

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE

Published Daily Except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO. 27-29 North Fir St. Phone 2-6-41

ROBERT W. RUEL, Editor. HERB GREY, Advertising Manager. GERALD LATHAM, Business Manager. ERIC ALLEN, Jr., Managing Editor. EARL H. ADAMS, City Editor. HARRY CHIPMAN, Telegram Editor. RICHARD JEWETT, Sports Editor. OLIVE STARCHER, Society Editor. DALE ERICKSON, Circulation Mgr.

An Independent Newspaper Entered as second class matter at Medford Oregon under Act of March 2, 1957

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: By Mail—In Advance Per Copy 10c. Daily and Sunday—One year \$12.00. Daily and Sunday—Six months \$6.50. Daily and Sunday—Three months \$3.50. Sunday Only—One year \$3.50.

By Carrier—In Advance—Medford Ashland Central Point Eagle Point Jacksonville Gold Hill Phoenix Shady Cove Rogue River Talent all on motor routes. Daily and Sunday—One year \$15.00. Daily and Sunday—Six months \$8.00. Carrier and Dealers—5c per copy. All terms Cash in Advance.

Official Paper of the City of Medford Official Paper of Jackson County United Press—Full Leased Wire MEMBER OF AUDIT BUREAU OF CIRCULATION

Advertising Representatives: WEST-HOLLIDAY COMPANY INC. Offices in New York Chicago Detroit San Francisco Los Angeles Seattle Portland St. Louis Atlanta Vancouver B.C.

NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION AFFILIATE MEMBER. Oregon Newspaper Publishers Association

Flight o' Time: Medford and Jackson County History from the files of The Mail Tribune 10, 20, 30 and 40 years ago.

10 YEARS AGO: Aug. 12, 1946. (It was Monday) Recent property transaction here is the sale to Mel V. Younger of the Drury Lane orchard formerly owned by Allen B. Drury.

20 YEARS AGO: Aug. 12, 1936. (It was Wednesday) Six foot model of super liner Queen Mary on display in the lobby of the Medford branch, First National Bank of Portland.

30 YEARS AGO: Aug. 12, 1926. (It was Thursday) Health examination for children entering school for the first time this September scheduled at Baptist church clinic.

40 YEARS AGO: Aug. 12, 1916. (It was Saturday) Mrs. Jennie M. Kemp, state president of the WCTU, speaks at Baptist church.

What's the Answer? Can You Get 4 of the 7? Copr. 1955 Editorial Research Report

1. Of all Americans who own stock in publicly-owned corporations, about one-third, one-half or two-thirds have incomes under \$7,500?

2. The old-age annuity to a widow under social security is or isn't higher if she has a minor child to support?

3. Maximum legal speed on highways is more than 60 miles an hour in some states; right or wrong?

4. If Stevenson gets the 1956 Democratic nomination on the first ballot he will or won't be repeating the story of his 1952 nomination?

5. What did these men with the first name of John have in common: Calvin, Huss and Knox?

6. Which major-league baseball team was once known as the Superbas?

7. Goldfish was originally the name of which well known movie producer?

The answers: 1. About two-thirds, says N.Y. Stock Exchange. 2. Is. 3. Right; it's 65 in 7 states. 4. Won't be. 5. They were religious reformers. 6. Brooklyn. 7. Samuel Goldwyn.

IDEAL MUSTACHE: San Francisco—U.P.—Prince Rainier III, ruler of Monaco, has won a new title—the man with the ideal mustache. The husband of former actress Grace Kelly was voted the title by the International Mustache Protective Association.

"To be or not to be?"

As before stated in this department the Democrats, unlike the Republicans, would rather fight than eat. And Captain Harry S. Truman, US Army, formerly of the White House (now retired from both) is the fightingest of them all.

Perhaps he wouldn't rather fight than eat, but we are quite sure he would rather fight than run a men's furnishing store—or attend a party convention without enjoying a good knock-down and drag-out hassle.

