

AN INDEPENDENT NEWSPAPER

(Published every evening and Sunday)
 EDITOR AND PUBLISHER: ALTON F. BAKER
 MANAGING EDITOR: WILLIAM M. TUGMAN
 NEWS SERVICE: Associated Press, United Press
 MEMBER: Audit Bureau of Circulations

The Register-Guard's policy is the complete and impartial publication in its news pages of all news and statements on news. On this page, the editors of the Register-Guard offer their opinions on events of the day and matters of importance to the community, endeavoring to be candid but fair, and helpful in the development of constructive community policy.

A NEWSPAPER IS A CITIZEN OF ITS COMMUNITY.

OUR CHOICE IS HOOVER

FOR president, our choice is Hoover. We find it impossible to place any confidence in Roosevelt. Thomas and the other "left wing" candidates are completely impractical and improbable. Surveying the field, we come back to Hoover as the only sensible choice.

How can we feel confidence in Hoover but not in Roosevelt, especially in view of all the grief the country has experienced since Hoover became president? How can we ignore party politics in making such a choice?

Between the parties we see little difference. Both parties are "conservative" fundamentally. They have almost identical alliances and interests. They approve of the present social, economic and governmental machinery. They differ only as to their ideas on how to tinker it and make it click.

Platforms are written in generalities to accommodate any probable candidate for president. A president can do little more than follow the general outlines, but it is his personality, meeting the circumstances and pressures of the period which gives policies their eventual shape.

In the present national crisis, to an unusual degree, the personality of the man in the White House is going to be important.

Hoover is an avowed conservative. Chastened by the experiences of his first four years in office, he has learned to fear rash promises and experiments. He may have become too conservative, but we have the comforting feeling that with all his admitted faults and shortcomings he is facing the facts.

Roosevelt is what? He is "a career man in politics," a man of rich and aristocratic family who has devoted his life to politics as some men of his type devote their lives to polo or yachting or golf. Emerging from Harvard he learned all the tricks of the politician trade under able tutors. He plays the game as well as professionals at their best.

In a college town we might resort to collegiate terms. Roosevelt is a man who has never outgrown the undergraduate mind. He has "made" governor and various other "honors." Now he is "out for president."

Between the two men there is remarkable contrast. Hoover did not enter politics until relatively late in life, after he had earned some degree of fame and fortune in business. He also belongs to a fairly prevalent type—the successful man taken up by practical politicians because his name is an asset. Hoover is the "honorary degree type," only his political honoraries have got him into a lot of work.

Hoover has never acquired Roosevelt's practiced art of appealing to the public. Even in the heyday of his popularity, he found it difficult to express himself. In the early days of his administration, he relied much on the supposedly smart councilors the party put around him. This has often caused him to appear hesitant and inept.

With crisis deepening around him, however, Hoover has emerged definitely into leadership. With demagogues clamoring around him and bidding him to do this and that, he has labored patiently and with grim determination to understand the ever changing symptoms of the world sickness. Step by step he has evolved remedies which have checked the course of the economic malady.

Not all of his policies can be called wise, perhaps, but in the main they have been wise, and it is as much the things he has NOT done as those he has done which should inspire confidence. He has refused to be stampeded into shortsighted but costly "relief programs" which might have stifled popular clamor but could only have made matters worse.

Hoover is condemned by his critics because he did not foresee and prevent the world depression. Name any world leader who did foresee it. Name any one of them who has been more successful than Hoover in checking it. Can it be proved that Roosevelt at any time displayed the foresight wisdom which he now recites so glibly from his desk? Name any leader today who can be said with certainty to understand all the problems of world confusion or one who has any swift or guaranteed cure for it.

Roosevelt, playing the political game as gaily and recklessly as a poloist chasing a ball about the field, has had the audacity to proclaim himself the miracle worker who can set all things right. His speeches have been laden with promises of whatever any particular section seemed to want, and if you will examine them carefully you will find that they simply cannot be made to fit.

