

Maybe Someday But Not Now

One of the hottest controversies under the Capitol dome centers around the state attorney general and a series of proposals designed to "take his office out of politics." One would eliminate his job as an elective official and make the office appointive, much as the office of secretary of the board of control is now. Another would permit state boards and commissions to hire their own lawyers, who now are hired by the attorney general and assigned by him to other departments of government.

There are some middling good arguments in favor of these bills. However, we do not think they outweigh the arguments against them. Such arguments can be waged just as well two years from now. Our major concern is that changes of this nature not be made this year. There is a suspicion that too much politics motivates those who would change the present system.

The attorney general, unlike other major state officials, is at the mercy of the Legislature. The Legislature created his office 64 years ago, and the Legislature can take it away. He is not a "constitutional officer," in that his office is not set up by the state constitution.

The first attorney general, George E. Chamberlain, was a Democrat who was appointed by Gov. Sylvester Penoyer, and who later was elected governor and U. S. Senator. Except for Mr. Chamberlain, who left his attorney general job in 1895, attorneys general have been Republicans, and there have been precious few of them. Only six men, all Republicans, held the job between 1895 and 1953 when the present attorney general, Robert Y. Thornton, was sworn in. Governors, secretaries of state and state treasurers have usually been Republicans, too. Mr. Thornton, however, is a Democrat, and for two years he sat in Salem as the only Democratic state official.

There is no doubt that Mr. Thornton has sometimes been thinking of his political future and of his role as one of the state's leading Democrats. And there

is just as little doubt that the Republican officials of the state have been thinking of him in exactly the same manner. They have, to say the least, been unappreciative of Mr. Thornton's activities. A couple of times, when the board needed legal action, it short-circuited Mr. Thornton completely and went to private law firms for help. Privately, members of the board complained that they couldn't get a dependable opinion out of Mr. Thornton. Mr. Thornton and his friends have countered with the charge that the board was just mad because Mr. Thornton wouldn't always come up with the sort of legal advice the board most wanted to get.

And so it has gone. Mr. Thornton has not been content to be a minor official. He has pushed his office into the limelight several times, contending that it was his clear duty to look into the crime situation in some counties and to investigate allegations of "mink coat business" in the State Liquor Commission. These activities have not endeared him to other state officials.

Of course this is not the first time that the attorney general and the governor have been of different political parties. In the 58 years that Republicans sat in the attorney general's chair, there were Democratic governors four times, for a total of 18 years. The Democratic governors and the Republican attorneys general seemed to get along. There is the possibility that the present ill feeling between the Capitol and Supreme Court Bldg. is more of a personality conflict than a genuine weakness in government organization.

In any case we would not like to see a drastic change made in the present heated political climate. Let's wait a couple of years. Other men will be in the two jobs in other years. Let's wait and see if the same arguments develop in a climate of harmony and trust. If they do, then it will be time to consider a change, and to thresh this thing out on its merits.



PAUL W. HARVEY JR.

Power Dispute Violence Lacks Ferocity

SALEM (AP)—The Legislature's dispute over the Eisenhower administration's plan to develop power in partnership with local agencies might not be so violent as first believed.

A split among the Democrats in the House on the first test vote Tuesday indicates there may not be any strong opposition to it.

The test was on a memorial to Congress asking for construction of Green Peter and Cougar dams in the Willamette Basin under the partnership plan.

SURPRISE RESULT

The Democrats divided, 14 against it and 11 for it. It was a surprise, because it was thought at least 20 Democrats would oppose it. The Republicans supported the memorial 33 to 2.

A memorial really isn't very important, but they often cause the longest debates. They do provide a good test of sentiment.

The biggest power battle will be over ratification of the Columbia River Comp. et. Some Democrats say it will give Oregon the short end as far as getting power and water are concerned.

The Republicans who wrote

this compact claim it will guarantee Oregon more power and water than it would get without having the compact.

Another surprise was the announcement by Sens. Harry Boivin, Klamath Falls Democrat, and Pat Loneragan, Portland Republican, that they will ask the Senate to create an Un-American Activities Committee.

PAST PERFORMANCES

Judging from performances at past sessions, it doesn't look as though such a committee will be formed.

Boivin and Loneragan want a committee to investigate subversives and also alleged subversive matter in school textbooks.

The Legislature has considered this several times in the past, but neither house has ever voted for the idea. It has the support of some patriotic organizations.

Gov. Paul Patterson had some good words to say for the lobbyists who gave a dinner for the Legislature Tuesday night.

He told the lobbyists how they had bought him many dinners

while he was in the Senate, but added that no lobbyist ever had used a free meal to influence Patterson's vote.

The governor urged the legislators to get all the free meals they could get from the lobbyists, and he added that the lobbyists give the Legislature lots of help.

