

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE

Reads The Mail Tribune Published Daily Except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO. 27-29 North Fir St. Phone 2-4141

NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION AFFILIATE MEMBER

NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION

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

10 YEARS AGO Dec. 13, 1945 (It was Thursday)

Miss Nina Tuttle, Jackson county's Victory Queen candidate, loses out in finals of state competition in Portland.

From Arthur Perry's Ye Smudge Pot column: Many natives have already flitted, and many more plan to hie to California for the end of the year to relax and revel, and pay the sales tax they always vote against at home.

20 YEARS AGO Dec. 13, 1935 (It was Friday)

A rate reduction saving \$13,700 annually to users announced by California Oregon Power company.

Southern Oregon Art association to hold exhibit in Palm building on East Main st.

30 YEARS AGO Dec. 13, 1925 (It was Sunday)

J. R. Kline elected president of the Eagle Point Grange; Alfred Mittelsteadt chosen overseer.

Jackson County Chamber of Commerce plans banquet honoring members of Oregon Horticulture meeting here.

40 YEARS AGO Dec. 13, 1915 (It was Monday)

From Ashland and vicinity news: The Pompadour Mineral Springs Co., recently organized by Medford and Grants Pass parties and which is developing Lithia springs east of Ashland, derives its name from the Pompadour cliff in that locality.

From Local and Personal columns: Jack Dent, of the Wells Fargo local office, who recently went to Corvallis as relief agent for ten days, has returned and resumed his work in this city.

What's the Answer?

Can You Get 4 of the 77 Copr. 1955, Editorial Research Report

- 1. The AFL or the CIO put more members into their new combined labor organization, or was it about 50-50? 2. A member of the Society of Friends is more often called what? 3. As net farm income has been going down, average value of farm real estate has been going down or up, or staying about the same? 4. The Rose Bowl in Pasadena has a larger or smaller seating capacity than the Yankee Stadium in N. Y., or about the same? 5. More boys and girls were graduated from colleges and universities this year than five years ago; right or wrong? 6. Which state produces the most cranberries for sale? 7. Formosa is about 10, 100, 500 or 1,000 miles from the Chinese mainland? The Answers: 1—More AFL members. 2—Quaker. 3—Going up slightly. 4—Larger. 5—Wrong (1950 made an all-time high. 6—Massachusetts. 7—About 100. Only two coaches have guided University of Illinois football teams since 1913. Bob Zupke from 1913 to 1941 and Ray Elliot since 1941.

How About Taxes?

What about the veteran who doesn't want to go to school after his discharge? Is it fair to overburden him with taxes to pay for the education of his former buddy? No—Corvallis Gazette-Times.

Why isn't it?—provided he is a taxpayer. Should parents of children who decide to go to work instead of college, be exempt from taxation for higher education?

Or should those with offspring who quit at the 8th grade be similarly favored?

The above is only one of many points made against Senator Neuberger's program of social betterment which if adopted would, it is claimed, "bankrupt the nation in a day's time and put us all under Russia's thumb in a week."

And this, adds the Gazette-Times for final emphasis, is not just "idle political talk."

It may not be "idle" but it is rather foolish. Not that we approve of our junior Senator's program in all respects, or in many,—but to claim that war veterans who are taxpayers should not bear their share of the burden of providing education for those of their buddies who want it, only because THEY themselves don't, is a somewhat bizarre idea, to say the least.

As for Neuberger's proposal in the realm of social betterment, if passed in toto, bankrupting this "richest nation on earth in 24 hours" and putting the USA under "Russia's thumb in a week," granting a generous allowance in exaggeration for the sake of emphasis, is surpassing the bounds of even extreme hyperbolic license.

AS FOR taxes, so many of the alarmists who see bankruptcy just around the corner, appear to have forgotten that Uncle Sam went through one of the most severe depressions in world history without coming even close to it. Surely the old gentleman should be able to go through one of the greatest periods of prosperity, without serious results, regardless of what programs of social betterment may be offered, by the junior Senator from Oregon or anyone else.

There is another point often overlooked.

Taxes are paid directly or indirectly by almost everyone. Taxes are included in rents, the high cost of living and the purchase of articles whether they carry a special excise tax or not. No one likes them but no one entirely escapes them. They can't.

Moreover the latest word from Washington is that they will not only be reduced next year, but the federal budget has an excellent chance of being balanced.