One little example. Cornered by cattle growers and dirt farmers in the southwest, this "fellow farmer" hastened to assure them of absolute protection on their products despite a general policy which calls for lowered tariffs.

We happen to believe in lower tariffs, as rapidly as they can safely be brought about. How does Roosevelt propose to attack the mounting tariff walls? By special treaties with particular nations, rather than by policies uniform throughout.

Right here is one of the most dangerous places of quackery in the whole Roosevelt program. Special trade agreements with favored nations are a first step toward involving the country in offensive and defensive alliances of the most perilous sort. This is one of the surest devices for bringing war about, and there is plenty of evidence in the history of Europe.

Nor could such special tariff amendments be brought about without creating internal sectional difficulties of the worst sort. Will it be the lumber industry of the Northwest or the steel industry of the East that is offered to Great Britain, say, as a propitiatory sacrifice? Your guess?

By letters circulated in New York, ten million unemployed have been assured the government will see that they get jobs, but the job program fails to differ from the Hoover program in any essential particular when it is finally smoked out in the Boston speech.

Never in the history of the country has there

been such a brazen display of ward technique by a candidate for president. "Tell 'em what they want to hear. They soon forget." But will they forget? Will the popular wrath that has been vented on the mild and inarticulate Hoover be anything compared with the wrath which may follow Roosevelt if promises are not kept?

Ye may have your choice of the two men. You may have the accomplished political gymnast who vaulted deftly from the high trapeze of Wilsonian idealism onto the shoulders of William Randolph Hearst. His new act is that of a tumbler in which he plays leapfrog on the backs of William Gibbs McAdoo, H. Johnson, and a somewhat reluctant Al Smith, right up to the steps of the White House. Or you may have Hoover!

Hoover lacks imagination, say the critics. He is stubborn. On the other hand those very imperfections may signify courage and common sense. We choose Hoover, a grim, determined man to whom the presidency has become a grave reality, not a first prize in a sporting event.

THAT LAST BIG PUSH

THE state of Oregon is going to say "NO" to the schemers who have been trying to wreck the University and the Normal Schools and convert the wreckage of sixty years of educational effort into profit for mysterious and shame-faced interests. It is not safe to count the victory as won but it will be won if every effort is concentrated on the last big push. Reports from every part of the state indicate a decided turn of sentiment against the quacks and plotters who have tried to foist this costly grab upon an economy-seeking public.

With one day left before the voting it is going to be necessary to make sure of the results. In a race of this kind it is necessary not only to win sentiment but get the votes. Throughout the state must go the word that voters must not forget to vote and they must not forget to VOTE 317 X NO.

Though the supporters of the measure are in retreat in every part of the state, they are grumbling that they will be back with other harrassing measures to bedevil the educational system and exact toll from the state. There must be an avalanche of NO votes on the Zorn-Macpherson bill to say that the people of Oregon will not countenance such tactics.

With victory in sight, it is as dangerous to relax the effort as it is to fumble a football on the five yard line. The work of contacting the voters in person or by mail must go on up to the last minute of the fight. The last big job is to make sure the vote gets out. This word MUST go to all parts of the state.

Sometimes we are inclined to mourn when we think of the money and effort spent in this vicious and unnecessary struggle. The same money placed in a loan fund or an endowment would have made it possible for hundreds of boys and girls to return to school who have had to drop out because of hard times.

The loss in this struggle has not been merely the loss of those most interested but a loss to all the people of the state. It will be a good investment in the end, however, if the people of the state can be made to realize what they have lost in the struggle.

There must be a vote Tuesday which says that never again must such a spectacle be allowed to disgrace the state of Oregon. We must turn from destructive to constructive effort.

"Oregon has millions for education but not a cent for grabbers."

The slogan was coined early in the campaign. As confidence is restored, as friends and alumni of the schools and great educational foundations come forward again with their gifts, then will education be of more service to all and less costly to taxpayers.

A REMINDER TO HUNTERS

FROM a farmer's wife near Alvadore, we have received an interesting letter. It is not exactly a complaint. It is a reminder which our friend would like to have called to the attention of all hunters. Hunters complain because so many farms are "signed" against hunting. Our friend tells a story.