The dinner was given by the Oregon Assn. of Trade Executives.

Legislators are worried because the bills are so slow in being introduced. We figure that only about 20 per cent of the bills have been submitted.

BLOOD OF BILLS

Many bills, drafted by the legislative counsel, are being carried around in members' pockets. Some members like to wait until the flood of new bills starts, so that committees won't be able to look at these members' bills too closely.

The delay makes it look as though the session will last a long time. It probably will close up some time in May.

IN THE EDITOR'S MAILBAG

McKenzie 'Lunkers'

EUGENE—(To the Editor)—A requiem seems in order for the remaining Big Fish of the McKenzie River. With the jilting of their river biologist's 14-inch limit recommendation the McKenzie folks turn the clock back to emotional regulation of the McKenzie fishery and they may be mighty, mighty sorry.

Oddly enough their chief argument against the 14-inch limit was that the angler liked to catch the big one—was in fact always looking for the big one. So what do they do, they demand that the big one be done away with.

Probably they do not know of the high popularity of the famous stretch of water in Pennsylvania where the angler is restricted to two fish per season for specimen purposes and is restricted to dry fly. It abounds with cagy big trout.

Probably they did not read the Sports Afield story "How to Have Good Fishing." That formula was to forbid possession of trout at any time.

Furthermore, I doubt if the McKenzie folks understood the Game Commission policy as stated last Friday by Dr. Rayner of going to smaller fish planting because of higher hatchery costs. That means 4- to 5-inch liberations and 6-inches to catch.

With the "lunkers" dredged out as they soon will be, the prospects of up to a limit of 6- to 6½-inch hatchery minnows won't draw the type of fishermen that sustains either the resort or guide business. So it seems that they have hurt rather than helped themselves and the Lane County economy.

They actually would have been far better off pleading for a drop of the limit to 12 or even 11 inches and for fly fishing only. In essence they asked for the discontinuance of \$10,000 worth of hatchery facilities in the death of the 14 and over length fish. By dropping to a 12-inch limit they could have gained another \$20,000 worth of hatchery facilities plus more big fish drawing power.

By going to fly fishing, as on the North Umpqua, the fish could be released without the harm incident to lure or bait.

Seemingly the McKenzie folks overlook the fundamentals, that it is live fish and not dead fish that sustains them. This frypan fish-market approach will kill them. Furthermore, it could bring on a movement to ban the fishing from boats on the McKen-

zie and that would really hurt the resort business. But for now, let's shed a tear for the McKenzie "Lunker" that is to be no more!

MERT FOLTS
359 Fairway Loop

Hit-and-Run

EUGENE (To the Editor)—From my front door—3566 Elmira Road—Wednesday (Jan. 19) a.m. about 8:30, our pretty, light brown terrier was killed by a hit-and-run driver. Dogs should not be on the road, you say! Granted; but they will go there! We are in a restricted speed zone, and the cars following slowed up and turned aside to avoid hitting her again, but the first car did not stop nor even slow down, and our pet was dead before I could reach her.

The color of the car? I don't know. Very yellow, would be as good a guess as any. Though of mixed parentage, the dog was invaluable on our chicken farm as a rodent dog—and pet.

That very afternoon I located our older dog, missing since evening before, in a ditch not many feet away, and I tearfully carried her in and laid her in the same grave. As my husband shoveled in the dirt, I said: "Thank God it wasn't any of the children."

To the drivers of these two cars (I wonder if they slept well, last night) this warning—Please drive carefully! Next time it might be child playing ball—or on a bike—or roller skates, getting in front of your cars. It could be your own, or a friend's child.

MRS. NICHOLAS BERTELSEN,
3566 Elmira Road.

Feels Sorry

SPRINGFIELD (To the Editor)—I do feel sorry for the people of Eugene! I wonder how many Eugeneans noticed the article on Page 1, Section B, Jan. 18, 1955, about your new "police state"? They (the cops) marched him (the so-called drunk) from the Belvedere Hotel, THEN arrested him for being "drunk on the street." Talk about frame-ups—he didn't NEED a trial!

Guess the reason that I resent this is that I was arrested in Eugene for a charge of "reckless driving" while using a car dealer's car which "shimmied" in the front wheels. Therefore, the "cop" (of your police state) de-

cided that I must be drunk—or something!!! I wasn't—so, all of a sudden, I became a "reckless driver," going five miles over the speed limit (which was a lie, also—I had my eye on the speedometer at the same time I saw the "hiding" cop). It cost me \$15 which I paid—and now, that I know how the state regards such cases—I wish that I hadn't!

"I would have paid me to fight it, if it had cost \$100! Anyway, the point of all this is: When and where are you Eugeneans going to "SIT" on your over-zealous police (cops)? You already have a bad name from out-of-staters. Don't you like other people's BUSINESS dollars?"