We realize the advantages of such an announcement in a presidential year, but there is one thing we do hope will NOT happen, namely:

We hope tax reductions will be ordered after the balancing of the budget not before.—R.W.R.

Change the Law

If the GM train proves up to engineering hopes, it is safe to predict that progressive Union Pacific will be among the first railroads to make purchases of the new passenger equipment. It is also safe to assume that the Southern Pacific will not.—Ashland Tidings.

The Tidings, of course, is correct. The SP is one of the most reactionary corporations in the world and will never spend a nickel for better public service until increased revenue is assured unless some power greater than itself compels it to do so.

AND where is that power? Not in the courts. At least we can find no one to predict the State Supreme Court will overrule the lower courts, in their interpretation that under the present law, the State Public Utility commissioners power to regulate the all-powerful SP is, to all intents and purposes, non-existent.

Some voters are convinced the Southern Pacific controls the state courts as well as the State Legislature and any attempt to get a fair deal as far as rail service to Southern Oregon is concerned, might as well be abandoned.

WE CAN'T believe that. We don't believe there is any corruption involved. BUT we do believe if the state law forming the Public Service commissioner office were changed, and some teeth—even one sturdy upper plate—supplied, the SP, powerful, callous and money-mad as it is, would be forced to serve the people of the Rogue River valley and Southern Oregon, as the provisions of its original franchise directed.

THE SP has the strongest single lobby machine in Salem no doubt. But if the people of Southern Oregon, and the people of the state sympathizing with our predicament would unite, on a concerted drive to change the state law and make it effective instead of a joke, the mighty billion dollar corporation, could, we feel sure be brought to time, forced to do the job it should do, and it wouldn't take a hundred years to do it!—R.W.R.

Case Against Medford Man Is Dismissed

Roseburg—Charges against G. Francis Putnam of Medford were dismissed in circuit court here last week. He was charged with drawing a bank check without having sufficient funds in the bank. The dismissal grew out of a Oregon Supreme court decision in which a state law was declared unconstitutional. Putnam had appealed the case to circuit court from justice court in Canyonville.

Crater Music Concert Will Be Held Friday

Central Point—The annual winter concert by the Crater High school band, choir and Girls Glee club will be held in the high school auditorium at 8 p.m. Friday, Dec. 16. Norman Carothers is director of the three groups. The band has about 60 members, the choir about 45 members and the Girls Glee club about 30 members. Carothers said there will be no admission charge, and the public has been invited.

Matter of Fact By Joe and Stewart Alsop

GAS AND THE DEMOCRATS Washington—There has been much self-congratulatory talk among Democrats about the marvelous party unity they have achieved since 1952. But there is one issue which is likely to start one of the bitter party rows in years—more bitter even than the offshore oil issue which tore the party apart in the last Presidential election. The row is expected to break out, moreover, within two weeks of the opening of the next session of Congress.

The Fulbright bill, which would free producers of natural gas from Federal price regulation, is very near the top of the Senate calendar. The enemies of the Fulbright bill say that its passage would cost consumers as much as \$800,000,000 a year in hiked gas prices. And, according to one expert estimate, passage of the bill could increase the value of proved gas reserves by a cool \$20,000,000,000.

Obviously, large interests are involved. The floor leader for the bill will be Sen. William Fulbright of Arkansas. But its most important proponent will be Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson of Texas, who is probably the most powerful man in the Senate.

Johnson, whose state is the biggest of the four major gas-producing states, frankly intends to use all his power to secure passage of the bill. He has remarked flatly that he will work just as hard for the gas producers as Sen. Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota, for example, works for his dairy farmers.

Until recently, it did not seem probable that Johnson would really have to work very hard. According to his own reported estimate as of September he could count on a sure majority of 58 votes. And just because passage of the Fulbright bill seemed so certain, it was thought it would meet only token opposition.

But now all is changed. Previously, the oil companies which have favored the bill and which probably constitute the most politically powerful of all business groups, have met no opposition from within the business community. But now 40 utility companies from all over the country, fearing that big increases in gas prices would badly hurt their business, have banded together to fight the Fulbright bill. And, the utilities are also not without political influence.

MOREOVER, the Johnson forces have been warned to expect a fight. Johnson's Texas colleague, Price Daniel, recently remarked to Sen. Paul Douglas of Illinois that he hoped the natural gas bill would go through quickly, without a bad fight. Douglas amiably replied that he thought the issue demanded "very careful examination." He has since let it be known that he has already reached page 70 on a speech he is writing on the issue, and that he expects to double that.

Given the usual interruptions, a Senate speech of 140 pages will make a fine substitute for a filibuster until a real one comes along. Moreover, there have been important breaks in the pro-Johnson ranks.

Sens. Harry Byrd and Willis Robertson of Virginia, for example, are now counted as Douglas allies. Other Southerners, like the very influential Richard Russell of Georgia, are reported wavering. And strong support from his fellow Southerners is essential to a victory for Johnson on the issue.

Douglas, moreover, counts confidently on the votes of at least 15 Republicans from the gas-consuming states in the Mid-West and North-East. All in all, it begins to seem that the Fulbright bill will be no pushover, although the odds are no doubt still on its passing. And it is as certain as such things can be that there will be a big, angry fight within the Democratic party before it does pass.

NORTHERN Democrats are even muttering that, if Johnson and the Southerners insist on pushing the natural gas issue, they may decide to push the civil rights issue. Party unity, they argue, is now a one-way street. This kind of muttering could lead to an explosion which would break the facade of Democratic unity into smithereens.

The Republicans are divided on the issue too, of course, but there is not nearly the same passion on either among Republicans and a big row on the

WAVES BY CONTRACT Bridgeport, Conn. (U.P.)—A CIO contract with Rilling-Dermetics Co. provides that women workers shall be given two days off a year to get permanent waves.

issue would clearly hurt the Democrats far more. The hurt could be especially painful to Adlai Stevenson. As in the case of the offshore oil issue in 1952, Stevenson will also certainly have to declare himself on natural gas. A stand against the gas interests might well lose him a lot of Southern and South-Western delegates. And Stevenson needs those delegates badly, for the first-ballot win which he is clearly planning for next summer's convention.

1955, New Work Herald Tribune Inc.

Something for the left wing (government-run-everything) Democrats to think about: The right wing coalition government of Prime Minister Robert Menzies won a LANDSIDE victory in Australia's general elections.

Two and a half hours after the counting began, the right wing coalition appeared certain to win 71 seats out of a total of 122 in the all-powerful Australian house of representatives. At that hour, the opposition Labor party had won only 47 seats, with four seats (districts) remaining doubtful.

In the present house (which will be replaced by the new one) the right wing coalition party held only 64 seats against the Labor party's 57. A majority is 62—which left the right wing coalition a narrow majority of only three.

In the new house, chosen yesterday, they appear certain of a majority of at least nine.

WHY IS the Australian election significant? In order to answer that question, we'll have to recite a little history.

IN AN effort to lift itself by its bootstraps, the English-speaking-world began somewhat more than two decades ago to swing toward socialism. This swing began in Australia and New Zealand—which, led by Labor parties, went all-out for government-run-everything. The swing reached Britain in 1945, when the Conservative party, headed by Winston Churchill, was thrown out and the British Labor party came into power.

This swing was reflected in our country by the New Deal-Fair Deal administrations which remained in power from 1932 until 1952.

KEEP THIS in mind: This broad swing toward socialism—government-run-everything, make everybody rich and happy by the simple process of passing a law—BEGAN IN AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND. The counter-swing—that is to say, the swing AWAY from government-run-everything socialism—STARTED IN AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND several years ago. Both countries threw out Labor governments and voted in more conservative government.

THEN came the counter-swing in Britain. Britain, too, threw out the socialist-leaning Labor party—which, in its years in power had gone a long way toward socialism, embracing government ownership of steel, coal, transportation, etc.

Britain also—following the lead of Australia and New Zealand—confirmed its swing swing against Labor party socialism at a succeeding election.

Now Australia confirms again its verdict that Labor party socialism isn't what it is cracked up to be. The circle is complete. That is why the general elec-

tion would clearly hurt the Democrats far more. The hurt could be especially painful to Adlai Stevenson. As in the case of the offshore oil issue in 1952, Stevenson will also certainly have to declare himself on natural gas. A stand against the gas interests might well lose him a lot of Southern and South-Western delegates. And Stevenson needs those delegates badly, for the first-ballot win which he is clearly planning for next summer's convention.

1955, New Work Herald Tribune Inc.

Something for the left wing (government-run-everything) Democrats to think about: The right wing coalition government of Prime Minister Robert Menzies won a LANDSIDE victory in Australia's general elections.