A nice looking man came to the door and asked if he might hunt the premises. He seemed to be hunting pheasants. The lady said the place was signed but that the man might hunt through. He started. Two companions joined him. A few rods from the house they saw a flock of ducks disappearing into the water.

BANG! BANG! BANG! Too late the hunters learned that the birds they had killed were not wild ones but semi-tame cross-bred mallards which had been kept in the pond as decoys.

Apologies do not quite cover such an irritating incident. Nor do apologies cover fences pushed down, gates left open, and many other annoyances.

Farmers are not usually hostile to hunters. Most of them are also fond of hunting. Likewise, we doubt if many sportsmen are really indifferent to the rights of the people whose ground they hunt over. It is the selfish few who are responsible for most of the trouble.

That is why our friend out west suggests a reminder. It is timely.

From Mrs. Edwin L. Knapp, formerly of this city, now of Medford, we have a letter correcting an impression among some of the ladies that The Oregon Clubwoman, magazine of the state federation has been lukewarm on 317. Mrs. Knapp enclosed one of last summer's issues which smashed the moving scheme as a fraud on the taxpayers and a crime against education.

Mark Hathaway yesterday got hold of a chap who has been campaigning for the Zorn-Macpherson grab among the downstate granges and just took him around the University campus. The gentleman was amazed at the splendid buildings and departed much irritated with the smooth gent who had misled him into lending his good name to a false and racketeering measure.

News from Bandon: Half a page in this week's Western World tells the Coquille valley and the Coast to Vote 317 X NO. R. T. Moore and L. D. Felsheim headed a citizens' committee which bought the space. It is one of the most effective smashes of the whole campaign.

Football and politics do not mix, says Ajax McGurk. Well, anyhow both have been played in the mud this season.

The Look of the Month!



WHAT SOME THINKERS THINK

—Compiled by CLAY E. PALMER—
 Pastor of First Congregational Church

BRUCE BARTON, well known writer and business man, writing the leading article in the Woman's Home Companion, sets forth the reasons why he is going to vote for Hoover, yet he says: "His signing the Hawley-Smoot tariff turned the whole world's thinking backwards. Why he signed it is a mystery. Nearly a hundred leading economists joined in a public appeal against it, and his closest personal friends added their earnest pleas. The Smoot-Hawley bill was a terrible blunder. . . . The trade of the world is bound and gagged; no nation can be really prosperous until the gas and bonds are removed."

Lewis Lawes, warden at Sing Sing: "For the records at Sing Sing show that 97 per cent of our prisoners were never associated with any boys' club or any of the juvenile associations where boys learn how to spend their leisure in wholesome recreation. 75 per cent or over of the prisoners are not skilled or learned in the mechanics or trades. 90 per cent are not actively interested in any church organization."

E. Merrill Root, poet and professor of literature at Earlham college: "The new decade will act with scientific candor and ruthless realism. But it will use that realism first to sweep aside the opium of the intellectuals (which is the dogma of the fixed fertility of man), and will act with terrible vision (idealism) and terrible energy (romance). Capitalism as we know it—blind, ruthless, violent, in the dark, sentimental, easy, illusioned in the light—is without a future; it will end by some miracle of noble wisdom, or by fiat of one of the extremes, whether left or right."

World Tomorrow: "The National Religion and Labor foundation recently opened headquarters at New Haven, Conn. The movement is supported by 114 advocates of social change, including Bishop Francis J. McConnell, Reinhold Niebuhr, Norman Thomas and Rabbi Stephen S. Wise. It is unambiguously opposed to the present capitalist organization of society. Its aim is 'to help inspire workers of hand and brain to take control of our economic life by organizing as workers, consumers and citizens.'"

Dr. Paul Blanchard, executive secretary of the city affairs committee of New York City: "The Saturday Evening Post and the business success magazines pretend that men get rich because they are able and stay rich because they are incompetent. The answer is Wall St. and Samuel

Leull and Ivar Kreuger and eleven million unemployed, and the residence and slum sections of any midwestern in the United States. With few exceptions the greatest fortunes in America today are not made by business scientists but by financial manipulators."