BUT who is he going to fight? That is the question, as the country awaits his decision as to his choice for the head of the ticket.

As stated when he arrived in Chicago, the only man he opposes for President is himself. But before the big circus opens he will have to oppose someone and our guess is, it will be Adlai Stevenson.

Not because of anything HST has said about civil rights, not being a band wagon-jumper or anything else, but simply because only by such action can he be assured of enjoying a real "battle royal." And that is what his fighting heart wants.

If he should jump on the Stevenson band-wagon however that would settle it. Stevenson would not only be a shoo-in but probably before the roll call on the first ballot had been finished. There would be no fight.

NONE of that for Harry. We want action. He wants to go over the top with banners waving, six guns blazing and the enemy fleeing pell mell from hot pursuit.

The odds don't count. All the odds were against him in 1948, but the more they lengthened the more "he gave 'em hell", and with even many of his most trusted advisers maintaining it would NOT be done—he DID it!

WELL if he did it 8 years ago why can't he do it today? The undersigned can see a number of reasons but we imagine "HST" can see only one to wit: His love for a good, knock-down scrap is only exceeded by his love and 100 per cent devotion to the Democratic party.

If before the battle is joined the Democratic party's "non-elderly statesman" should become convinced, or be convinced—that the action he contemplates would hurt the party more than it would help, then our prediction would be not any jump on the Stevenson band-wagon, but a slow climb thereon—perhaps with some help from the sympathetic Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

In other words instead of having the joy of fighting the enemy, Harry S. Truman (retired) would have to content himself only with fighting and gaining a victory over himself.—R.W.R.

Does It Mean War?

"Do you think it means war?"

That question has been fired at this department several times since the British and French sent their battle-fleets and airplanes in the general direction of the Suez canal.

Ten or twenty years ago the answer would be easy and would have been "Yes."

For here is a perfect setting for war, all the necessary ingredients for the devils brew are there, ready and waiting.

ON ONE side we have an "Egyptian Mussolini" who has nationalized this vital gateway to the East, and must back up his edict or suffer a severe and probably fatal blow to his standing and prestige.

And on the other side the enfeebled but still proud and pugnacious British lion, badly wounded but still full of fight, who can't yield to the Cairo ultimatum, without suffering a devastating defeat, and run the risk at least of extinction as a world-power.

Unless one side or the other backs down how can war be prevented?

Well it can't be. But our prediction is, either one, or more likely both sides, will back down, at least sufficiently to avoid an armed conflict.

IN OTHER WORDS we look for a workable compromise, not war. We grant we are overworking our crystal-ball today, and may on all counts be mistaken. But we don't think we are and for one simple reason, namely: Nations like individuals who really don't want to fight, almost always find some way to prevent it, particularly when their friends and backers feel the same way about it.

This Suez incident may prove the exception to the rule but we think not.—R.W.R.

Editorial Comment

TEACHING THE WRONG THING? The writers of some of the editorials and many of the sports columns dealing with the current Pacific Coast Conference fiasco show a great lack of knowledge of their subject.

Many of these writers seem to be going along with the Los Angeles sports writers in this line of reasoning: "Sure, there was a mess in the PCC, but it's unfair to penalize the students involved. After all, they're youngsters and didn't know any better."

Which is a lot of bunk. Before students can compete for PCC member institutions they must each year file financial statements, showing any financial aid they receive from sources other than their parents. These statements are filed with the conference commission-

er. If a boy filed a statement showing that he had received unpermitted aid, he would be declared ineligible for further competition.

In order to receive this aid, then, three things must happen: 1. Some organization must raise the illegal funds and make them available.

2. The coach of the sport involved must set up the pay scale.

3. The player involved must deliberately falsify his annual financial statement.

If a player deliberately lies in his statement, he can't be very innocent. And if schools undertake to teach them how to lie, to help them prepare false statements and to set up "deals" which both the player and school know are illegal, then the schools are teaching the wrong subjects.—Bend Bulletin.

Communications

Letters to the Editor must bear the name and address of the writer, although under certain circumstances the use of a pen name or initial for publication is permissible. The Mail Tribune reserves the right to edit all letters with a view to clarification and condensation. Letters submitted for publication must not exceed 400 words.

Drunken Sergeants To the Editor: On this McKee case, it seems to me that all the leading publications, as well as anybody else whose opinion on the subject would amount to anything, are placing all sympathy on the side of the sergeant who routed the Marine Corps recruits out at night and force-marched them to their drowning, at a time when they had right up to expect to sleep and rest for whatever the hard-boiled sergeant might have cooked up for them for the next day.

Good stiff training is a very necessary thing for getting service recruits into shape for possible combat, but as I see it, legitimate, authorized training, be it ever so tough, is one thing, and getting drunk and trying to show off, on the part of some noncom whose idea of grandeur is to make young recruits fear him, is another.

It is a big switch from the days when I was a drill instructor (and considered a good one too). If a drill sergeant had ever presumed so much authority in those days as to turn out a bunch of men in the night, or any time other than duty hours, we would not have had to endanger their lives by forcing them through swollen streams, in order to be subject to loss of our stripes.

And I think it should not be that any non-commissioned officer, because of dislike or dissatisfaction with the progress of some of the platoon he is instructing, is allowed to work off his mad on the recruits.

I have wondered how the parents of the six boys who lost their lives feel about this thing. You wouldn't know by the published accounts of the trial. All the space was taken up with pictures of, and references to, the grief-stricken relatives of the defendant. I wondered why some of the families of the poor kids who were drowned by the hard-boiled action of this sergeant were not pictured or talked about.

Parents do not necessarily raise their boys to be "sissies," but you could not blame them for not wanting them pushed around by drunken sergeants.

Pat Graham 175 Jeanette st. Medford, Ore.

Why Not Discuss Issues? To the Editor: Wayne Morse has been accused of having a poor attendance record in the U.S. Senate while actually he has one of the highest according to the Senate roll-call. This is just another example of the effort being made by certain members of the Republican party in this state to discredit him. We wonder WHY! Surely it isn't they want him out of office be-

cause he isn't a good legislator for if that were true we would have seen concrete evidence of it rather than the straws we have received such as this weak effort to minimize one of the highest attendance records in the U.S. Senate.

On the other hand I would like to hear some explanations concerning the Al Sarena Mining Co.'s timber operations, the exploitation of wildlife sanctuaries for oil and gas numbering in the hundreds these past three years, the reason for the reputation of a Federal Hell's canyon dam which the Interior Dept.'s own examiner said was the most feasible development of the Snake river, and the reason why Douglas McKay was replaced on his cabinet post by Fred Seaton who is generally recognized as being different on his views of conservation from McKay as brightest day is from darkest night?

I think the status of these issues is notoriously obvious by the reluctance the Republican officials have to discuss them. Do they believe the controversy they are trying to formulate about Senator Morse will hide these questionable topics? If so did Morse hurt them that much for placing principle above party fealty, that they consider their wounded egos more important than Douglas McKay's determined effort to aid special interests at the expense of the people not only in this state but the United States?

Ken Corliss, 1564 Myers lane, Medford, Ore.

S.P. Action Deplored To the Editor: I want to commend you most highly for the series of excellent editorials which you have been publishing in the Mail Tribune, insisting that the Southern Pacific live up to its obligations as a public utility by providing adequate and modern service on the Siskiyou line.

It is ridiculous that the S.P. should be permitted to enjoy a virtual freight monopoly in this profitable lumber area and yet not have to undertake passenger service unless, as you so effectively point out, every unit of its operation shows a profit. This same philosophy might justify a department store removing its drinking fountains, wash rooms and elevators unless they showed a profit.

It seems to me that a railroad must operate as a whole system and that the public has the right to ask for certain public-service features in return for the very profitable operations which the railroad may have elsewhere.

Let me again assure you what a splendid job you are doing. Senator Richard L. Neuberger Washington, D.C.

THE DEPENDENCE of Western Europe on the canal is undesirable big, and the dependence of Great Britain is even worse. Nearly half of the oil consumed in Western Europe last year came through Suez; for Great Britain it was 75 per cent. Whatever the guarantee is that can be worked out by diplomacy, it will remain the stark fact that Nasser has physical control of the canal, that Western Europe can be critically hurt if the canal is closed.

For that reason, it is imperative that the Western powers concert measures to reduce their dependence on Suez, to break the monopoly which Egypt possesses over their vital communications. The less they are dependent, the more it will be Egypt's advantage to keep open the canal on fair terms.

That is why we should encourage and help the British and the French who are thinking of such measures as: The building of more and bigger tankers to go around the Cape, and of a pipe line, conceivably even a second canal, from the Red Sea to the Mediterranean through Israel in order to by-pass Suez.

1956 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

THE BRITISH decision to evacuate its armed forces from Egyptian territory—a decision for which we have some responsibility—marked the end of an epoch in the Middle East. It means that national interests in the Middle East will have to be based not on vested rights but on contracts and agreements arrived at by the calculation of mutual advantages. It is too late to consider seriously as practical policy the restoration of the old relationship.

The Western powers can intervene if they are attacked. They can intervene to repel overt aggression. But they cannot intervene in order to impose the kind of regime they would like to see in the canal zone. They

In the Day's News

By FRANK JENKINS

As this is written Give-'em-Hell Harry is the big boy in Chicago. Embattled Democrats assembled for the convention are marking time while they wait to see who gets his nod for the nomination.

MEANWHILE—A backer of Stevenson has just expressed his belief that Truman will come out for Harriman. The reporters explain cryptically that "the person who gave this opinion" is a close friend of Truman, as well as a Stevenson backer.

This "person" closed by predicting Stevenson's nomination even if Harriman does get the Truman accolade.

ADLAI himself has just come from Harry's hotel suite, where he was closeted for a half hour with the former President. As he came out, he was jumped by the reporters who demanded to know what was talked about.

Adlai quipped: "We decided to elect a Democratic President."

IN AN more serious vein, he said they talked about the platform and the campaign. Asked how he felt after his session with Harry, he replied: "I feel just as good today as I did yesterday and the day before."

The newshawks then dived on him with questions as to whether he and the former President were in agreement on a civil rights plank for the Democratic part. Adlai dropped his mask of persiflage and answered simply: "I think so."

HARRIMAN has just disembarked from his plane at the Chicago airport. To the clustered newshounds he expresses confidence that he will win the nomination.

There's no getting around the fact that when the Democrats put on a convention they know how to stage the show.

DEMOCRATIC "spoke s m e n," assembled in Chicago, leave no doubt that they regard the farm problem as one of the biggest, if not the MAJOR, issue in the 1956 campaign.

Democratic Senator Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota declares flatly that the farm problem is the MAJOR NATIONAL ISSUE his party has in its ammunition box.

Former President Truman says the nation's farmers are JUST ABOUT RUINED and the only thing that can save 'em is to put the Democrats back in power.

HMMMM. If the farmers are all BROKE after ten years of subsidized high prices maintained by the Democrats after the war ended, what's the future of farming?

If that IS the case, I'm afraid agriculture is a goner.

IF YOU'RE getting slightly cynical about all this politicking, you may say that what is going on in Chicago now and what will be going on in San Francisco a week later is a lot of childish tommyrot and that we ought to grow up.

South Korea held an election on Wednesday and unofficial final returns show that President Syngman Rhee's Liberal party won 66 per cent of the offices. The opposition Democratic party won only 2 per cent of the jobs (the rest went to the numerous splinter parties).

A (South Korean) Democratic party spokesman calls the results a one-sided victory brought about by what he termed GOVERNMENT PRESSURE AND LIBERAL PARTY COERCION.

OUR political gyrations in election years may seem childish and absurd, but if we can keep TOO MUCH POWER FROM RESIDING IN TOO FEW HANDS TOO LONG, we'll come out all right.

must use diplomacy to induce Egypt and its friends.

THE DEPENDENCE of Western Europe on the canal is undesirable big, and the dependence of Great Britain is even worse. Nearly half of the oil consumed in Western Europe last year came through Suez; for Great Britain it was 75 per cent. Whatever the guarantee is that can be worked out by diplomacy, it will remain the stark fact that Nasser has physical control of the canal, that Western Europe can be critically hurt if the canal is closed.

For that reason, it is imperative that the Western powers concert measures to reduce their dependence on Suez, to break the monopoly which Egypt possesses over their vital communications. The less they are dependent, the more it will be Egypt's advantage to keep open the canal on fair terms.

That is why we should encourage and help the British and the French who are thinking of such measures as: The building of more and bigger tankers to go around the Cape, and of a pipe line, conceivably even a second canal, from the Red Sea to the Mediterranean through Israel in order to by-pass Suez.

1956 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

Matter of Fact By Joe and Stewart Alsop

HARRY TRUMAN'S ROLE Washington—Harry S. Truman's journey to Chicago poses what may be called the other big question about the Democratic convention (The number one question, of course, is whether the North-South coalition supporting Adlai Stevenson will be split by a civil rights fight.)

The question about Truman, as it has been phrased by Averell Harriman himself, is whether he will "take his coat all the way off, or only half way off" to fight for Harriman's nomination. As these words are written, the Truman coat is certainly half way off already.

In the earlier period of pre-convention maneuvering, the former President always publicly maintained that he had no candidate, but even then his impartiality had a quality all his own. He disliked Sen. Estes Kefauver enough to say so openly. He disliked Adlai Stevenson enough to say so privately. And he liked Governor Harriman enough to say so both publicly and privately.

While Kefauver was still in the race, and there was still some chance of a sort of balance between candidates, Truman did not go much further than letting his own views be known in this manner, so that the professionals could not mistake where he stood. But when Kefauver's withdrawal thoroughly upset the balance, Truman made at least one major effort to restore it again. This was in his home state of Missouri, where he is not a delegate, but has much natural influence on the delegation.

WITH the several Missouri delegates who sought his council, Truman was rather sharply critical of Adlai Stevenson, questioning Stevenson's ability to wage a tough campaign and attacking his standing as a political professional. Some of the bad feeling between the two men evaporated after Stevenson went to see Truman in Chicago last July; but there was still a sharp edge of bitterness on such Truman remarks as his forecast, "Why, if Stevenson is ever elected, he won't let us inside the White House."

More positively, the former President strongly urged Missouri national committeeman Mark Holloran and other Missouri delegates to continue voting for Missouri's favorite son, Sen. Stuart Symington, for at least two ballots. This was a direct effort, of course, to aid Averell Harriman's strategy of holding the favorite son delegations in line, and thus stopping

the Stevenson bandwagon. Truman told his fellow Missourians frankly that he wanted them to stick with Symington because he thought this would help Harriman. Harriman, he said, would be a fighting candidate. Only a fighting candidate, in his opinion, could challenge the personal appeal of President Dwight D. Eisenhower. So he was for Harriman and made no bones about it.

THUS it is clear that the Truman coat is half way off. To take it all the way off, however, the former President will have to take two very serious steps. He will have to come out publicly and unequivocally for the Harriman candidacy—which is a very different thing from using his personal influence in private, as he did in Missouri and will no doubt do in other states. And he will also have to give maximum support to the Harriman strategy of splitting the party on the platform in order to split Stevenson's coalition.