ALLEN G SNEED
834 B St.

Cougars Scream?

EUGENE—(To the Editor)—Thanks to Mr. Helfrich for his interesting story about cougars. But strange that he never heard one scream. Back in Missouri during the 90s people talked about a "panther" almost every winter, and that he screamed like a woman in distress. One oldtimer tells us: "We were riding along a forest road and bobcats were quite common, but all at once we heard a terrible scream. Our horses started on a dead race and we let them run for about 2 miles before they stopped."

The first one that I ever heard was at Corona, Calif., one evening after dark. The dogs were tied up and not far from the house in a lemon grove there was a blood-chilling, long drawn out scream. I rushed to the other room and told the others that a cougar was outside. They were skeptical at first, then he made another scream. They all jumped up and went outside and turned the dogs loose. The dogs barked and ran into the grove, but the cougar had made a safe retreat.

The next morning a neighbor stated that a chicken coop containing two roosters was torn to pieces and the cocks were gone. I will never forget that terrible scream, but as far as sounding like a woman in distress that is decidedly an understatement. Any lady who can scream like a cougar would do well to quit her job at once and join a circus, as she could make more money in one night than she could in a year pounding a typewriter.

DORVIN DUDECK,
Box 5.

Ike's Formosa Plan Avoids Call for Attack on China

WASHINGTON (NEA)—The Eisenhower administration has no intention of backing Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist Republic of China forces on Formosa in any attack on the Chinese mainland. This flat statement can now be made on highest official authority in connection with President Eisenhower's special message to Congress requesting authority for U. S. armed forces to act in defense of Formosa and the Pescadores islands.

It is admitted that the draft resolution presented to Congress might give the President, as commander in chief of U. S. forces, authority to order an attack on Chinese Communist strong points from which an attack on Formosa and the Pescadores might be launched. But there is no intent to release Chinese Nationalist forces for such an attack on the China mainland.

Up to the present, this latter point has been in doubt. There have been some Republican leaders who have maintained that the United States should release Chiang Kai-shek's forces to liberate the China mainland from the Communists. Some extremists have even gone so far as to advocate that U. S. naval and air power be used to support this assault.

The Eisenhower administration spokesmen have never either supported or discouraged this talk. It obviously made good propaganda for keeping the Chinese Communists guessing as to the real American intent. U. S. military and economic assistance, totaling over half a million dollars, has obviously kept Chiang Kai-shek's government from collapse. It has also supported the idea that the Nationalist government was being kept in readiness for a return to power in China.

On Formosa, of course, the Chiang government has done little else but talk and prepare for eventual return to the mainland and driving the Communists out. It is now admitted officially in Washington, however, that there are few people who believe that this Republic of China rule over the mainland will be achieved by armed force. Instead of this, the policy is stated as

supporting the belief that internal schisms, unrest and hostile demonstrations by the Chinese people on the mainland will themselves eventually overthrow Communist dictatorship.

It is pointed out that the Chinese people have never been held together very long by any of their rulers or conquerors. The role of the Nationalist government on Formosa is therefore said to be one of waiting to take advantage of this situation when the unrest and uprisings come into being.

When the Chinese Communists first conquered the mainland and drove Chiang Kai-shek's forces to Formosa, Acheson sized up the situation as being one about which the United States could do very little. He was damned all over the country for this do-nothing policy.

But he stuck to his guns. He pointed out that while many people regarded China as a springboard for attack on world communism, it was really only a morass. Everyone who had tried to conquer China or to rule it had bogged down in it.

Japan had tried to conquer China and failed. When the United States had tried to help China, it had become despised by the Chinese. Now it was the Russians' turn to go in and try to make over China. Future history would show that the Communists bogged down and because the people whom the Chinese most despised.

Leaders in the Eisenhower administration will probably deny that they are following this old line. But there is little discernible difference.

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

ACHESON DAMNED

In slightly different words, what this policy amounts to is nothing more nor less than what former Secretary of State Dean Acheson once referred to as "letting the dust settle in China."

When the Chinese Communists first conquered the mainland and drove Chiang Kai-shek's forces to Formosa, Acheson sized up the situation as being one about which the United States could do very little. He was damned all over the country for this do-nothing policy.

But he stuck to his guns. He pointed out that while many people regarded China as a springboard for attack on world communism, it was really only a morass. Everyone who had tried to conquer China or to rule it had bogged down in it.

Japan had tried to conquer China and failed. When the United States had tried to help China, it had become despised by the Chinese. Now it was the Russians' turn to go in and try to make over China. Future history would show that the Communists bogged down and because the people whom the Chinese most despised.

Leaders in the Eisenhower administration will probably deny that they are following this old line. But there is little discernible difference.

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."

President Eisenhower's message to Congress, near its close, said: "What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy."