and Religious Welfare of Members—Gardening Lectures Will Encourage Growth of Truck Produce—Poultry Contest Coming.



ONE OF BOYS' CLUBS AT PORTLAND Y. M. C. A.



J. R. MCKNIGHT, ASST. BOYS' WORK DIRECTOR.

J. W. PALMER, DIRECTOR.

J. C. MEEHAN, ASST. BOYS' WORK DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.

PAUL B. HOFFMAN, BOYS' EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR.