

The Evening Herald

HERALD PUBLISHING COMPANY, Publishers
 FRANK JENKINS, Editor
 MALCOLM REPLY, Managing Editor
 Published every afternoon except Sunday by The Herald Publishing Company at 104-112 South Fifth Street, Klamath Falls, Oregon
 Entered as second class matter at the postoffice at Klamath Falls, Ore., on August 30, 1934 under act of Congress, March 3, 1879
 MAIL RATES PAYABLE IN ADVANCE
 By Mail In County Outside County
 Three Months \$1.75 \$2.25
 Six Months \$3.25 \$4.00
 One Year \$6.00 \$7.50
 Delivered by Carrier in City
 One Month .50
 Three Months 1.50
 Six Months 3.00
 One Year 6.00
 MEMBER AUDIT BUREAU OF CIRCULATION
 Member of The Associated Press
 The Associated Press is exclusively entitled to the use or republication of all news dispatches credited to it or not otherwise credited in this paper, and also the local news published therein. All rights of republication of special dispatches here are also reserved.
 Represented Nationally by
 M. C. SUGENES & CO., Inc.
 San Francisco, New York, Detroit, Seattle, Chicago, Portland, Los Angeles
 Copies of the News and Herald together with complete information about the Klamath Falls market, may be obtained for the asking at any of these offices

Primary Bill Arguments

TWO of the favorite arguments used against the September primary bill, which should be passed by the voters next Friday, are that the poor man would be handicapped under the new system, and that the farmer would not be able to vote because the fall primary would come in harvest time.

Sheldon Sackett, in his interesting Crow's Nest column in the Coos Bay Times, disposes of these arguments in the following paragraphs:

Arguments made against the change in primary election dates may be plausible; they are not practical. Among pot shots thrown at the September primary is the charge that a poor man cannot run for office. The facts are that a man can start his campaign any time he wishes—he can announce he seeks the nomination in January and cover the state on foot by September; the only difficulty will be the fact that people are not interested in politics until a few weeks before election time and the aspirant for office will have difficulty getting audiences. Once he is nominated he has nearly two months to campaign before the general election. With a car—and any candidate, no matter how poor, has an auto—he can make the state readily in that period and he will also be able to use the radio and the newspapers—two vehicles for public information without which no political aspirant can succeed.

A group is making the charge that the September primary is bad because it falls in the harvest period and the farmer is thereby distracted. Yet it was, Morton Tompkins and Ray Gill, grange leaders, who in 1931 when both were in the house, sought an August primary. One date is as bad as the other as far as interfering with farmers' work is concerned. The facts are that the farmer can get away a few hours to vote whatever time the primary comes just as he can take a holiday July 4 or go to the state fair the first week in September.

Too many of the arguments against the September primary bill are like the well-known sieve, they just don't hold water.

Police Work Increases

HERE'S something for Klamath citizens to think about: Arrests made by the city police department in 1935 increased in number more than 50 per cent over 1934.

Police Chief Frank Hamm's report to the council Monday showed 1938 arrests in 1935, against 1272 in 1934. Part of the report had been published previously in the news columns, but the full importance of the statistics is emphasized in the complete report.

It is notable that arrests involving liquor showed a marked increase. Lumping the totals under drunk, drunk and disorderly, sale of liquor to Indians, possession of liquor, and driving while intoxicated, we find that the 1935 arrests ran up to 1267, against 780 in 1934. Drunken driving arrests mounted from 52 to 75.

For purposes of detailed information, here's the comparative arrest table:

Report of Activities of the Police Dept. for the year 1935	1935	1934
Arrests	1938	1272
Drunk	539	532
Drunk and Disorderly	165	157
Vagrancy	102	68
Reckless Driving	129	79
Disorderly Conduct	104	72
Traffic	85	52
Sale of Liquor to Indians	62	16
Driving while Intoxicated	75	53
Open	55	30
Possession Liquor	26	22
Robbery	6	—
No Operators License	38	—
Wanted Foreign	18	—
Larceny	12	26
Larceny of Auto	6	—
Soliciting	12	9
Sanity	4	7
Breaking and Entering	8	—
Assault	6	7
Bad Checks	8	—
All Others	88	84
Total	1938	1272

If these increases in the number of arrests are attributed entirely to more vigilant and more vigorous law enforcement, the citizen can survey the table with considerable satisfaction. But if they mean more lawlessness—and it seems they must mean that, to a certain extent—there is cause there for real concern. It appears things are going in the wrong direction.

One thing that is apparent on the face of the report is that the Klamath police department's volume of work has increased greatly in the past year. That's a fact the citizen and taxpayer should recognize.

It begins to look as if traffic signals would make a majority campaign issue.

