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CITY CLUB ELECTION MEASURE REPORTS . . . To Be Discussed

CONSTITUTIONAL SIX PER CENT TAX LIMITATION AMENDMENT—MAJORITY AND MINORITY REPORTS
The Committee: Paul Boley, Harry Burnside, Don A. Ellis, Morris Little, T. F. Maginnis and Volney Pratt, Chairman for the majority; John B. McKenna for the minority.

OREGON LIQUOR DISPENSING LICENSING ACT
The Committee: L. G. Covington, Barron Fitzpatrick, Erling Hustvedt, the Rev. L. E. Kempton, George Mead, Dr. Frank Perlman, and Walter B. Moore, Chairman.

WORLD WAR II VETERANS’ BONUS AMENDMENT

All election measure studies done under the Legislation and Elections Section, Nelson C. Hazeltine, Section Chairman.

These reports were printed in full in last week’s Bulletin.

ALSO . . . Printed Today and To Be Discussed

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AUTHORIZING INDEBTEDNESS FOR STATE REFORESTATION
The Committee: Kenneth R. Cochran, David Fain, Clarence Richen, James C. Wallace, and Warren Marple, Chairman.

LAW PROHIBITING SALMON FISHING IN COLUMBIA RIVER WITH FIXED APPLIANCES—MAJORITY AND MINORITY REPORTS
The Committee: John E. Daly, Raymond Kell, Harold King, Kenneth Kraemer, Hobart Mitchell, and Arthur Markewitz, Chairman for the majority; John Coughlin, for the minority.

LAW AUTHORIZING STATE TAX COMMISSION TO LEVY TAX IN EXCESS OF LIMITATION
The Committee: Paul Boley, Harry Burnside, Don A. Ellis, Morris Little, T. F. Maginnis, John B. McKenna, and Volney Pratt, Chairman.

ACT AUTHORIZING SPECIAL TAX FOR FIRE AND POLICE DISABILITY RETIREMENT AND DEATH BENEFIT PLAN

ACT TO AMEND CITY CHARTER TO PERMIT STREET VACATIONS
The Committee: Richard Crow, Fred C. Inkster, W. O. Knox, Albert Musick, and Ben Bernhard, Chairman.

SPECIAL TAX LEVY FOR PURCHASE OF FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT AND FIRE STATION CONSTRUCTION
The Committee: J. Alfred Hall, Richard Ritz, Dwight Schwab, James G. Smith, and Frederick Arpke, Chairman.

Members are urged to be prepared if they wish to be heard from the floor. Individual arguments will be limited to three minutes each.
CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AUTHORIZING INDEBTEDNESS FOR STATE REFORESTATION

Amending state constitution by adding Article XI-E, authorizing an indebtedness by loan of state credit not exceeding at any one time 3% of 1% of all taxable property in state to provide funds for forest rehabilitation, reforestation and acquisition of lands. Funds derived from sale, exchange or use of forest lands shall be applied in liquidating indebtedness. Bonds or other obligations issued may be renewed or refunded. Ad valorem tax to be levied annually outside 6% limitation in sufficient amount for paying indebtedness and interest. Legislative assembly may provide other revenues supplementing or replacing tax levies and necessary legislation.

302—YES I vote for the amendment.

303—NO I vote against the amendment.

To the Board of Governors of the City Club of Portland:

BACKGROUND OF THE MEASURE

The state of Oregon owns or administers approximately 500,000 acres of forest land including considerable areas of county lands which have been turned over to the State Department of Forestry for administration. About half of the lands held or administered by the state are cut or burned over and in need of reforestation.

The bulk of this denuded state acreage is in Clatsop and Tillamook Counties where the disastrous fires of 1933, 1939 and 1945 destroyed the natural forest cover so completely that reforestation by seeding or planting is required. The state holdings also include several smaller but equally denuded areas. Most of the state lands which now require reforestation lie in the highly productive forest areas west of the Cascade summit.

Reforestation requires not only planting and seeding, but fire protection by removal of snags, construction of roads and fire breaks, and installation of detection and communication facilities. Continuing annual expenditures must of course be made for fire protection, operation and general administration.

The necessary program of reforestation has been variously estimated to cost from 7 to 15 million depending on the conditions that may be encountered when the work is undertaken and upon the level of prices and wages prevailing at that time. The program will necessarily extend over more than a decade. Expenditures would be small during the initial years of the program and would increase somewhat as the program developed.

The first steps are to procure seed and nursery stock and to fireproof the land. The State Forester has prepared a biennial budget for consideration by the next legislature which totals $550,000 and which in his opinion is adequate to start the work.

Until a forest cover is reestablished, these denuded areas will continue to constitute a most extreme fire hazard and a threat to life and property in adjoining areas. Salvage operations have eliminated many of the snags and provided numerous access roads. Nevertheless, much remains to be done to fireproof the land prior to restocking.

The economic future of the Portland area and the state is to a great extent dependent upon the re-establishment of its timber resources and the maintenance of forest lands in productive condition. The Portland area has not yet felt the full loss of payrolls and trade that will eventually result from the Tillamook Burn inasmuch as salvage operations made possible by present abnormal market conditions have led to the recovery of a substantial amount of usable timber.

The area in western Oregon in which most of the state forest lands lie is considered by foresters to be among the most productive timber growing areas in the world. There is every expectation that state funds spent on reforestation can be fully recovered from the sale of timber. These expenditures may, therefore, be regarded as a public investment. Every year lost in re-establishing the state's forest resources defers by that much
the realization of these benefits. Reforestation also results in conservation of the soil, protection of watersheds, and recreational and scenic values which cannot be overlooked.

PAST EFFORTS

Repeated efforts have been made over a number of years to establish an adequate state program of reforestation. Following the third Tillamook fire of 1945, the Governor appointed a special committee to recommend a program of state action. The majority of the committee recommended financing of the reforestation program by issuance of general obligation bonds which would be supported by a general property tax. The Governor, however, accepted the minority report of the committee and recommended to the legislature the financing of the program by the levy of a severance tax on cut timber.

The 1947 legislature divided almost evenly upon the method of financing. It finally levied a small severance tax to support a forestry research program and enacted the present referendum measure to finance reforestation by a bond issue supported by a general property tax. The City Club’s Forestry Committee reported on the proposed severance tax bill at the time it was under consideration in 1947.

Your committee has not attempted to reach any conclusions with respect to the broader questions of the adequacy of the presently proposed measure to accomplish a comprehensive forestry program, or the desirable method of financing such a program.

ANALYSIS OF THE MEASURE

Against this background of the urgent need for reforestation and the long efforts to initiate a state program, the present committee was inclined to resolve all reasonable doubts that might arise with respect to the merits of the proposed measure in favor of the bill. Unfortunately, however, several serious deficiencies in the drafting of the bill soon became apparent.

To facilitate this analysis, the proposed constitutional amendment is quoted in full below:

“Section 1.
1. The credit of the state may be loaned and indebtedness incurred in an amount which shall not exceed at any one time 3/4 of 1 per cent of the assessed valuation of all the taxable property in the state, to provide funds for forest rehabilitation and reforestation and for the acquisition, management, and development of lands for such purposes.
2. So long as any such indebtedness shall remain outstanding, the funds derived from the sale, exchange, or use of said lands, and from the disposal of products therefrom, shall be applied only in the liquidation of such indebtedness.
3. Bonds or other obligations issued pursuant hereto may be renewed or refunded.
4. An ad valorem tax outside the limitation imposed by Section 11, Article XI, of this Constitution shall be levied annually upon all the taxable property in the state of Oregon, in sufficient amount to provide for the payment of such indebtedness and the interest thereon.
5. The legislative assembly may provide other revenues to supplement or replace the said tax levies.
6. The legislature shall enact legislation to carry out the provisions hereof.
7. This amendment shall supersede all constitutional provisions in conflict herewith.”

The following are the principal points which gave concern to the committee:

1. The first sentence provides no clear indication of whether the amount of the bond issue authorized is to cover the entire program of reforestation or whether the ceiling amount of bonds authorized may be issued annually. Three-quarters of one percent of the present assessed value of taxable property in the state of Oregon is something in excess of $10 million. This is within the range of estimates of the total cost of the proposed reforestation program for presently held state lands. On the other hand, it would appear that the total authorized amount of bonds may be issued annually because of the language limiting the bond issue to the specified amount outstanding “at any one time” and the later language discussed below which requires that the indebtedness be retired annually. It would therefore appear that the state may incur an indebtedness of as much as $10 million per year so long as the money is utilized for the purposes indicated. This is a needlessly large authorization and one that may be subject to legislative abuse.

It may be noted that there is nothing in the statement of purpose to preclude the expenditure of state funds on private lands. This may or may not be desirable but to
avoid ambiguity the purposes for which funds may be expended might have been more clearly stated.

2. The third sentence permits the refunding or renewal of bonds. This conflicts with the sentence that immediately follows which requires the annual levy of an ad valorem tax in sufficient amount "to provide for the payment of such indebtedness".

3. The fourth sentence of the proposed constitutional amendment requires the annual levy of an ad valorem tax sufficient to provide for the payment of the indebtedness and the interest thereon. This sentence is susceptible of no other interpretation than that the indebtedness must be repaid annually. The levy of an annual tax sufficient to repay the indebtedness and interest is mandatory. The conflict with the previous provision that bonds may be renewed and refunded has been noted. The mandatory property tax levy is also in conflict with the permissive provision in sentence five which would allow the legislature to provide "other revenues to supplement or replace tax levies".

4. The fifth sentence reads: "The legislative assembly may provide other revenues to supplement or replace said tax levies." There would seem to be no occasion for the use of alternative sources of revenues because of the mandatory ad valorem tax levy. There is, furthermore, no restriction on the kind of levy which may be made by the legislature. Conceivably any kind of tax might be imposed. This possibility is suggested by the last sentence which provides that "this amendment shall supersede all constitutional provisions in conflict herewith".

The amendment, as drafted, will necessarily invite extensive judicial interpretation by reason of its several ambiguities. The reality of protracted litigation appears imminent if, for example, bonds are issued for a longer term than one year, or if the annual tax levy is adequate to provide for the retirement of the entire indebtedness outstanding, or if resort is made to other taxes or sources of revenue, etc. It has also been suggested that resort might be made to income tax revenues as an offset to the ad valorem tax levy provided for in this measure. This would constitute an additional source of uncertainty and possible litigation. It is also conceivable that the absence of a more adequate statement of the purpose for which the funds may be expended can create uncertainty that may lead either to abuse or to resort to the courts for interpretation.

CONCLUSIONS

The committee is impressed with the need for the early establishment of an adequate state program for reforestation state lands. The limitations of this particular bill appear to be of such magnitude, however, that in the opinion of the committee, they cannot be disregarded. It appears to the committee to be dangerous for the public to place its reliance upon a measure which has such pronounced weaknesses as to invite litigation.

RECOMMENDATION

Your committee is, therefore, constrained to recommend to the City Club that it go on record as opposing House Joint Resolution No. 24.

Respectfully submitted,

KENNETH R. COCHRAN
DAVID FAIN
CLARENCE RICHEN
JAMES C. WALLACE
WARREN MARPLE, Chairman

Approved October 11, 1948, by Nelson C. Hazeltine, Section Chairman, Legislation and Elections for transmittal to the Board of Governors.

Received October 18, 1948, by the Board of Governors and ordered published and submitted to the membership for discussion and action.
PROHIBITING SALMON FISHING IN COLUMBIA RIVER WITH FIXED APPLIANCES

PURPOSE: Making it unlawful to construct or maintain in waters of Columbia river or tributaries, any pound net, fish trap, fish wheel, scow fish wheel, setnet, weir, drag seine, whip seine, or other fixed appliance, for catching salmon, salmon trout or steelhead; defining a setnet and seine. Excepting state and national government in catching fish for propagation or scientific purposes, and Indians under federal regulation. Providing penalties for violations, and subjecting all unlawful gear and appliances to condemnation and sale; proceeds and fines arising from violations to be paid to state treasurer for benefit of state fish commission.

318—YES I vote for the proposed law.
319—NO I vote against the proposed law.

To the Board of Governors of the City Club of Portland:
The committee, appointed to consider the proposed bill to outlaw the use of fixed fishing gear, i.e., set nets, traps and seines, on the Columbia river, submits the following report:

SCOPE OF INQUIRY
This bill prohibits the use of set nets, traps and seines on the Columbia river and its tributaries. Its practical effect would be to limit commercial fishing on the river to the use of Gill nets. Your committee considered the scope of the inquiry to be:

"Whether the elimination of set nets, traps and seines as commercial fishing gear in the Columbia river would conserve the Columbia river fishing resources by increasing the escapement of fish to the spawning grounds."

Related problems were also considered, but the foregoing was the basis for evaluating the merits of the proposed legislation.

PROONENTS ARGUMENTS
The measure is sponsored officially by Charles T. Henne of Tidewater, Oregon, and Charles E. Neimela of Astoria, Oregon, members of the Columbia River Fishermen's Protective Association. The arguments advanced in favor of the bill may be summarized as follows:

1. The elimination of set nets, traps and seines on the Columbia river will conserve the Columbia river fishery resources by (a) increasing the escapement of fish and (b) by making better regulation of commercial fishing on the river possible.
2. The elimination of fixed gear will benefit sports fishing by permitting a greater escapement of sports fish.
3. The elimination of fixed gear will abolish a special monopoly which has successfully opposed efforts to conserve the Columbia river fishing resources.
4. The elimination of fixed gear will coordinate fishing regulations with those established in the state of Washington.

EVALUATION OF ARGUMENTS
As a preface, two facts should be noted. The first is the status of the four types of salmon runs that occur annually on the Columbia river. The two spring runs, namely, the blueback and spring Chinook, are badly depleted and are nearing the vanishing point. The two fall runs, namely, the chum and fall Chinook, are not only maintaining themselves but show evidence of increasing.

The second fact relates to the seasonal operation of the various types of gear. Fixed gear is used almost exclusively during the fall run, when the water is clear, to fish for chum and fall Chinook salmon. Gill nets, on the other hand, fish all of the runs and are most effective during the critical spring run when the mesh is less visible.

1. CONSERVATION OF FISHING RESOURCES.
In 1935 the state of Washington outlawed the use of fixed gear. This afforded an opportunity for evaluating the effect of such legislation, with the consequence that a number of studies have been made of this problem during the interim. The results of these studies were released in June of this year in a report by the Oregon Fish Commission entitled, "The Effects on Salmon Populations of the Partial Elimination of Fixed Gear on the Columbia River in 1935." This report was prepared by D. R. Johnson, Dr.
W. M. Chapman and R. W. Schoning. Messrs. Johnson and Schoning are with the Oregon Fish Commission. Dr. Chapman was with the University of Washington, Department of Fisheries, while preparing this study, but is now with the United States Department of State.

This study developed the fact that since 1935 over 70% of all fish caught on the Columbia river were taken by gill nets; that under 20% were taken by seines, traps and set nets and that the remainder were taken by other means. It is to be noted, therefore, that this law concerns itself with only 20% of the commercial catch on the Columbia river. Your committee realizes that fixed gear take about 45% of the steelhead caught while gill nets take approximately 40%, and Indian dip-nets take the remainder.

The annual catch by types of gear is set out graphically in Figure 1. Figures II and III present similar information on a poundage and percentage basis. (Reproduced from the Fish Commission’s Report of June 1948).

The Fish Commission study shows that the elimination of fixed gear does not increase the escapement of fish but simply increases the size of the catch by the remaining types of gear. The report states:

“While there is little doubt that certain components of the Columbia river salmon populations, particularly the spring Chinook and blueback, are in dire need of protection, it is equally evident that the elimination of any one form of gear has not, and probably will not provide that protection. Fishery regulations designed to increase the escapement must operate on all gear used to take salmon during their entire life cycle in both fresh and salt water.”

To these facts should be added the further fact that fixed gear is not used to any appreciable extent to fish the runs that are in need of protection, namely, the blueback and spring Chinook runs.

There is, therefore, no evidence that elimination of fixed gear will conserve the Columbia river fishing resources by increasing the escapement of fish to the spawning grounds.

2. SPORTS FISHING.

If the elimination of one type of gear simply increases the total catch of the remaining gear by a proportionate amount, then it would appear that sports fishing will not be appreciably benefited by the measure.

However, the proponents of the bill argue that fixed gear of necessity uses a small mesh and therefore will catch all types and sizes of fish, including steelhead, jack salmon and sea run cutthroat. The mesh sizes of gill nets, on the other hand, can be varied and therefore if fixed gear is eliminated then gill netters, whom the proponents assert are more conservation-minded than fixed gear operators, would be willing to support regulation that would prohibit the use of gill nets with small mesh.

This argument is weak since (1) although traps and seines use small mesh and take small fish, including steelhead, Oregon’s 1947 Session Laws, Chapter 438, vests adequate control over commercial fishing in the Oregon Fish Commission. The Commission has authority to regulate fishing gear, to open and close seasons, streams, areas of rivers, etc., to prohibit the use of gill nets with small mesh and to decree larger mesh for fixed gear. In addition, the Oregon State Legislature has the authority to decree specific fish as game fish just as the State of Washington has done. (2) The representatives of the Fish Commission, whom the committee interviewed, advised that selective fishing of the type proposed by the proponents would be biologically unsound. It was pointed out that from a biological point of view it is better to catch all sizes of fish, including the jack salmon, rather than catch only the large fish. It was stated that the jack salmon, which is a precocious but dwarfed male, will fertilize eggs and it is believed that if selective fishing were practiced by taking only the larger fish, in time the size of the fish would decline, since the “runts” were being protected and thereby selected as breeding stock. It was also pointed out that the number of trout caught by commercial fishing gear is insignificant and that the steelhead could be protected by other means. One method of doing this would be to declare steelhead a sports fish and to regulate the size of mesh or gill and set nets and to require trap operators to set steelhead free. (Contrary to the popular conception, fish caught in traps are not injured and therefore could be released without harm; whereas fish caught in gill nets are frequently injured.)

3. MONOPOLY.

The proponents further argue that the operators of fixed gear enjoy a special monopoly which should be abolished. This argument is premised upon the fact that there are only
Figure 1. Percentage of Total Annual Catch of Columbia River Chinook Salmon Taken by Various Types of Gear, 1928 through 1946.
TABLE 1. Annual Production in Pounds of Chinook Salmon in the Columbia River by Each Type of Gear, 1928 through 1946

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gill Net</th>
<th>Set Net</th>
<th>Trap</th>
<th>Seine</th>
<th>Dip Net</th>
<th>Fish Wheel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>9,559,285</td>
<td>191,023</td>
<td>2,514,071</td>
<td>3,360,747</td>
<td>81,663</td>
<td>266,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>9,199,633</td>
<td>254,822</td>
<td>2,411,363</td>
<td>3,080,457</td>
<td>302,479</td>
<td>194,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>10,486,492</td>
<td>126,486</td>
<td>2,639,565</td>
<td>2,785,097</td>
<td>407,811</td>
<td>173,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>12,723,561</td>
<td>188,955</td>
<td>2,713,748</td>
<td>3,591,697</td>
<td>708,588</td>
<td>200,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>10,583,929</td>
<td>47,168</td>
<td>2,396,091</td>
<td>2,156,578</td>
<td>199,148</td>
<td>449,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>12,016,294</td>
<td>188,546</td>
<td>2,553,194</td>
<td>2,313,988</td>
<td>729,105</td>
<td>478,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>10,793,000</td>
<td>90,800</td>
<td>2,939,900</td>
<td>3,693,800</td>
<td>410,000</td>
<td>195,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>11,068,789</td>
<td>62,500</td>
<td>403,100</td>
<td>2,168,500</td>
<td>1,424,966</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>11,185,803</td>
<td>74,400</td>
<td>472,100</td>
<td>2,275,817</td>
<td>1,536,461</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>13,634,940</td>
<td>32,700</td>
<td>576,618</td>
<td>2,844,616</td>
<td>1,493,052</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>8,969,907</td>
<td>33,152</td>
<td>468,226</td>
<td>1,784,885</td>
<td>1,311,972</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>9,586,642</td>
<td>51,137</td>
<td>633,785</td>
<td>2,133,144</td>
<td>1,058,424</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>8,921,500</td>
<td>143,184</td>
<td>634,574</td>
<td>2,450,215</td>
<td>1,616,510</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>15,491,002</td>
<td>197,444</td>
<td>801,340</td>
<td>3,206,586</td>
<td>3,038,844</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>12,651,776</td>
<td>182,797</td>
<td>688,448</td>
<td>2,506,858</td>
<td>2,467,197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>7,710,244</td>
<td>111,484</td>
<td>473,119</td>
<td>1,821,214</td>
<td>1,545,779</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>10,497,853</td>
<td>146,847</td>
<td>552,028</td>
<td>1,844,604</td>
<td>1,159,113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>9,679,133</td>
<td>173,009</td>
<td>596,171</td>
<td>1,198,767</td>
<td>887,276</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>9,566,419</td>
<td>212,369</td>
<td>593,453</td>
<td>1,847,340</td>
<td>1,760,219</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Small landings made after 1935 which were listed (probably erroneously) as taken by "set line" have been omitted, as have insignificant landings listed as "miscellaneous". There have been similar omissions for some of the other species. These are included in the totals, however, in subsequent tables.

TABLE 2. Percentage of Total Catch of Chinook Salmon on the Columbia River Taken by Each Type of Gear, 1928 through 1946

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gill Net</th>
<th>Set Net</th>
<th>Trap</th>
<th>Seine</th>
<th>Dip Net</th>
<th>Fish Wheel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the whole period under consideration (1928 through 1946), fish wheels were permitted to operate only on the Washington side from 1928 through 1934. That gear was responsible for about two per cent of the take during those years.
a limited number of trap and seine sites on the river and that in issuing an annual license for traps and seines a preference is given to the operator occupying a site. This is hardly a monopoly in the ordinary sense of the word, in view of the fact that traps and seines take only 20% of the total catch.

Indeed, this bill would seem to establish a monopoly by the gill netters rather than by the operators of fixed gear. In fact, the opponents of the bill argue, its passage would create a state-sponsored monopoly in the real sense of the word since under the law only gill netters would be allowed to fish and since under existing practice only fishermen belonging to the Columbia River Fishermen’s Protective Association fish with gill nets on the river.

CONCLUSIONS
(a) Passage of this measure will not appreciably conserve or develop the Columbia river salmon fishery, and
(b) It will give the public a false sense of having solved the problem of reestablishing the spring Chinook and chum salmon runs and thereby will hinder the adoption of effective conservation measures by strict and adequate enforcement.
(c) It is confiscatory of investments in land and equipment owned by fixed gear operators.

RECOMMENDATIONS
We, therefore, recommend against the passage of this bill.

ADDITIONAL SUGGESTIONS
On the basis of the committee’s investigation, it wishes to make these further suggestions to conserve the Columbia River Fishery:
1. That longer closed fishing seasons be adopted for all types of gear during the critical fish runs, and that staggered closure areas be practiced as in this 1948 season.
2. That steelhead be declared a sports fish; or, as an alternative, be partially protected by requiring larger mesh on the gill nets and by requiring trap and seine operators to release steelhead caught by them.
3. That adequate funds be made available to permit effective enforcement of existing laws regulating commercial fishing, and that enough state police officers be assigned to patrol the entire fishing ground with proper equipment.
4. That the State law provide heavy penalties for violations.

Respectfully submitted,

John E. Daly
Raymond Kell
Harold King
Kenneth Kraemer
Hobart Mitchell
Arthur Markewitz, Chairman

Approved October 15, 1948, by Nelson C. Hazeltine, Section Chairman, Legislation and Elections for transmittal to the Board of Governors.

Received October 18, 1948, by the Board of Governors and ordered published and submitted to the membership for discussion and action.

MINORITY REPORT
To the Board of Governors of the City Club of Portland:
The undersigned submits herewith his minority report on the proposed initiative measure to outlaw the use of fixed fishing gear in the Columbia river.
I disagree with the recommendation of the majority report against passage of said initiative measure.
I agree with the recommendations contained in the committee's report concerning further regulation of the Columbia River Fishery, with the additional suggestions and recommendations contained at the conclusion of this minority report.
Some of the reasons for which I disagree with the recommendation of the majority of the committee favoring the defeat of the proposed measure are as follows:
1. There is a trend in the direction of eliminating fixed gear. This is evidenced by the 1935 law of the state of Washington and by the recent action of the electorate in the
Territory of Alaska recommending to Congress that fish traps be eliminated from the streams of Alaska.

2. The majority report states that fixed gear accounts for only about 20 per cent of the total catch of the Columbia River Fishery. This statement in itself may be accurate, but the implications are very misleading. The facts are that fixed gear takes a much more disproportionate share of the catch. The problem should be viewed not as a percentage of the total catch of the Columbia River Fishery, but as a percentage of the catch of the Oregon part of the Columbia River Fishery, since there is no fixed gear in Washington. The Fish Commission report itself shows that fixed gear takes about 30% of the commercial catch on the Oregon side. (See Table 3, page 14 of the report.) Also, since the fixed gear works only during the fall run it is evident that fixed gear take a much larger percentage than 30 per cent of the fall run, when the steelhead and other sport fish are running.

3. Elimination of fixed gear would greatly assist the run of steelhead and other small sport fish, such as cutthroats and jack salmon. My information is that the fish trap located near the mouth of the Sandy river, mentioned in the next paragraph, itself is reputed to have taken as much as 2,000 pounds of steelhead in a day during the heavy steelhead run. The report of the Oregon Fish Commission, relied upon by the majority report, shows that elimination of fixed gear on the Washington side after 1935 permitted a large escapement of steelhead on the Washington side. For instance, it shows that the take of steelhead on the Oregon side since 1935 has increased. But on the Washington side in 1934 there was a take of approximately 1,300,000 pounds of steelhead by all types of fishing gear. In 1935 the take of steelhead on the Washington side was reduced from approximately 1,300,000 pounds of steelhead to approximately 400,000 pounds of steelhead. Since 1935 the take of steelhead on the Washington side has averaged about 30 percent of the take before elimination of fixed gear.*

The same trend of escapement of silver salmon, chums and blueback salmon is shown on the same report on the Washington side after 1935.

4. The fixed gear in the Columbia river to be productive has to be placed in areas where it blocks off the bulk of the run of sea-run fish. An instance of this is the fish trap located just below the mouth of the Sandy River, which blocks off the entire Sandy river run when in operation.

5. Another bad feature of fishtraps and fixed gear is that, since the fixed gear are located close to shore, they catch a large number of “tulles” ripe for spawning, which are not good for eating. Such a catch is pure waste, since the fish are not good for eating, and their spawn is lost.

6. Anyone familiar with sport fishing for steelhead, cutthroats and bluebacks knows that the steelhead fishing on the Washington side (sport fishing) has increased since 1935 when fixed gear was eliminated in the State of Washington. Now a fisherman can go to such streams on the Washington side as the Lewis river, Kalam river and other rivers and catch steelhead. Steelhead fishing on the Oregon side in streams running into the Columbia River has practically ceased.

7. The implication in the majority report is that the spring run of salmon is becoming depleted because of gill netting. In my opinion, such a conclusion is unwarranted, because it only shows a part of the picture. Of course, gill net fishermen take salmon during the spring run. But the spring run traditionally was a run that spawns in the higher reaches of the Columbia and in streams such as Eagle Creek on the Oregon side. Construction of Grand Coulee Dam has effectively barred the run which spawned in the higher reaches of the Columbia river. Construction of Bonneville Dam has cut down the spawn in the middle reaches of the Columbia river and has eliminated many spawning streams. Therefore, the depletion of the spring run is due to many other factors besides commercial fishing.

8. The majority report minimizes the idea of monopoly in fixed gear. However, the monopoly is a real one because of the limited number of effective fixed gear locations and the apparently correct report that practically all fixed gear locations are controlled either directly or indirectly by one company.

9. When one deals with the actions and biological tendencies of fish in deep streams, such as the Columbia river, one is almost forced to an opinion which can be neither proven nor disproven. Unfortunately, many of the conclusions based upon such reasoning in the past have proved faulty. There is no reason to suppose that the majority statement that allowing jack salmon to escape would be biologically unsound is any more scientific than many other theories heretofore advanced by people who have an interest in escaping

*Table 15 of Oregon Fish Commission Report at page 26.
further conservation. As a matter of fact, the opinion that jacks fertilize eggs is a new one, as jacks are merely precocious males who enter fresh water before the normal four or five year span.

10. Regardless of any theories advanced by commercial fishing interests, either those of the fixed gear group or the floating gear group, the fact remains that the salmon, steelhead and sea-run trout are becoming depleted. Therefore, it would seem that the so-called conservation measures taken in the past have not been effective and that other measures are indicated, including the elimination of fixed gear.

11. A very potent reason for eliminating fixed gear in the Oregon side of the Columbia Fishery is to make the regulations on both sides of the river coincide. This lends itself to effective regulation. On the Washington side fixed gear has been eliminated and steelhead has been declared to be a sport fish. It is widely reported on the river that when Washington commercial fishermen catch steelhead in their gill nets they sell the steelhead on the Oregon side.

12. Undoubtedly in the proposed measure one group of commercial fishermen is set off against another group. But such a situation is of advantage to the public at large. A restriction of fixed gear is inevitable. It should be eliminated now while there is still a chance to perpetuate sea-run fish in the Columbia river.

13. Every time an attempt is made to pass some measure to conserve the sea-run fish in the Columbia river, the argument is advanced that the particular measure is not a good measure, but there are other steps that could be taken to help conservation. When it is time to adopt the alternative measure suggested by the opposition, we find the people who have suggested the alternative measures just as strongly opposed to the alternative measures.

RECOMMENDATION

I, therefore, recommend as follows:
That the City Club go on record as favoring the passage of the initiative measure to eliminate fixed gear in the Columbia river.

ADDITIONAL SUGGESTIONS

1. That the City Club study the possibility of legislation or administrative action to accomplish the following purposes:
(a) Declaring steelhead a sport fish;
(b) Adopting regulations providing for a longer closed commercial fishing season during the runs of fish in the Columbia river;
(c) Making available funds to permit effective enforcement of existing laws dealing with the commercial fishing in the Columbia River Fishery;
(d) Promulgating of regulations by the Oregon Fish Commission to increase the size of the mesh of all commercial fishing gear;
(e) Providing that in the event of a conviction in a court of law of a commercial fisherman for violation of fishing laws, it be mandatory on the part of the Oregon Fish Commission to revoke the fishing permit of such an operator for a period at least as long as the current calendar year.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN J. COUGHLIN

Approved October 15, 1948, by Nelson C. Hazeltine, Section Chairman, Legislation and Elections for transmittal to the Board of Governors.
Received October 18, 1948, by the Board of Governors and ordered published and submitted to the membership for discussion and action.
Certificate of Necessity for Levying a Tax in Excess of the
Six Per Cent Constitutional Limitation
(Pursuant to Chapter 477, Oregon Laws 1947)

Shall the State Tax Commission be authorized to levy a tax amounting to $6,430,069.10 in excess of the limitation imposed by Section 11, Article XI, of the Constitution of the State of Oregon, to meet appropriations and expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, to be offset by funds derived from taxes on or measured by net income?

320—YES  I vote for the proposed levy.
321—NO  I vote against the proposed levy.

To the Board of Governors of the City Club of Portland:

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The state's authorized expenditures for the fiscal year 1948-49 exceed miscellaneous income by $13,627,740.61. A property tax levied by the state amounting to $7,137,671.51, the maximum allowed under the constitutional 6% limitation, was immediately offset by transferring an equal amount from income tax receipts. Thus, actually no property tax will be collected for this purpose.

The electorate is now asked to approve a special tax levy in the amount of $6,490,069.10 to correct the deficit in authorized expenditures. If the special tax levy is approved the $6,490,069.10 will be immediately offset by an equal amount transferred from income tax receipts.

The "surplus" in the income tax receipts account is estimated by the State Treasurer to be $53,000,000, and the anomaly of voting a special tax levy when such a "surplus" exists arises from the fact that income tax receipts may be used only to offset property tax levies. Thus, there must first be a property tax levy to be so offset and since the state has exhausted its levy within the constitutional 6% limitation, only the voters can authorize a special levy for the balance required.

The necessity for the special tax levy appears to be a mere bookkeeping technicality, but your committee wishes to point out that it is the logical result of the application of the principal of limitation on expenditures embodied in our state constitution known as the "constitutional 6% limitation." This bookkeeping technicality has been followed in Oregon for the past nineteen years and was, in effect, confirmed by the state supreme court in August of this year. This money will actually be spent and, if our state were not so fortunate as to have a substantial balance in its income tax receipts account, the money would also be levied and collected from property taxpayers.

Your committee has not investigated the necessity or desirability of the expenditures which caused this measure to be proposed, since the responsibility for such investigation is vested in the state legislature. It seems sufficient to find that such expenditures have been duly authorized and will be made.

CONCLUSION

It seems pointless to place the state's finances in a technical deficit position when it has ample funds on hand, merely because current expenditures have increased more than the 6% envisioned by the constitution.

RECOMMENDATION

Your committee, therefore, recommends that the City Club go on record as approving the measure.

Respectfully submitted,

PAUL BOLEY
HARRY BURNSIDE
DON A. ELLIS
MORRIS LITTLE
T. F. MAGINNIS
JOHN B. MCKENNA
VOLNEY PRATT, Chairman

Approved October 11, 1948, by Nelson C. Hazeltine, Section Chairman, Legislation and Elections for transmittal to the Board of Governors.

Received October 18, 1948, by the Board of Governors and ordered published and submitted to the membership for discussion and action.
AN ACT TO AMEND THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND
IN ORDER TO PERMIT STREET VACATIONS

PURPOSE: An Act to amend the Charter of the City of Portland so as to permit street vacations within a distance of 2000 feet from any meander line of any navigable water or 1000 feet from any railroad depot or terminal yard when necessary or in the public interest for use by the United States, the State of Oregon, or political subdivision or any governmental agency of either, for a public purpose other than street use. Shall the Charter be so amended?

504—YES  I vote for the amendment.
505—NO I vote against the amendment.

To the Board of Governors of the City Club of Portland:

Your committee has made a study of the proposed amendment to the Charter of the City of Portland, Section 1-107, Inalienability of Public Places, and reports as follows:

The charter provision as it now stands is the old Zigler Amendment, which was enacted in 1913 and which provides, among other provisions, that the City Council shall not vacate any public street within 2000 feet from any meander line of any navigable water, or within 1000 feet from any railroad depot or terminal yard, except in such instances where the City of Portland owns the property on both sides of a street, and then in such instance the street may be vacated by a vote of four-fifths of the members of the Council. No provision was made for vacating streets for use by the state of Oregon or the United States. The purported purpose of the Zigler Amendment was to prevent railroads in particular from buying property immediately adjacent to railroad depots, and terminal yards, or lands adjacent to navigable water and obtaining vacation of streets, thus denying the public access to waterfront areas.

The United States Government desires to increase the facilities of the Main Post Office by adding an annex to the present facilities located at Broadway and Glisan Streets. The United States Government has arranged to purchase the private property, now vacant, bounded by N.W. 8th Street, N.W. Glisan Street, N.W. Park Street, and N.W. Hoyt Street. The Post Office also desires that N.W. 8th Street be vacated by the City of Portland in order that the new structure may cover this entire area. Northwest 8th Street dead-ends at Hoyt Street, and little use is made of this street at the present time except for postal delivery purposes.

The Post Office Department has pointed out to the committee that the amount of their business transacted in the City of Portland has increased five times since 1940, and that the City of Portland is a clearing point for much of the parcel post destined for Portland and other towns and cities in this area.

The proposed site of the new annex is particularly desirable to the Post Office Department in view of the close proximity of the proposed annex to railroad facilities, and also because adequate loading facilities can be incorporated in the new structure on Hoyt Street, where there will be very little interference with other vehicular traffic.

The amendment is necessary, not only for the immediate purpose of increasing postal facilities for the City of Portland but also for the elimination of restrictions that no longer serve the best interests of the city's growth. To be sure the United States Government could exercise its right of eminent domain for the acquisition of this or other property, but such a procedure is undesirable, because it is likely to lead to lengthy legal involvements and delays.

No opposition to this amendment was found to exist. The City Planning Commission, along with all interested property owners, was in favor of the amendment. The concensus is that the proposed amendment is highly desirable and that it will not essentially affect the original purpose of the Zigler amendment, as a street vacated under the terms of the proposed act must be used for a public purpose by a governmental agency of the United States, or of the State of Oregon.

Your committee therefore recommends that the City Club go on record as approving the amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

W. O. Knox  ALBERT MUSICK
FRED C. INKSTER  RICHARD CROW
BEN BERNHARD, Chairman

Approved October 12, 1948, by Nelson C. Hazeltine, Section Chairman, Legislation and Elections for transmittal to the Board of Governors.

Received October 18, 1948, by the Board of Governors and ordered published and submitted to the membership for discussion and action.
AMENDMENT TO PORTLAND'S CITY CHARTER TO PROVIDE
FIRE EQUIPMENT AND BUILDING FUND

PURPOSE: An act to amend Portland's city charter to provide for a fire equipment and building
fund to be used for the purchase of new fire equipment to replace 21 pieces of equipment 20 to 35
years old and to purchase property for, construct and equip modern fire stations to replace Engine
Houses Nos. 1, 2, 13, 19, 21 and 26; directing the levying therefor of a special tax for the years 1949,
1950, 1951, 1952 and 1953 in excess of constitutional limitation of not to exceed one-half mill on each
dollar of assessed valuation and directing that proceeds from the salvage of obsolete fire equipment
be placed in such fund.

506—YES I vote for the amendment.

507—NO I vote against the amendment.

To the Board of Governors of the City Club of Portland:

In considering this ballot measure your committee was confronted with two basic
questions:

1. Are the proposed expenditures needed and reasonable?
2. Are the proposed methods of financing satisfactory?

NEED FOR THE EXPENDITURE

In our investigation, we have been unable to find anybody who has questioned the
need for a substantial expenditure on new fire equipment and fire stations. The average
age of all motive equipment of the Portland Fire Bureau is 19 years. The bill under con-
sideration would provide funds to replace at least 20
are over 20 years old and 9 of which are over 25 years old, including one hook and ladder
truck and one hose truck purchased before World War I. It is estimated that the cost of
replacement of these 20 pieces of equipment would amount to approximately $384,000
or an average expenditure over the next 5 years of approximately $77,000 per year.
Assuming 20 years as the average life of equipment, this amount is approximately what
one would expect to be spent annually on the automotive equipment of the Fire Bureau
which has a current replacement cost value of approximately $1,575,000.

During the last 10 years (1939-1947) the Fire Bureau has spent $160,000 for the
purchase of new automotive apparatus, an annual average outlay of only $16,000. One
of the principal reasons for this low figure was the inability to secure equipment. Funds
accumulated for this purpose were returned to the general fund where they were urgently
needed for other functions of city government greatly expanded under the pressure of a
war-time growth that has continued uninterrupted in the post war period.

The fire stations that are to be replaced are probably in even poorer condition than
the equipment. Most of them were constructed for horse drawn equipment and are poorly
located for the modern standpoint. Included in the proposed building program is a new
headquarters building, the cost of which will run several times the cost of any of the
other station houses. Present architect's plans now under consideration call for an ex-
penditure of nearly $700,000. Your committee had some reservations on the amount of
the expenditure on the headquarters building at this time, although its construction will
replace three downtown stations now in use.

However, it should be understood that passage of this charter amendment carries no
obligation on the council to authorize construction of the headquarters building along
lines now under consideration.

In spite of the condition of equipment and buildings, the Portland Fire Bureau has
always had an outstanding record, is nationally recognized, and today Portland is one
of only two cities on the Pacific Coast enjoying a Class 2 rating. An examination of the
methods of rating and the scoring procedure of the National Board of Fire Underwriters
indicates that this high rating has been maintained by means of a high over-all efficiency
on the part of the Fire Bureau in the face of the certain very definite handicaps, principally:
(a) The absence of alleys which increases the difficulties in fire fighting, and (b) the large
number of old structures. While your committee has not felt it proper to give too much
consideration to this factor, it should be mentioned that there is a definite possibility
that Portland will lose its Class 2 rating unless equipment in excess of 20 years old is
soon replaced.

The Commissioner of Public Affairs has estimated that such a drop in rating would
mean an extra expenditure in fire insurance premiums of $1,000,000 annually. It should
be added that such a change in classification is possible even with the passage of the present charter amendment because certain factors taken into consideration by the Board of Underwriters, such as the absence of alleys and the age of structures, are not subject to the control of the Fire Bureau.

METHOD OF FINANCING

The principal objection to this charter amendment, aside from the general reluctance of taxpayers to vote themselves any increase in tax payments, arises from the method of financing proposed. Students of government will point out that a city charter is no place for the inclusion of detail. They likewise insist that the type of action proposed in the charter amendment can be accomplished by proper financial management, the basic principles of which are violated when the charter or constitution of a public body is amended to provide for the expenditure of funds for specific purposes for several years beyond the regular fiscal year. They agree that the principal reason for the procedure proposed in the charter amendment is that it is difficult, and often impossible, to secure these additional funds, by voting an increase in the general fund from which the needs of the Fire Bureau could be budgeted. Because of this difficulty it has become the practice of many municipalities to obtain funds in excess of the 6% limitation by submitting for approval of the voters levies for specific purposes which are known to have broad popular support.

Most city officials frankly agree with this criticism but point out that under the handicaps of the 6% limitation, no other practical procedure is open to them. They point to the fact that war years presented a particularly difficult problem because many normal purchases were impossible due to the lack of any supply whatsoever. Now, years later, in their attempt to make up for postponed maintenance and replacement, they find themselves handicapped by Oregon's 6% constitutional limitation. In view of these peculiar circumstances, the method of financing as proposed in this charter amendment, has become a common practice in Oregon cities.

A combination of bonding and special levy was one other suggested method of financing considered by the council. This was rejected in favor of the method which appears on the ballot. The reasons for adopting the method as presently proposed are not perfectly clear but seem to stem largely from a general preference for a "pay-as-you-go" plan plus a reluctance to vote bonds in a time of general prosperity which frequently become a burden in less fortunate times.

CONCLUSIONS

1. There is a definite need for the new equipment and for the replacement of the six fire stations as proposed in the city charter amendment based on Resolution No. 23722.

2. The proposed expenditures appear to be reasonable. The $384,000 for new motive equipment over a 5-year period is in line with what would be expected for replacement on an investment currently valued at $1,500,000.

3. Since retirement of equipment over 20 years of age, which these proposed expenditures will finance, is one of the important factors considered by the National Board of Fire Underwriters, such retirement is deemed advisable, if Portland is to retain its Class 2 rating.

4. The proposed method of financing is an awkward one which does not conform to accepted principles of good public administration. However, it appears to be one of the few means by which a fast growing community can circumvent the straight jacket imposed by the 6% constitutional limitation.

RECOMMENDATION

Your committee recommends that the City Club go on record as approving the passage of the proposed charter amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

J. ALFRED HALL
RICHARD RITZ
Dwight SWAB
JAMES G. SMITH
FREDERICK ARPKE, Chairman

Approved October 11, 1948, by Nelson C. Hazeltine, Section Chairman, Legislation and Elections for transmittal to the Board of Governors.

Received October 18, 1948, by the Board of Governors and ordered published and submitted to the membership for discussion and action.
ACTION ON CITY CLUB REPORTS, OCTOBER 15th

The report and recommendation of the committee authorized to study the Old Age Pension Act was adopted unanimously by those at the luncheon, October 15, 1948. Vote 311 NO. A substitute motion that the City Club go on record as favoring the Bill Amending the Licensing and Acquisition Provisions of the Hydroelectric Act made and seconded after the original motion to accept the committee's report and recommendation had been offered and seconded, carried by approximately 20 votes of those present at the meeting. Vote 306 YES.

CITIES FILTER COMIC SALES

According to the American Municipal Association, nearly 50 cities have banned the sale of certain comic books that have been declared objectionable by civic groups. Los Angeles and Terre Haute are the first localities during the current flurry of action on comics to pass ordinances to put their bans into effect. Los Angeles county's ordinance prohibits sale of comic books which deal with murder, burglary, kidnapping, arson or assault with deadly weapons while Terre Haute's bans the sale, display, printing and distribution of undesirable comic books. A ten member civic board will grade Terre Haute's comics.

ELECTED TO MEMBERSHIP

CHARLES BRADLEY, M.D.
Associate Professor of Pediatrics and Psychiatry
University of Oregon Medical School
Proposed by Richard M. Steiner

RALPH W. GOLBY, Attorney
Associate with Freed and Failing
Proposed by John C. Failing

NORMAN A. STOLL, General Counsel
Bonneville Power Administration
Proposed by Hall Templeton

PROPOSED FOR MEMBERSHIP

If no objections are received by the Executive Secretary prior to November 6, 1948, the following applicants will be elected:

HAROLD E. FARRIS
General Manager, Stubb's Electric Co.
Proposed by Walter J. Miesen

WILLIAM H. HOLM, C.P.A.
Partner, I. D. Wood & Co.
Proposed by T. F. Maginnis

FLOYD LANDER
Security Salesman, Blyth and Co., Inc.
Proposed by William B. Boone
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