Two and a half hours after the counting began, the right wing coalition appeared certain to win 71 seats out of a total of 122 in the all-powerful Australian house of representatives. At that hour, the opposition Labor party had won only 47 seats, with four seats (districts) remaining doubtful.

In the present house (which will be replaced by the new one) the right wing coalition party held only 64 seats against the Labor party's 57. A majority is 62—which left the right wing coalition a narrow majority of only three.

In the new house, chosen yesterday, they appear certain of a majority of at least nine.

WHY IS the Australian election significant? In order to answer that question, we'll have to recite a little history.

IN AN effort to lift itself by its bootstraps, the English-speaking-world began somewhat more than two decades ago to swing toward socialism. This swing began in Australia and New Zealand—which, led by Labor parties, went all-out for government-run-everything. The swing reached Britain in 1945, when the Conservative party, headed by Winston Churchill, was thrown out and the British Labor party came into power.

This swing was reflected in our country by the New Deal-Fair Deal administrations which remained in power from 1932 until 1952.

KEEP THIS in mind: This broad swing toward socialism—government-run-everything, make everybody rich and happy by the simple process of passing a law—BEGAN IN AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND. The counter-swing—that is to say, the swing AWAY from government-run-everything socialism—STARTED IN AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND several years ago. Both countries threw out Labor governments and voted in more conservative government.

THEN came the counter-swing in Britain. Britain, too, threw out the socialist-leaning Labor party—which, in its years in power had gone a long way toward socialism, embracing government ownership of steel, coal, transportation, etc.

Britain also—following the lead of Australia and New Zealand—confirmed its swing swing against Labor party socialism at a succeeding election.

Now Australia confirms again its verdict that Labor party socialism isn't what it is cracked up to be. The circle is complete. That is why the general elec-

tion would clearly hurt the Democrats far more. The hurt could be especially painful to Adlai Stevenson. As in the case of the offshore oil issue in 1952, Stevenson will also certainly have to declare himself on natural gas. A stand against the gas interests might well lose him a lot of Southern and South-Western delegates. And Stevenson needs those delegates badly, for the first-ballot win which he is clearly planning for next summer's convention.

1955, New Work Herald Tribune Inc.

Something for the left wing (government-run-everything) Democrats to think about: The right wing coalition government of Prime Minister Robert Menzies won a LANDSIDE victory in Australia's general elections.

Two and a half hours after the counting began, the right wing coalition appeared certain to win 71 seats out of a total of 122 in the all-powerful Australian house of representatives. At that hour, the opposition Labor party had won only 47 seats, with four seats (districts) remaining doubtful.

In the present house (which will be replaced by the new one) the right wing coalition party held only 64 seats against the Labor party's 57. A majority is 62—which left the right wing coalition a narrow majority of only three.

In the new house, chosen yesterday, they appear certain of a majority of at least nine.

WHY IS the Australian election significant? In order to answer that question, we'll have to recite a little history.

IN AN effort to lift itself by its bootstraps, the English-speaking-world began somewhat more than two decades ago to swing toward socialism. This swing began in Australia and New Zealand—which, led by Labor parties, went all-out for government-run-everything. The swing reached Britain in 1945, when the Conservative party, headed by Winston Churchill, was thrown out and the British Labor party came into power.

This swing was reflected in our country by the New Deal-Fair Deal administrations which remained in power from 1932 until 1952.

KEEP THIS in mind: This broad swing toward socialism—government-run-everything, make everybody rich and happy by the simple process of passing a law—BEGAN IN AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND. The counter-swing—that is to say, the swing AWAY from government-run-everything socialism—STARTED IN AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND several years ago. Both countries threw out Labor governments and voted in more conservative government.

THEN came the counter-swing in Britain. Britain, too, threw out the socialist-leaning Labor party—which, in its years in power had gone a long way toward socialism, embracing government ownership of steel, coal, transportation, etc.

Britain also—following the lead of Australia and New Zealand—confirmed its swing swing against Labor party socialism at a succeeding election.

Now Australia confirms again its verdict that Labor party socialism isn't what it is cracked up to be. The circle is complete. That is why the general elec-

tion would clearly hurt the Democrats far more. The hurt could be especially painful to Adlai Stevenson. As in the case of the offshore oil issue in 1952, Stevenson will also certainly have to declare himself on natural gas. A stand against the gas interests might well lose him a lot of Southern and South-Western delegates. And Stevenson needs those delegates badly, for the first-ballot win which he is clearly planning for next summer's convention.

