

# Thatcher is no friend, feminists say

By MAUREEN JOHNSON  
The Associated Press

LONDON — The British general election made Margaret Thatcher the first woman government leader in Britain and Europe.

But it also reduced the number of women in the House of Commons from 27 to 19. And to the chagrin of Britain's feminist movement, the victorious Conservative Party's woman leader appointed no women to senior Cabinet posts.

Leaders of Britain's feminist organizations say they like neither Mrs. Thatcher, with her publicly stressed image of housewife as well as politician, nor her right-wing politics with its threat of public spending cuts they claim will be hardest on low-income women.

However, they mourn far more the defeat of several women Labor Party members of Parliament than the fact that only three of Mrs. Thatcher's 65 junior Cabinet ministers are women.

The state-funded Equal Opportunities Commission takes a happier view than militant feminists.

"We are delighted a woman has been appointed to the highest office in the land," says commission spokeswoman Roberta Vincent-Emery. "Given there are hardly any women in Parliament, women are also doing rather well in the new Cabinet. The fact is it seems to be extremely difficult for women to get into politics."

Jenny Earl, director of Rights for Women, one of Britain's sprinkling of feminist movements, feels differently.

"Margaret Thatcher as prime minister does not represent anything progressive as far as we are concerned, and in a sense it could be actually dangerous because she plays on being a housewife," she said.

"She doesn't want to antagonize women or make them feel guilty about not working so she constantly stresses the women's role in the home — one quite evidently she does not fancy for herself.

"Women have always been housewives and mothers. Our fight is to give them opportunities — and equal opportunities — to work.

"If there's anybody left who thinks women are useful only for washing dishes, Mrs. Thatcher's appointment might be a help in influencing them to the contrary, but that's about all."

In the election, more than 150 of the 2,572 candidates were women, and they took their worst beating at the polls in nearly 30 years.

Many ran in districts their parties had no hope of winning. As a result, although they comprised about 6 percent of the candidates, they won only 3 percent of the 635 seats in the House of Commons. Eight Conservatives and 11 Laborites were elected; in the last Commons there were 18 Laborites, 7 Conservatives and 2 Scottish Nationalists.

"It's not surprising there aren't many women Cabinet ministers, they're aren't many women members of Parliament to choose from," says Eileen Fairweather, editorial writer for the feminist magazine Spare Rib.

Ms. Fairweather is critical of Mrs. Thatcher.

"She's not a woman-identified woman. She makes out that if you have ability you can raise the children yourself, do all your own housework and still get on.

"It just isn't true for most women. They don't have nannies, like Mrs. Thatcher had, or rich husbands."

Fairweather believes the new Conservative government's promised cuts in public spending will make it more difficult for working women to get state-subsidized help to care for their young children or old dependents, or to get free abortions on the National Health Service.

In contrast to their American counterparts, women's rights activists in Britain have little influence and concede they are outside the mainstream of politics.

There are no well-known figures and the organizations are small and diversified. They get scant publicity except during sporadic controversies on such issues as abortion.

Feminist groups estimate that there are 35,000 women activists out of a total population of nearly 60 million, with perhaps another 500,000 who have gotten their message.

Most observers consider that Sally Oppenheim is the only woman with a chance of getting a senior post in Mrs. Thatcher's Cabinet in the future. Mrs. Oppenheim, 48, has a businessman husband who is reputed to be a millionaire and three children. Mrs. Thatcher named her Minister for Consumer Affairs, a junior Cabinet post.

The other women junior ministers are a 37-year-old statistician, Lynda Chalker, and a member of the House of Lords, Baroness Young. Both are in ministries where appointments of women are not unusual, education and social services.



TAYLOR JONES/The Charleston Gazette

## Madison's black heritage

Barbara Robinson Shade and her husband, Oscar, are longtime residents of Madison. As the former director of Madison's Headstart program and as an assistant professor of Afro-American Studies at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, she has observed first-hand the development of the black community in Madison.

More than a desire to record a history of the city's black population, Shade said she undertook this project in response to the needs of her students. Coming primarily from urban areas, the black students on the Madison campus indicated to her that they did not feel the same sense of community and unity among the city's black population as in their home towns.

Her own knowledge and research of the city's history, coupled with that of her students, produced a different conclusion — with the appearance of Madison's first black citizen, there came with him a desire to survive and thrive in the community.

This is the first of an eight-part series in which Shade shows that blacks in Madison did not always have an easy time adapting to the white-dominated society. But blacks were able to prosper here, successfully integrating with whites while maintaining their own identity.

Shade is a native of Junction City, Kan., which she describes as being very similar to Madison. She received her bachelor's degree from Pittsburg (Kan.) State University and her master's degree in educational psychology from the UW-Milwaukee. Shade did her post-graduate work on the Madison campus. Before joining the Afro-American



Barbara Robinson Shade

Studies Department here in 1975, she worked with the State Department of Public Instruction.

Her husband is a member of the State Patrol Board and a past president of the Madison Chapter of the NAACP. The Shades have three children.

## The First blacks in Madison were only step above slavery

By BARBARA ROBINSON SHADE

In a color-conscious society such as ours, being the only person of color (or one of a few in a white-oriented group) generates two possible reactions. The nonwhite could be ignored, treated as invisible. Or the person of color becomes a model of his or her race.

In the latter case, that individual may develop heightened sensitivity to looks, overt and covert judgments and assessments of the majority. That person may be asked to explain the views and describe the experiences of an entire race — a race as diverse in opinions, experiences and ideas as in skin color.

Even today, it is difficult for the person of color to deal with those pressures, and during the pre-Civil War period, it was probably even more difficult.

One can only wonder why blacks came to a place like the predominantly white City of Madison. A major factor was that they had little choice about their residence, since they were brought to the city by their "masters." Technically, there were no slaves in Wisconsin; in reality, there were many former slaves who were listed as servants and remained in the homes of their former owners.

It was one such female servant and former slave in the

James Morrison household who became the first black resident in Madison.

James Morrison, his family and his slaves, moved into the Wisconsin Territory in 1827. While residing in Iowa County, he was appointed clerk of probate court. Seeing an opportunity for advancement, Morrison relocated in newly-created Dane County in the Village of Madison, where he worked as clerk and manager of A.A. Bird's general store.

By 1838, Morrison, Bird and James Doty decided to build the American House Hotel, where delegates to the territorial legislature were housed.

With the increase in his financial resources, Morrison moved his family from Iowa County to Madison in 1839. With his family came a female servant, the city's first black resident. Although no information about the woman is available, she apparently remained in Madison until 1845. No further identification of the servant is available.

Blacks who came to Madison between 1836 and 1847 seem to have stayed only long enough to be identified in one census, and not by specific name. In 1846, one black male was listed as a resident of the Madison Hotel, which was owned by Chester Bushnell. In that same year, an

(Continued on Page 20, Col. 1)

## 25 years after Brown vs. the Board, we still have a long way to go

"It is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education. Such an opportunity, where the state has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms."

By VIRGINIA MAYO  
Capital Times Staff Writer

The statements quoted above are from Brown v. Topeka Board of Education, the 1954 U.S. Supreme Court decision that revolutionized racial relations in this country.

The decision has been rightly termed "the most critical civil rights development of this century." The case re-

versed the landmark Plessy vs. Ferguson decision of 1896, which had held that as long as the facilities and accommodations for blacks were "equal," they could constitutionally remain separate.

Not only did the May 17, 1954, decision provide the impetus for the desegregation of schools, it also provided the legal basis for attacking racial segregation in virtually every segment of society.

This week marks the 25th anniversary of that decision. There are some who believe that American society is completely desegregated, to the detriment of the middle-class white majority. Yet many blacks and whites question

whether the goal set forth in the 1954 decision has been accomplished.

Subsequent court cases have further refined the mandate of the 1954 Brown decision. The second Brown case in 1955 required that desegregation of school districts be undertaken "with all deliberate speed." That principle was to be modified by a 1969 high court decision, which called for the termination of "dual school systems at once." Two 1971 cases held that, "In many situations, there will be no remedy for segregated schools other than busing."

The mid-1970s saw desegregation cases involving school districts in Austin, Indianapolis, Omaha, Dayton and

others being decided by the high court. The decisions in those cases and others left many wondering whether the Supreme Court had started a retreat from its long-espoused commitment to the right of school children to a desegregated education.

Two decisions in particular signaled the shift. The first, in 1976, involved an allegation of employment discrimination. The high court ruled that an action found to be racially neutral in intent, even if it has a discriminatory effect, is constitutionally permissible.

The second case, in 1977, involved zoning in Arlington Heights, Ill. The court held that a plaintiff must prove a particular action was designed to discriminate against blacks before the action could be declared invalid.

Has this country turned away from desegregation? What can blacks and other minorities expect 25 years from now?

In a recent U.S. Civil Rights Commission report entitled, "Desegregation of the Nation's Public Schools: A Status Report," it was noted that 47 school districts in the country have not completely desegregated. Many plans haven't been completely implemented, and some do not meet Department of Health, Education and Welfare standards.

Settlement of Milwaukee's desegregation suit is about two weeks old. It provides for fully-integrated teaching staffs and racial balance in all-white schools. The plan still allows for one-third of the black students in the school district to remain in 20 all-black schools.

Lawyers for the plaintiffs have been advising their clients not to appeal Federal Judge John Reynolds' ruling — this despite the fact that some members of the black community are displeased with the plan and the two black representatives on the school board voted against the settlement.

Former School Board President Anthony Busalacchi, the pivot in the settlement vote, cited the following reasons for his support of desegregation plan:

"If board members wanted total integration of the school system, they had the opportunity to do that when they approved the proposed settlement. Both the plaintiffs and the defendants, in their infinite wisdom, saw that 75 percent (desegregation) was the most the system and the city could effectively deal with."

It was a decade before Congress enacted legislation to strengthen the implementation of the Brown decision. Yet recent actions by Congress, most notably an amendment

(Continued on Page 20, Col. 1)

## Who says crime doesn't pay?

By ROGER SIMON  
Chicago Sun-Times News Service

E. Howard Hunt walked past me down the hall and into the television studio. He does not talk, I had been told, to newspapermen. I watched him carry — almost drag — a huge, vinyl suitcase along with him.

Once again, Howard Hunt is on the road.

Once again he is going from TV show to TV show, from speaking appearance to speaking appearance. I had made a promise to myself to stop writing about the Watergate crooks. The reason was simple: Pallid, boring little men, they were not as interesting as an ordinary car thief.

But they will not stop thrusting themselves in front of us, flaunting their crimes, telling us to buy their books and listen to their sad, sad tales.

Perhaps never in history have such inept crooks made so much from their crimes. They came from good homes — Hunt's father was a judge — went to the best schools, lived high and mighty and, when they got caught in the sleaziest of acts, they turned around and became professional victims. Professional victims who know how to make a buck.

HUNT WILL not stop. He has launched yet another media blitz. Nothing is as sad as a man who doesn't know that his fad is over. Two years ago, Hunt was pulling down \$2,000 a speech to tell us how he was right and the rest of the country was wrong.

Hunt, who skulked around the Watergate complex with a

two-way radio shoved down his pants leg, had engineered one of the most bungled burglaries of all time. He had also organized the break-in of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist's office.

But Hunt had an obsession, not just for game, but for money. When the CIA let him know that his career was going nowhere, he hung around so he could get his pension — \$20,000 a year. Then he joined a Republican-connected public relations firm for another \$24,000 and went on the White House payroll for \$100 a day.

A few days after the Watergate break-in, he extorted more than \$200,000 from the White House to keep his mouth shut. He turned his wife into a bagman, carrying White House hush money around the country to other Watergate crooks. And when she died in a plane crash while carrying \$10,000 of it, Hunt collected \$300,000 from United Airlines.

Needless to say, upon release from prison he sold his memoirs for six figures.

While at the White House, no job was too low for Hunt. He began by gathering dirt on Ted Kennedy. He supervised the forging of false State Department telegrams to



E. Howard Hunt

show that John Kennedy had authorized the assassination of the president of Vietnam. He bugged the phones of two New York Times reporters. He went around the country "disguised" in a red fright wig and was once offered the job of poisoning columnist Jack Anderson.

WHEN THERE was a dirty little job to do, the White House knew exactly whom to go to.

And now that it is all over, now that all the publicity has faded and the bucks are harder to come by, he cannot give it up.

In People magazine last week, struggling to keep his name in front of the public, Hunt played his last card. He attacks Richard Nixon, saying Nixon "deceived him."

Apparently there is not even honor among thieves these days.

The article, which mentions none of Hunt's crimes, does mention that Hunt has written a new book and will go on a speaking tour in the fall.

"I cannot escape the feeling that the country I have served for my entire life and which directed me to carry out the Watergate entry is punishing me for doing the very thing it trained and directed me to do," Hunt once said.

According to his twisted code, it is we, the American people, who are guilty, and not Howard Hunt. And the price we must pay, apparently, is having to listen to him.

So he will be on the talk shows and be in the magazines and take one more ride on the media merry-go-round. And I suppose there are those who will pay him \$2,000 to tell us what a tough life he has had.

Who says crime doesn't pay?



# Neighbor is problem — if you look

CHICAGO — An unusual question of etiquette has been raised by two young ladies named Pearl and Liz, who live in an apartment complex in the suburb of West Chicago.

This column occasionally deals with matters of etiquette. It was I who once arbitrated the famous social question: Should a gentleman offer a lady a chew of tobacco?

Anyway, the situation involving Pearl and Liz is this:

They both have ground floor apartments in the complex. And their problem is that they have a neighbor, a young man, whose conduct they consider offensive.

His apartment is between their apartments. Thus, when they visit each other, which they do frequently, they have to walk across his patio and past his parlor window.

And, they say, he makes a practice of sitting in his living room and grinning at them when they walk by.

**Mike Royko**  
Chicago Sun-Times  
News Service



Grinning in itself is not a breach of etiquette. If anything, it normally would be considered the neighborly thing to do.

But what bothers them is that when he grins, he is usually naked.

**T**HIS IS NOT the kind of story I like getting involved in, because if you write about one naked man grinning at his neighbors, it encourages hundreds of others with the same problem to call up and ask for equal space.

However, Pearl and Liz raise some interesting social and legal questions because their local police, the sheriff's police and the state's attorney's

office all say there is nothing that can be done. Pearl says that the authorities have told her that if this man wants to sit in his living room naked, grinning at his passing neighbors, that is his right.

"I think it is just terrible," says Pearl. "I called the police and they said there was nothing they could do about him. I asked the policeman: 'How do you know he is not a rapist?'"

"And do you know what the policeman said to me? He said: 'Lady. Men who are exhibitionists do not commit rape.'"

"Do you know if that is true?"

To be honest, I don't know if it is true or not, since I've never seen a Gallup Poll on that particular subject. However, it seems logical that a man who is content to sit on his sofa, grinning at the passing scene, is less dangerous than one who hides behind a tree or a hedge.

Pearl says the first time she noticed her neighbor acting this way was several days ago. "It was about 2 a.m.," she said.

And what were you doing looking in his window at 2 a.m.?

"Uh, we were walking back and forth between our apartments. We had a problem with a friend of ours that is too complicated to explain. But Liz had been at my place, then I had been over at her place, and we went back and forth several times.

"The first time we went by, he was sitting there on his couch, nude, with that big grin on his face. He's divorced, you know, and he's only about 28 or 29.

"Anyway, we went by a little later. And that time, he was lying on the couch."

Still grinning?

"Yes, he was grinning."

And then?

"Then I walked by again, and he was still on his couch."

Still grinning?

"No. He was sleeping. And then we went by again at 9:30 in the morning. And he was still on

the couch, but he was still sleeping."

So, Pearl and Liz want to know, what is the best way for them to handle this situation.

**T**HE FIRST thing to consider is that the young man is grinning, a facial expression generally considered genial and friendly. He is not, by their description, leering which the dictionary says is an expression that is "sly or insulting or ... malicious."

Now, if he were leering or winking or rolling his eyes — or doing all three at once — then his behavior would be, as the British say, "bad form."

But since he is merely grinning, we have to assume that he is just a friendly person who happens to be naked.

Why he is naked, we don't know. Maybe his air conditioner doesn't work. Or he only has one change of clothes, and it is in the washer. Or it could be that he is a creep.

But his motivation isn't the issue. The real question of etiquette here is not his nakedness and his grinning. It is whether young ladies should be casting sidelong glances into his apartment window.

Consider it from his point of view. There he is in his own apartment, sitting on his couch, wearing a happy grin. Suddenly two female faces appear at his window.

And not once, but two or three times — at 2:30 a.m. and later.

Why, he would have been justified in calling the police and complaining that he was being peeped at by a peeping Pearl and a peeping Liz.

**A**ND SINCE they kept returning to peek at him, it would be understandable if he believed that they were pleased with his appearance.

So I suggest that Pearl and Liz, if they must stroll by his window that often, should show some ladylike restraint and avert their heads. And no titling and giggling either, ladies.

And the young man should consider wearing some sort of garment so as not to encourage his neighbors' curiosity.

## ● The First blacks in Madison

(Continued from Page 19)

other male was recorded as living in the home of Abram Yockey, a recent arrival to the city.

In 1847, three other blacks were listed as living in the Madison Hotel, two males and one female. Two other persons of color were found in the J. Burk home.

Living alone, with no apparent white-family connections, was the first Madison black to be listed by name in the Census records: Darky Butch. Out of 632 residents in the city, the total black population during 1847 was six.

By 1848, black family units began to arrive in the city. Their purpose for coming to Madison as free individuals appeared to be the pursuit of economic opportunity and a new life.

One such family was that of J. Anderson, a 47-year-old barber from Ohio. With him was his wife Elizabeth, 38, and a son or brother, Alexander, 17, also a barber. The 1885 Census records that Cornelia Johnson, 50, an immigrant from Norway, also lived in the Anderson household.

Taking advantage of the right of blacks to own property in Wisconsin, Anderson purchased a lot on the corner of Gilman and Henry streets and another lot on the corner of Hamilton and Dayton streets. The value of the property was \$400, considered to be a substantial amount then. By 1850, Anderson had his own barber shop.

Another black couple, William and Catherine Mitchell from Louisiana, also arrived in Madison about this time. They worked as cooks at the American Hotel. Mitchell also purchased several lots, which were valued at \$1,000. One of the lots was located on the corner of University and Lake streets (the northeast corner of the University Square Mall), and the others were near the intersection of West Wilson and South Hamilton streets.

Like other free blacks of the time, Anderson and Mitchell were members of service professions, which were seen as appropriate occupational roles for blacks. As such, both were able to capitalize on

their roles and amassed sizable fortunes by catering to well-to-do whites.

With the money from his shops, Anderson and his wife moved to Janesville and established another barber business. In the 1860 Census, Anderson's real estate holdings were valued at \$80,000, and his personal property was assessed at \$10,000.

The Mitchells also moved to Janesville, where Mitchell became a successful restaurant owner. His property was valued at over \$250,000 in the 1860 Census.

In pre-Civil War Wisconsin, it was appropriate for blacks to take on the role of servant to whites. Blacks were barbers, cooks, taxi drivers, tailors and laborers. Since it was deemed appropriate for blacks to sing and dance, people of color also became musicians and bandleaders.

But it was not considered appropriate for blacks to be businessmen, entrepreneurs, government decision-makers or professionals such as doctors, lawyers or teachers. Those were acceptable jobs for blacks only among their own people.

But every now and then, some individual would find a way to do the unexpected. William H. Noland was just such a man.

Although not listed in the 1850 Census, the William H. Noland family is credited with being the first permanent black residents of Madison, since they were present during more than one Census period. With their inclusion, the black population count for 1850 should be 11, rather than six.

Noland brought with him his wife, Anna, and three children, Laura, Anastasia and William S. Two other children, Frank and Charles, were born here and could probably be considered the first native-born black Madisonians.

Noland was often referred to in correspondence as "the Professor." The title was used both seriously and sarcastically — after all, blacks were not supposed to be a "professor."

The name was most appropriate for this man of many talents. He was a successful businessman

and entrepreneur, combining his barbering skills with those of the cloth dyer, cleaner and musician to make a financially secure life for his family. In addition, he served as a law clerk for William B. Jarvis, a prominent Madison attorney, and in later years, Noland functioned both as a chiropodist and veterinarian.

Had Noland's skin been a different color, he would have been remembered as one of Madison's most prominent citizens and would probably have had a greater chance to profit financially, to hold public office, to take his place in Wisconsin history along with such figures as Henry Dodge, C.W. Baird, A.A. Bird and others.

Noland came to Wisconsin from New York state with his family. As a free mulatto, he probably had not experienced the type of discrimination and prejudice that were spiritually and emotionally debilitating. He was a man of hope, but more importantly, Noland was a man who perceived himself as equal and unfettered by color.

Noland could also be considered Madison's first civil rights activist — Noland was given that title because of his refusal to shave a slave catcher. With that title, goes another first for Noland; he was a victim of the first overt act of racism in the city.

As a law clerk for Jarvis, Noland was seen as capable of serving as a notary public, a state-appointed political office. Jarvis nominated Noland for the post and offered to put up the cash bond required for the post.

Although Gov. Coles Bashford accepted the nomination and made the appointment, Secretary of State David W. Jones, a recent immigrant from Wales, refused to accept the bond.

His notation on the records reads: "This man is a nigger, and the secretary refuses to file his bond." Although Jones was denounced throughout the state, nothing was done, and Noland was not appointed to the position.

NEXT: "Passing over" into white society

## ● 25 years after Brown vs. the Board

(Continued from Page 19)

to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 introduced by Sen. Robert Byrd, D-W.Va., forbid the direct or indirect use of Department of Health, Education and Welfare funds for transportation of any student to a school other than the one that is nearest the student's home for remedial desegregation.

In other words, federal money could be used to transport and desegregate students as part of those students' original school assignment, but no money could be used for busing to eliminate existing school segregation.

Byrd's amendment was further enforced by the fiscal year 1978 HEW appropriation bill, which contained an antibusing amendment. A suit challenging that provision in federal court in Washington, D.C., was unsuccessful.

The U.S. Civil Rights Commission has concluded that the legislative branch "has undermined the

What price, financial and emotional, are whites and blacks willing to pay to accomplish the goal of

ability of the executive and judicial branches to guarantee the nation's children and young people their constitutional rights. It has thus acted against widely-accepted civil rights goals and contributed to a lessening of the national will with respect to equal rights in the vital area of public education."

In comments prefacing the report, the commission's vice chairman, Stephen Hiron wrote: "There is a paucity of data to judge the effectiveness of public school desegregation. The sad fact is that a quarter of a century after Brown vs. Topeka, we have no standard or criteria to measure 'progress' in this controversial area."

Many more questions have surfaced than have been resolved since the Brown decision was handed down by former Chief Justice Earl Warren. What constitutes desegregation in public schools and other areas of society?

A desegregated society? What role can bilingual-cultural education play in desegregating society?

The commission has recommended to President Carter enervated efforts to promote desegregation of public schools. Congress should turn back all efforts to thwart desegregation, HEW should intensify its enforcement efforts, the Department of Justice should assign sufficient resources to litigate desegregation cases, and the president should coordinate all resources within the executive branch to bring about the constitutional mandate of elementary and secondary school education.

"Beating one's breast and pontificating that 'the law of the land must be carried out,' does not assure that the law will be carried out," Horn wrote. "The preparation of plans that work is what implements the law. To prepare such plans, we need better information on what has worked and what has not worked and under what conditions.

"After a quarter of a century, it is about time that we begin."

Within 60 days, he said, he would convene a federal-provincial conference on the constitution and ask the provinces to agree on an amending formula.

If the provinces failed to agree, he said, he would ask the British government to repatriate the constitution anyway and hold a national referendum within two years asking the Canadian people to decide what the amending formula should be. All the provinces now have to agree before the constitution can be amended.

## Delays in constitutional reform imperil national unity: Trudeau

London Telegraph News Service

TORONTO — Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau has warned that further delay in reforming Canada's constitution could lead to the breakup of the country.

Trudeau, who is campaigning for re-election on May 22, gave the warning after he promised to move quickly on ensuring that Canada's constitution is brought home from Britain and overhauled if he remains in office.

Canada's constitution is an 1867 act of the British Parliament, and retuning it has been held up for many years because the Canadian federal government and the 10 provinces have been unable to agree on a formula for amending it once it is brought home.

Trudeau, fleshing out an earlier promise to move quickly, said that within 30 days of being re-elected he would recall Parliament and seek a joint declaration by the commons and Senate that the constitution should be brought home.

**TREAT YOURSELF TO LUXURY.**

Ask About Our Wide Selection  
Of Cadillacs.

1979 Cadillac Coupe DeVille '9995<sup>00</sup> Plus Tax

**DIESEL POWERED DeVilles**  
In Stock Starting at \$13,730

**AUTOCAP** **AHRENS**

1200 Applegate Rd.  
Phone 271-2211

# 91 BIG YEARS

## Our 91st Anniversary Sale Continues with More Savings for you!

### SPORT COATS

Plaid sport coats in the new spring shades green, blue and brown in most sizes including Big & Talls. Reg. \$100

**\$75**

### BLAZERS

Oak Park polyester/wool year around in navy, brown and tan. Regular \$75. 38 to size 50.

**\$55**

### SLACKS

One group of assorted solid and pattern dress slacks. These are in sizes 36 to 566 and sold up to \$35.

**\$15**

### SUITS

**EXTRA SPECIAL**  
One group of fine quality mens suits in both vested and non-vested. Regular priced to \$160 and sizes from 38 to 52 long.

**\$79**

### QUAD SUITS

Palm Beach and Oak Park 4 piece suit with extra slack and reversible vest. Choice of solids, light and dark colors. Sizes from 38 to 46. Normally sells at \$185.

**\$139.**

To size 54. Big and Tall \$10 extra

**LONDON FOR ALL-WEATHER COATS**  
Entire stock of spring unlined and zip lined coats. (38 to 54 sizes)

**25% OFF**

Many other unadvertised items!

# Rundell's Big & Tall

Small Charge for Alterations

**ON THE SQUARE AT 15 E. MAIN 255-9186**