On the second point, Truman has repeatedly said that one of his grand objects at Chicago would be to help in taking a united Democratic party into the hard election fight against Eisenhower. Anyone who knows Harry Truman, knows, of course, that he will not tolerate a wishy-washy platform. But demanding a forthright platform is a very different thing from trying to promote a platform fight just for the sake of a fight.

AGAIN, Gov. Harriman and his friends have repeatedly asked Truman to announce in public the support that he has always promised them in private. And Truman has always refused, saying, first, that he did not think this kind of public intervention appropriate for an ex-President, and adding, second, that he could not make a decision anyway until he had studied the situation in Chicago. One of the symptoms of the situation is the inclination of Truman's own Missouri delegation to disregard his plea to hold for Symington, and thus to assist Harriman. One or two of the Missourians are Harriman-inclined. The rest are either friendly to Stevenson, or simply anxious to get on the bandwagon. Unless there is a big upset in the interval, at least a majority of the delegation is inclined to shift to Stevenson at the end of the first ballot, or at any rate to leave Symington on the second. And Sen. Symington is not anxious to argue with the majority.

Maybe the platform fight will change everything. Maybe Stevenson and company will somehow arouse the always hot Truman temper. But although it is dangerously close to decision-time to be making forecasts, it now seems most likely that the Truman coat will stay where it is, halfway off and halfway on for Harriman.

(Copyright 1956 New York Herald Tribune Inc.)

Our wire editor has been making use, from time to time, of a front page "box" to inform our readers where they can find their favorite features or departments.

The wife of one of the other staff members, unaware of this development, recently spotted the box, entitled "Inside Today," for the first time. Her immediate unthinking reaction was "Oh, why did they get the inside pages all fouled up?"

City Manager Robert Duff discussing figures at a recent council meeting presented some which inadvertently had too many digits. He explained afterward that it was a "typographical error."

Another such, we presume, was on a recent list of wedding license applications put out by the county clerk's office, which listed the birth date of a prospective bride as Jan. 1, 1956.

Our final error story today concerns a mailing we recently received, reporting on a speech made by a political candidate before a statewide organization. The news release said the candidate "asserted" something or other.

The thing that distresses us about this is not the error, as such, but the fact that it was made by the Oregon Education Association.

The telephone rang in the newsroom last week, and the caller inquired about the percentage of registered voters, both Democrats and Republicans, who cast ballots in the May 18 primary election.

Not knowing the figures off-hand, but knowing they could be looked up in the file, the staff member who answered the telephone suggested that it would be quicker for the caller to inquire of the elections department in the county clerk's office.

Came the reply: "Shh... That's who's calling."

Today and Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann

The Suez dispute is on two planes which, though they are related, need to be carefully distinguished in our minds. On one plane, the circumstances of the seizure of the Suez Canal Company are a spectacular test of prestige, precipitated by President Nasser in order to demonstrate that his power in the Middle East is greater than that of the Western nations. On the other plane, by taking over the administration of the canal, he is in a position to discriminate among the users of the canal, and to exert upon them political pressure.

On the first plane, that of prestige, the dispute is a showdown which, carried to its conclusion, would mean either the fall of Nasser or the collapse of the British, French, and American position from Morocco to the Persian Gulf. On the second plane, the issue is the modernization and the implementation of the treaty of 1888, guaranteeing free and equal use of the canal. The question, which has been posed in London, Paris and Washington, is whether to move on the first plane or on the second—towards a showdown with Nasser or towards measures to protect the international character of the canal. The decision agreed to by the Western powers has been to move on the second plane—that, as the London "Economist" puts it, "the immediate Western interest is not to teach Col. Nasser a lesson (he must learn his own lessons) but to keep the ships passing through the canal."

This is a wise decision, even from the point of view of the showdown on prestige. For if by patient, resourceful and disinterested diplomacy the treaty of 1888 can be modernized and reaffirmed, with general international support, there will be,

in the old Wilsonian phrase, "peace without victory" in the canal zone.