E. Stanley Jones, America's greatest missionary to the Orient: "Millitism is not only wicked; it is stupid. For over twenty years China has tried to unite herself by military force. All of these twenty years in military effort to unite the country has ended in disunity worse than founded. Force produced force, war produced war. And now Japan comes along and when the whole thing was sneaking into death revives it—by attacking China (and taking Manchuria). Then Jones goes on to show how Japan is failing and that her 'overbearing militarism spoils the rest of her program.'"

Mahatma Gandhi: "I hold that the world is sick of armed rebellions. . . . Self-sufficiency of one innocent man is a million times more potent than the sacrifice of a million men who die in the act of killing others. The willing sacrifice of the innocent is the most powerful retort to insolent tyranny that has yet been conceived by God or man."

E. G. Homrighausen, minister of English Reformed church: "To Jesus the worst sinners are not residents of Sodom or Gomorrah, nor those taken in adultery, nor those guilty of profane swearing. He never condemned their sins. But the worst sinners are those externally respectable folks, who often follow religious customs, who possess the attitude of pride, of conceited piety, of unbrotherliness, of indifference, of religious superiority—dogmatists of conduct and thought. These smug individualists who have need of none and who pride themselves on keeping clear of the sins of the common rabble."

Dr. Glenn Frank, the distinguished president of U. of Wisconsin: "The secret springs of social creativeness lie in the main outside the realm of the rational, and the rational reaches its highest effectiveness when illumined and warmed by ultra rational impulses. . . . I am convinced that any renewal of Western civilization that is to mean more than a mere re-establishment of the old order of things under new names must be, in the deepest sense of the word, a religious movement. It must deal with the roots of life."

IN THE EDITOR'S MAIL BAG

DR. KUYKENDALL WRITES
 EUGENE, Ore.—(To the Editor):—This national campaign reminds me very much of the McKinley-Bryan contest in 1896. In that campaign, the democrats were even more cocksure of victory than they are this year. And not a few republicans had the defeatist complex, just as some of them have now.

There was a good reason for that state of mind. On October 1st, 1896, Bryan undoubtedly had the election won. He would have carried Oregon almost two to one. If there had been a Literary Digest straw poll then, McKinley would have been snowed under in early October, so the democrats had good reason to feel hilarious. And how they did tell the world about it, especially we republicans, who were brazen enough to stand up for the hated gold standard.

Then, as now, we were in the midst of a great depression, greater it has always seemed to me than the present one. The farmers were bearing the brunt of it as usual, but were far better and more compactly organized than now, the Populist party being largely of their making.

All kinds of economic panaceas were being held out to the suffering folk, for the relief of our financial ills. Free silver with Bryan as its magnetic leader, swept the people off their feet. Anything for a change from the existing hard times. "It can't be worse."

The present outcry sounds very familiar to those of us who remember '96. But Bryan made no glibber promises then than does the democratic leader of today, and at first it captured the voters. However, the American voter has a way of thinking things out if you give him the facts

and a little time. Thirty days were enough. So when election day rolled around, McKinley was triumphantly elected.

It looks like history would repeat itself in spite of Digest polls. One thing is certain. The cry, "It can't be worse," is already discredited. With modern inventions the world has become a very small place. So every voter in this broad land knows something of the conditions, not only of our land, but of all the nations of the earth.

Every voter knows that wherever you may go, the world around you will find no country where conditions are better than here at home. Everywhere wages are lower, living conditions are worse, working hours longer. Every voter knows that even if times are very hard with us, in no nation under the sun are there so many families living in their own homes, so many people driving their own automobiles, so many listening to their own radios, nowhere are so many millions of healthy children going to school every day. In no nation is there so little starvation and disease as so much health and well being. Nowhere are there so few strikes and food riots. Not only could conditions be worse, but they actually are, right now, worse in practically every other nation in the world.

Conditions might be as bad with us as they are in England, with its low wages, high taxes and hunger strikes. Conditions might be as bad with us as in Germany and Central Europe. As compared to their conditions, ours seems a land of comfort, health and plenty.

And what shall we say of the condition of the teeming hosts of India, and the Orient. They would thank all their gods and ancestors if they could have only a few days of our worst hard times.

Our intelligent voters know that our hard times would have been infinitely relieved if it had not been for the great relief program which Herbert Hoover drove through a balking democratic congress.

They know that he has been a wise and steady helmsman in this storm, and they are not going to rock the boat at this critical juncture.

Whatever the result of the election, this is no time for any republican to hang his head in shame. Certainly it is no time for any good American of any brand to be ashamed of this great nation of ours.

Under a great leader, we have stemmed the world tide of depression better than any other nation. It is still true that our system of government and of economics with all their faults, is the best in the world.

I think it is time to get out our Hoover buttons and banners and go after this gang of "little Americans" who are making the air blue with their claims of inferiority of our system, our government, or our times.

It might be worse. It is worse everywhere outside our country. It will be worse here if these "little Americans" have their way.

W. KUYKENDALL

ROOSEVELT ON TARIFF

EUGENE, Ore.—(To the Editor):—The position of Governor Roosevelt with regard to tariff duties on farm products has been questioned recently and whether intentionally or not has been misrepresented in some instances. I think it is only fair that your readers should know what his position really is that they may approve or disapprove of his stand. Below is a quotation from his speech at Baltimore, Oct. 25, 1932, which I wish you would print in order to clear up any misconception or doubt in this matter.

"Of course it is absurd to talk of lowering tariff duties on farm products. I declare that all prosperity in this broader sense springs from the soil. I promised to endeavor to restore the purchasing power of the farm dollar by making the tariff effective for agriculture, and raising the price of farm products. I know of no excessive high tariff duties on farm products. I do not intend that any duties necessary to protect the farmer shall be lowered. To do so would be inconsistent with my entire farm program, and every farmer knows it and will not be deceived."

GEO. O. GOODALL

ENDORSES MOFFITT

SPRINGFIELD, Ore.—(To the Editor):—Recent letters in your newspaper in behalf of the democratic candidate moves me to say a word for my fellow townsman, Laurence Moffitt, republican candidate for county school superintendent.

Qualifications being equal, I vote for persons for public office who have had the experience and know what can be done but also has a plan to reduce the expense of the office nearly \$5,000 a year.

Lane is a large county with many small school districts strung all the way from Crumette station on top of the Cascades to Hecla Head on the Pacific coast. Some of these schools are in inaccessible places which can only be reached in winter months over muddy mountain roads and trails. These schools in the out of the way places are usually the ones that need the most help from the county superintendent's office. Mr. Moffitt is a conscientious young man and very energetic. He has visited schools in Lane county that never before have had a visit from the superintendent's office. His is the policy of raising the standards of the weak school up to the strong—giving every boy and

girl in the county an equal chance for proper training.

I have no ill feeling for the democratic candidate personally. It is her privilege to keep running for the county school superintendent's office as often as she can get the nomination. However, when she does not need the employment in order to support her family, I think it is a poor time to vote for her when she has not taught school in recent years and it is doubtful if she is as well qualified for the position as Mr. Moffitt.

When I say I know Mr. Moffitt is well qualified for the position of county school superintendent, I know whereof I speak, for I was chairman of the board which employed him in the Springfield schools previous to his becoming assistant county school superintendent. W. H. POLLARD.

HITS AT WAGE SCALE

EUGENE, Ore.—(To the Editor):—In Sunday's issue of the Register-Guard Commissioner O. E. Crow again takes up the gavel for Judge Barnard. He insinuates rural districts are getting more than their share of road and school funds. Mr. Crow, why take statistics for the year 1930 to answer the Crow Tax league? Would you have the people believe that is the amount spent each year in the four road districts in and around Crow? Or did it suit your purpose to select a year when the state built a main highway through the districts? Should any road district have to build and maintain a highway that is used much more by the state and out-of-state people, than it is used by the people in the district? Would it be fair to tax the people along the McKenzie, the Willamette, and the coast highways to build and maintain when they are used almost exclusively by state and interstate traffic? You said Union District No. 3 received about twice as much school funds from the county and state as the district put in. Why did you not tell us that last year there were twenty districts in Lane county that did not put one cent district money in their schools but got all their money from the county and state?

Your argument about selecting a patrolman is childish. We apply your argument for selecting a patrolman to selecting a commissioner or a commissioner thereby saving "real community brawls. . . which is bad for everybody, and the court, in order to keep things in order." You will find as good men for patrolman in the district and they are more interested in the district than an outside man.

In previous articles the court has boasted about the efficient way the court has spent county money. Let us refer to only one case. On Dec. 13, 1931, your relief workers were sent out on Lane highway to shovel rock into trucks to be scattered on the highway. Four trucks, three private and one county were sent out to haul the rock the four men were to shovel. The truck with the driver, cost the county \$12 a day, the patrolman got \$3.60 a day, making a cost of \$51.60 a day to get \$8 worth of relief work. Is that efficiency when all four trucks were standing idle nearly all the time waiting to be loaded? It seemed so they could not work until Dec. 20th, when the same stunt was re-enacted. It is time for a change. It looks like a little Tammany in the court house.

Our next legislature should nullify the law setting salaries for county officials which the state does not pay and allow counties to set the salaries of county officers. The county pays the salary. It should say the amount.

D. E. HUGHES

ALL FOR HOOVER

COTTAGE GROVE, Ore.—(To the Editor):—The way of the transgressor is hard. So says the Holy Writ. An expression of the old negro preacher might also be suggestive at this time: "The way of the transgressor is hard, and he dat sets on a red hot stove will be sh' to rise." President Hoover has been accused of being a foreigner, of being a millionaire, of being a pauper, of being too national minded, of not being patriotic, of playing into the hands of Wall Street, and of not having sufficient consideration of Wall Street interest. He has been accused of being against the veterans, and of being too considerate of the veterans. In short, he has been accused of every thing that might make votes for his opposition, depending on the party under discussion. I have filed many of the speeches made in this campaign against him and in all of them I have failed to find any of the claims as to his unfitness proven. They remain empty assertions without the slightest attempt at proof.

In the case of Mr. Roosevelt, I find many statements made. He is a hopeless cripple, and a physical giant. He is an intellectual wonder and a hairbrained ignoramus. He promises to put everybody to work, he is informed that he can put no one to work. He rights the wonderful record he has brought in New York and he is immediately informed that Al Smith made claim to these same reforms four years ago. He criticizes the present administration for not having legislation enacted curbing the actions of Wall Street in its crooked dealing with the public. He is reminded that Wall Street is in New York and regulation of that Street is a matter for New York to settle. He is also reminded that in 1928 Mr. Al Smith made the same claims and was repelled in the same manner.

President makes numerous claims concerning the affairs at Washington and in reply is shown to have given the wrong information, and so it goes. If Mr. Roosevelt is elected, who will be the personnel of his cabinet? Will the portfolio of secretary of state be in the hands of a competent person? Or will the international relations of this country be endangered by the appointment of someone to whom pre-election promises have been made. Who will be the secretary of the treasury? Will he be a man who will let the disbonneted offices in foreign countries be filled with men who are 100 per cent for America? Or will these places be filled with men who are sympathetic to the wishes of foreign nations that are now and have

been endeavoring to get cancellations of the balance of their obligations to us? What will be the attitude of the administration toward the veterans of our country? Will Mr. Roosevelt appoint as a member of the cabinet a man who is now one of the active members of the notorious Esso oil league?

Summing it all up, I am of the opinion that the poor man as well as the rich is in safer hands under Mr. Hoover than we can possibly be under Mr. Roosevelt. If Mr. Roosevelt is elected and he attempts to put effect the reforms he now advocates, it will be necessary for him to undo the program of Mr. Hoover and in the process we will be marking time. The old belt is pretty slack now and if we have to take another hitch in it for the purpose of marking time for three or four more years, we are afraid we won't resemble ourselves ever again. I am a thoroughly convinced that behind the frantic efforts to elect Mr. Roosevelt there are motives unknown to any of us. These motives it has been proven that Mr. Farley of the democratic party solicited funds from a firm in Canada for this campaign makes it unlikely for 100 per cent Americans to take the chances.

It has its parallel in Oregon in the real hidden motives behind the efforts to move the university to Corvallis. If the people of Oregon really believe the deep rooted plot that is behind the proposition to consolidate the schools there would be no question as to its outcome. The like lots of other matters let me say that there is a GOOD reason why the University should be moved from Eugene, back of the attempt to move it (unprovable at this time) are motives of the blackest sort.

Respectfully,
 E. E. McLENDON, Sec.
 South Lane County Taxpayers League.

LADY TO LADY

EUGENE, Ore.—(To the Editor):—Answer to Hoover-Chief's club. First, I thank you ladies for your invitation to join your organization.

My attitude toward our president or rather depreciable is this. Mr. Hoover comes out openly in the gold standard, imagining gold is the amount of fifteen billion is some and strong enough to move the commodities of the world estimated at about fifteen thousand billion. I would be like trying to run your steam from here to New York with a gallon of gasoline.

Furthermore, what gold there is in the possession of a few rich men from "Greenland's icy mountains" India's coral strand, and Herbert Hoover stands with them like Heracles with the globe upon his shoulders. No wonder, indeed, you acknowledge him our chief executive, as the great statesman on earth. I concede Hoover a very great statesman, a woman seem to fall for him more than men and if elected, Hoover can thank the ladies of U. S. But remember Solomon who had 1000 queens around him said: "Voe unto you when you are ruler over you."

Hoover is no dummy but whatever accomplished will be contaminated by gold and give the few golden families a chance time and again by their greed to inaugurate a depression. Gold and silver are like warm gold currency in the ocean keeping the world healthy and wealthy. Our printed currency is like the wind of credit. That is all we have at present, especially in the hands of August Meier, Morgan, Harrison, the Federal Reserve bankists, etc. No, dear ladies, I cannot vote for Hoover but—I vote.

P. S. My intercession for your dear sisters: Father, forgive them they know not what they are doing.

MINNIE M. SCOTT.

SOCIALIST VIEW

EUGENE, Ore.—(To the Editor):—For years and years we have been told to be sure and entrust the managing of public affairs to practical men; yes, put the emphasis on practical. And the people did just that. Year after year they elected practical men to office. And the result of the work of these practical men is what? Well, if anyone is acquainted with the facts were said this question, he no doubt would find that practical men would bring bad conditions, wherever, everywhere, and a comfortable living and security now and in the future for himself and family. Instead what do we find? We find bankruptcy. Bankruptcy political units, bankruptcy in industrial units; we find lack of food, clothing and shelter—retrograde everywhere, the aspect of a doleful people, doomed to deeper misery than they have experienced up to the present time. The people will have to learn that a knowledge of economic conditions, wherever, everywhere, is a very important equipment for anyone who wishes to understand the underlying causes of the present conditions and who would help in bringing about for ways and means toward getting out of them into something better.

There is only one avenue towards a better future, a future of hope, peace and happiness, the one on earth the New Testament talks about that avenue is the Cooperative Commonwealth. The collective ownership of the means of life, the democratic management of the same. The socialist party is the political organization which stands for this program. It will be the interest of the people to examine the candidate who is pledged to any such program for this "practical" means a stand for this as they are? Well and good if they are satisfied to go hungry, cold and in the midst of plenty; that is where we are headed under the present regime.

According to a statement by one of the candidates for a county office, tax delinquency in Lane county is \$1,000,000. This year the majority of the taxpayers have less than they had a year ago; therefore there will be more of a delinquent. The question is how much lower the county's income slide before the state treasury is in a state of same fix. How is the state of Oregon going to take care of it?

JOSEPH MUEHL

Rt. 3, Eugene, Ore.