Ten Years Ago

Keep open the north fork of the Sprague river until adequate fish screens are installed at intakes of irrigation ditches and until there is constructed a suitable fish ladder over Sprague river dam.

This is the message of the Klamath Sportsmen's association to the state game commission, which was decided upon at a special meeting last night after a long drawn out session at the chamber of commerce.

Frank Boutin of Portland was high bidder today for 20,000,000 feet of yellow pine in Klamath county that is being sold by the state land board. His bid was \$162,752 or \$5.42 per thousand. The minimum appraisal was \$3.50. G. C. Lorenz of Klamath Falls bid \$121,000 and Richard H. Hovey of San Francisco, \$121,200.

Adolph's Observations

IN THE present civilization of this country, monogamy is the prevailing type of family life, one wife for each man. Time was when we had considerable polygamy, which permitted one man to have several wives, but this is pretty well weeded out.

Polyandry, one wife with several husbands, has never been known among our people but we have an island possession where it is customary.

A news item reached here recently regarding the birth of a son to a woman with six husbands, who were divided even politically, three democrats and three republicans.

A family rumour arose when it came time to name the kid, as to whether he should be christened Delano or Herbert. After weeks of strife, much fighting and one duel, they finally called him Townsend.

Seattle, Wash., has a monument erected to the memory of Segie Pieterse Prospect, a world's champion cow.

WASHINGTON

NEWS BEHIND THE NEWS

The Inside Story From The Capital

By PAUL MALLON
 Copyright 1936, by Paul Mallon

WASHINGTON, Jan. 28.—Al's best pal, who lunches with him regularly, wanted to bet last September that President Roosevelt would not be nominated. He does not care to bet now.

This explains, in part at least, the undertone upon which Mr. Smith chose to swing his Liberty League speech. His folks say he had an idea that there is an outside chance of frightening the new dealers into moderating their course. He was pointing his remarks for effect upon a man who lives in the large white house, about five blocks away, more than anyone else.

This explanation would clear the mystery of why he chose to become "the lusty flailer" so early in the campaign game; before the actual vote war starts, if he had withheld his flail until later, it would have counted more in votes. Now, it may count more in indirect influence.

COVERT RESISTANCE

In the probable explanations you have a rather complete background of the inside Washington situation today. At this time last year, certain congressmen in Mr. Roosevelt's party were speaking daily against his policies in both houses. Now their tongues are silent. They are resigned to the prospect that the political mechanics of the situation are against them, and each is acting accordingly.

Generally their opposition minds are still working as actively as ever. They are as much as they can backstage to change certain legislation and government policy, but not by word of mouth.

You can catch a hint of it in what is happening on the new farm program.

PURPOSEFUL CONFUSION

The farm bill confusion of congressional leaders during the last few days may have appeared to outsiders to be little more than confusion to be credible. It was, confusing to be credible. It was, confusing to be credible.

For days, senate and house leaders have been making contradictory announcements. On the inside, they also have been pulling energetically among themselves over which house should pass the bill first. Each house thinks the other should.

Irrepressible Senator Glass is supposed to be the chief obstacle in the senate. He is offered as the excuse why the house should act first. The fact is he is being secretly abetted by a lot of good party men who do not want to show their hands.

Congressional leaders just do not want to bang through another farm plan without more study and care than they gave the first one. Although they do not want to say so.

EUROPE

The confidential report which Understudy Phillips brought back from Europe will never leak out in detail. The reason is that it takes a more serious view of European war prospects than the top diplomats here have generally held.

It is understood among the well informed that Mr. Phillips has told Mr. Roosevelt that the danger of conflict between Great Britain and Italy is much greater than one would gather from current published dispatches.

Face-saving is going to be deeply difficult, but not impossible.

Note—Mr. Phillips also discovered in Berlin that the Hitlerites are concerned over the unfavorable press reaction they are continuing to get in this country.

NO SALE

A number of minor republican trainers from the hinterlands brought in their "dark horses" for the Liberty League dinner. Conversational heats were run at most of the parties upstairs. Likewise the lobbies of certain hotels occasionally resembled horse-sales.

No buying was reported. Probably none was expected. Trainers of dark horses are usually satisfied merely to have their horses mentioned this early in the race.

NOTES

The budget caused little interest when it was originally submitted (January 6), but is arousing plenty now. Certain prominent new deal fiscal authorities are privately encouraging the current thought of immediate new taxes. That is a trial balloon.

Mr. Roosevelt mentioned the 1922 case of Bailey vs. George when he commented critically on the supreme court decision in the Rice Millers' case. Private lawyers here have dug up the Wallace decision, made by the court the very same day in 1922, contending it roves Mr. Roosevelt was wrong. No one can tell.

Mr. Roosevelt mentioned the 1922 case of Bailey vs. George when he commented critically on the supreme court decision in the Rice Millers' case. Private lawyers here have dug up the Wallace decision, made by the court the very same day in 1922, contending it roves Mr. Roosevelt was wrong. No one can tell.

SIDE GLANCES—by George Clark



"I told you this mailing tube would come in handy. Remember when you wanted to throw it away?"

decide that except the supreme court, and it already has.

There is some American Legion talk about backing Congressman Vinson of Kentucky for the senate next year, which indicates rewards available to legislators who support the bonus.

The new deal neutrality bill is worrying a number of congressmen with large Italian-American populations in their districts. They do not know what to do.

The theatrical trade magazine, Variety, lists the republican radio skit, "Liberty at the Crossroads," as "second rate entertainment."

From Other Editors

SEPTEMBER PRIMARY

From the Oregon City Enterprise

The measure to change the date of the primary election from May to September is supported by the governor, was endorsed by the county judges and county commissioners of the state in recent convention and by the Willamette society and most of the newspapers of the state. It is opposed principally by the Oregon State grange.

The Enterprise favors this measure because:

1. The change would eliminate a long-drawn-out, tumultuous and uselessly prolonged political campaign, cutting out unnecessary expense.

2. The short-time primary plan works; two thirds of the states now have their primaries in the fall; only nine, including Oregon, have them in the spring.

3. The effect of the change would be to focus public attention on issues and candidates at virtually the same time, bringing the voters' verdict while issues are fresh and clear in the public mind; under the present setup voters lose interest between the May primary and the general election in November.

4. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

5. Originally Oregon's primary law specified that primaries were to be held 45 days prior to the general election, which was then in June, so the primaries were then held in May. When the general election was postponed from June to November, the change

was made.

6. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

7. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

8. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

9. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

10. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

11. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

12. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

13. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

14. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

15. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

16. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

17. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

18. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

19. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

20. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

21. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

22. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

23. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

24. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

25. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

26. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

27. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

28. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

29. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

30. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

31. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

32. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

33. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

34. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

35. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

36. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

37. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

38. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

39. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

40. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

41. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

42. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

43. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

44. The change would preclude making the Oregon delegation to the national convention ridiculous by instructing them to vote for some unknown, also-ran favorite son who never has a real look-in.

conce, of the minority to majority will.

We don't believe anyone denies that a vast majority of the students at both the university and Oregon State college want these recreational and cultural activities maintained, and want the expense shared by all members of the student bodies so the expense for the individual will be as low as possible. Isn't it merely democratic that the majority should rule in such matters, just as in all governmental affairs? Of course it is. Compulsory fees may be right or wrong, desirable or undesirable; may be this, that or the other thing, but they are certainly not undemocratic, as long as a majority of those whose interests are involved want them. The very cornerstone of democracy is majority rule. Once deny that principle and democracy ceases to be.

Telling the Editor

Compulsory Money Circulation

BEATTY, Ore., (To The Editor)—Much has been said concerning the Townsend plan, and much more will be said before this plan becomes a law.

To me this statement seems a fact. When the people of a nation permit any interest to usurp complete dominion over their lives, they have mortgaged their soul to that interest. And any interest except that of God Almighty, complete in itself, according to a good Christian's viewpoint, lead straight to a state of confusion. Of course this is only a personal opinion, but let's consider it in this way. If a government existed only for an army, and every man, woman and child, every animal, every scrap of machinery, every dollar, etc., must be a part of the said army or else not be. Such institutions, as schools, churches, and all societies, for free thought, could not exist because the army could not use them. I think its very abolition would kill it.

It would be like the fellow that tried to live only on mince pie, and after forty years he just naturally laid down and died. Too much pie, I guess.

I think the people of the United States has a lot to be thankful for, because we have a constitutional government, guaranteeing us free speech and free thought.

I believe that our forefathers must have been somewhat inspired, when this government was in the process of organization.

However I believe that there is a serious problem growing in the midst of this free land. It is the money question. What caused the depression? It was money, the lack of credit. Surely no one is fool enough to say it is over-production. How can it be over-production when we have a relief proposition? It is simply our method of distribution, and that leads right back to money. Those that need have no money to buy, naturally those that have the produce to sell cannot sell, since there is none to buy. Money is supposed to be a medium of exchange, at least that is what I was taught in school, not a means of control. They made the dollar round to roll. If they were not meant to roll, why didn't they make them square? Government loans, inflation, etc., under our present system, all roll into the same old channel and into the coffers of high finance.

To say that the Townsend

plan will or won't work is a question that I cannot answer, nor can any one else.

One economist says it will break the country, and another says it won't hurt the country, but will help the country.

It reminds me of the story of two fellows who took out life insurance. One had had been talked into the idea by a smart agent, and the only way he could get out of taking the policy and save face, was give the insurance doctor \$10 if he couldn't pass the examination. He did not pass. The other had wanted to pass but was afraid he couldn't, so he gave the same doctor \$10 if he could pass and he did.

No one can deny this, if there was a certain amount of money that had to go into circulation every month, and that amount was big enough to really do some good. And it could not be stopped by any financial institution. For our old Uncle Sam was behind the money and it had to roll. How could it keep from doing the country good?

There is lots of discussion concerning the transaction sales tax. They say it is too hard on the little fellow. But little has been said about the present sales tax that is up for consideration by the people. So maybe it would be a good plan to vote down all sales taxes until the Townsend plan is passed?

I think this Townsend plan would be far more preferable than the recent NRA, AAA, etc. Its only plan so far that has offered anything to the people.

On the other hand, I don't think that we should vote for any candidate, who shouts for the Townsend plan, turning down an old and trusted representative.

A representative does what the people ask, and not what he, the representative wishes. And if he fails us, we are through with him. So when the said representative is sent back to his office time after time, it is a pretty good sign that he is carrying out the will of the people.

I am not slinking mad at any office holder or candidate, but simply expressing my own opinion. A COMMON FELLOW.

Mr. Lewis Has His Troubles

ALGOMA, Ore., (To The Editor)—Because people are continually asking about the Townsend plan, we are writing this article to answer all questions at once. Mr. Mortensen let us down again. We challenged Mr. Mortensen and Mr. Mahoney to this debate. We stipulated that it was to be a public debate. The Townsend club chairman took it on himself to appoint a committee of Townsend members, including Mortensen, but not us, to make arrangements for the debate. We objected saying that we had not a fair show under such an arrangement, so Mortensen agreed that he and I would agree on the wording of the question and the terms of the debate.

So Mortensen finally set the date for the 29th of January, and he and I agreed on the wording of the question, and I secured permission to use the Algoma Community hall, and was assured that a member of the school board, a chosen representative of the community, would serve as chairman. Mortensen publicly agreed that we would have judges, we to choose one, and the other one to be picked from the audience by the two judges already chosen. We chose our judge and secured his consent to act. He is a paid-up member of the Townsend club. Could any

thing be more fair than this arrangement?

Still Mortensen later sent us a list of provisions entirely wiping out these arrangements, and since his emissary refused to let us have Mortensen's note in our hands for a careful consideration of the "new" arrangements in which I had no voice, I decided to call on Mortensen to see what he actually wanted. According to his new arrangements he would have the entire say as to place and date of debate, with a Townsend chairman officiating instead of a non-partisan chairman, and there should be no judges, and the wording of the debate was changed, and what hurt most, we were to give him the gist of our arguments so he could decide whether it was worth his while to debate or not. Of course we couldn't agree to such unfair terms, and Mortensen refused to meet us on the 29th under the fair arrangements upon which we had agreed.

Now it is plain to see that Mortensen wanted to get a line on our arguments to see whether he thought he had a chance to defeat us or not. Knowing that his arguments for once, couldn't stand too close an examination, he lost his nerve.

He gave us his excuse that he didn't want to waste his time unless we had a good argument to present. This is absurd on the face of it. He spends his time running around the country addressing a handful of people here and there. He was absolutely assured a packed house for the debate, and so had a real opportunity for once, to present his arguments to a big audience, but his unfairness robbed him of his opportunity.

We'd like to mention that we haven't received any of Mortensen's promised financial aid to explode the Townsend theory.

In subsequent articles we expect to present in this column a portion of the material we prepared for this debate.

Sincerely,
 GEORGE LEWIS,
 Algoma, Ore.

ALGOMA, Ore., (To The Editor)—Because people are continually asking about the Townsend plan, we are writing this article to answer all questions at once. Mr. Mortensen let us down again. We challenged Mr. Mortensen and Mr. Mahoney to this debate. We stipulated that it was to be a public debate. The Townsend club chairman took it on himself to appoint a committee of Townsend members, including Mortensen, but not us, to make arrangements for the debate. We objected saying that we had not a fair show under such an arrangement, so Mortensen agreed that he and I would agree on the wording of the question and the terms of the debate.

So Mortensen finally set the date for the 29th of January, and he and I agreed on the wording of the question, and I secured permission to use the Algoma Community hall, and was assured that a member of the school board, a chosen representative of the community, would serve as chairman. Mortensen publicly agreed that we would have judges, we to choose one, and the other one to be picked from the audience by the two judges already chosen. We chose our judge and secured his consent to act. He is a paid-up member of the Townsend club. Could any

thing be more fair than this arrangement?

Still Mortensen later sent us a list of provisions entirely wiping out these arrangements,