THERE is, in fact, no other course open to us. For, except in the case of the Israeli ships which the Western powers have condoned, Nasser has not violated the treaty of 1888. To use force against him, say to blockade his ports or to re-occupy the canal zone, would, as of now, be aggression within the meaning of the United Nations Charter. Almost certainly, it would bring virtually the whole of Asia to Nasser's side and against the West. In all probability it would set off a chain reaction in the Arab countries, involving reprisals on the pipe lines and the oil fields.

There is every reason to suppose that the seizure of the canal company was carefully planned and prepared well in advance, and we must suppose that Nasser and the leaders in the Arab states have other moves prepared as their answer to Western intervention. It is not to our interest to provoke these moves since, as is self-evident, Nasser would have the moral and political support of such a large part of the world.

THE BRITISH decision to evacuate its armed forces from Egyptian territory—a decision for which we have some responsibility—marked the end of an epoch in the Middle East. It means that national interests in the Middle East will have to be based not on vested rights but on contracts and agreements arrived at by the calculation of mutual advantages. It is too late to consider seriously as practical policy the restoration of the old relationship.

The Western powers can intervene if they are attacked. They can intervene to repel overt aggression. But they cannot intervene in order to impose the kind of regime they would like to see in the canal zone. They

POTLUCK

(By M-T Staff and Contributors)

Not long ago in this column, we reported that a neighboring daily newspaper had chided us for a typographical error. We also said we didn't mind, provided that the other paper was itself without typographical sins.

Well, that same week the neighboring daily ran a story which, in recounting the activities of the YMCA camp, said: "Activities will include fishing, hiking, swimming and a big climb up Mr. McLoughlin."

Our attention was called to this by L. C. Ostrander of Ashland, whom we shall love forever.

Councilman John (Little Daisy) Snider, who announced his candidacy for the mayoralty of Medford last week, reported his campaign platform will appeal to everyone.

It is, he said: "I'm for the president."

If applies, he added, to the president of the local garden club and the presidents of all other groups, including the president of the United States.

A young lady we know left a stylish sweater unguarded in an unlocked car while attending a recent public function. Later she returned to the car. The sweater was still there. Was she pleased with the honesty of the general public in not swiping it? She was not. She regarded their failure to take her sweater a direct insult to her taste in clothes.

A certain Medford businessman, a graduate of Oregon State college, has long been a vociferous roofer for and supporter of the Orange and Black, although it was many years ago he earned his sheepskin. Early one recent morning however, he was seen wearing a jacket of green with lemon-yellow trim. Could time have modified his sentiments? Or was his son's University of Oregon jacket the only wrap handy when he sought protection from the chill morning air?

Our wire editor has been making use, from time to time, of a front page "box" to inform our readers where they can find their favorite features or departments.

The wife of one of the other staff members, unaware of this development, recently spotted the box, entitled "Inside Today," for the first time. Her immediate unthinking reaction was "Oh, why did they get the inside pages all fouled up?"

City Manager Robert Duff discussing figures at a recent council meeting presented some which inadvertently had too many digits. He explained afterward that it was a "typographical error."

Another such, we presume, was on a recent list of wedding license applications put out by the county clerk's office, which listed the birth date of a prospective bride as Jan. 1, 1956.

Our final error story today concerns a mailing we recently received, reporting on a speech made by a political candidate before a statewide organization. The news release said the candidate "asserted" something or other.

The thing that distresses us about this is not the error, as such, but the fact that it was made by the Oregon Education Association.

The telephone rang in the newsroom last week, and the caller inquired about the percentage of registered voters, both Democrats and Republicans, who cast ballots in the May 18 primary election.

Not knowing the figures off-hand, but knowing they could be looked up in the file, the staff member who answered the telephone suggested that it would be quicker for the caller to inquire of the elections department in the county clerk's office.

Came the reply: "Shh... That's who's calling."