1955, New Work Herald Tribune Inc.

Something for the left wing (government-run-everything) Democrats to think about: The right wing coalition government of Prime Minister Robert Menzies won a LANDSIDE victory in Australia's general elections.

Two and a half hours after the counting began, the right wing coalition appeared certain to win 71 seats out of a total of 122 in the all-powerful Australian house of representatives. At that hour, the opposition Labor party had won only 47 seats, with four seats (districts) remaining doubtful.

In the present house (which will be replaced by the new one) the right wing coalition party held only 64 seats against the Labor party's 57. A majority is 62—which left the right wing coalition a narrow majority of only three.

In the new house, chosen yesterday, they appear certain of a majority of at least nine.

WHY IS the Australian election significant? In order to answer that question, we'll have to recite a little history.

IN AN effort to lift itself by its bootstraps, the English-speaking-world began somewhat more than two decades ago to swing toward socialism. This swing began in Australia and New Zealand—which, led by Labor parties, went all-out for government-run-everything. The swing reached Britain in 1945, when the Conservative party, headed by Winston Churchill, was thrown out and the British Labor party came into power.

This swing was reflected in our country by the New Deal-Fair Deal administrations which remained in power from 1932 until 1952.

KEEP THIS in mind: This broad swing toward socialism—government-run-everything, make everybody rich and happy by the simple process of passing a law—BEGAN IN AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND. The counter-swing—that is to say, the swing AWAY from government-run-everything socialism—STARTED IN AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND several years ago. Both countries threw out Labor governments and voted in more conservative government.

THEN came the counter-swing in Britain. Britain, too, threw out the socialist-leaning Labor party—which, in its years in power had gone a long way toward socialism, embracing government ownership of steel, coal, transportation, etc.

Britain also—following the lead of Australia and New Zealand—confirmed its swing swing against Labor party socialism at a succeeding election.

Now Australia confirms again its verdict that Labor party socialism isn't what it is cracked up to be. The circle is complete. That is why the general elec-

tion would clearly hurt the Democrats far more. The hurt could be especially painful to Adlai Stevenson. As in the case of the offshore oil issue in 1952, Stevenson will also certainly have to declare himself on natural gas. A stand against the gas interests might well lose him a lot of Southern and South-Western delegates. And Stevenson needs those delegates badly, for the first-ballot win which he is clearly planning for next summer's convention.

1955, New Work Herald Tribune Inc.

Something for the left wing (government-run-everything) Democrats to think about: The right wing coalition government of Prime Minister Robert Menzies won a LANDSIDE victory in Australia's general elections.

Two and a half hours after the counting began, the right wing coalition appeared certain to win 71 seats out of a total of 122 in the all-powerful Australian house of representatives. At that hour, the opposition Labor party had won only 47 seats, with four seats (districts) remaining doubtful.

In the present house (which will be replaced by the new one) the right wing coalition party held only 64 seats against the Labor party's 57. A majority is 62—which left the right wing coalition a narrow majority of only three.

In the new house, chosen yesterday, they appear certain of a majority of at least nine.

WHY IS the Australian election significant? In order to answer that question, we'll have to recite a little history.

IN AN effort to lift itself by its bootstraps, the English-speaking-world began somewhat more than two decades ago to swing toward socialism. This swing began in Australia and New Zealand—which, led by Labor parties, went all-out for government-run-everything. The swing reached Britain in 1945, when the Conservative party, headed by Winston Churchill, was thrown out and the British Labor party came into power.

This swing was reflected in our country by the New Deal-Fair Deal administrations which remained in power from 1932 until 1952.

KEEP THIS in mind: This broad swing toward socialism—government-run-everything, make everybody rich and happy by the simple process of passing a law—BEGAN IN AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND. The counter-swing—that is to say, the swing AWAY from government-run-everything socialism—STARTED IN AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND several years ago. Both countries threw out Labor governments and voted in more conservative government.

THEN came the counter-swing in Britain. Britain, too, threw out the socialist-leaning Labor party—which, in its years in power had gone a long way toward socialism, embracing government ownership of steel, coal, transportation, etc.

Britain also—following the lead of Australia and New Zealand—confirmed its swing swing against Labor party socialism at a succeeding election.

Now Australia confirms again its verdict that Labor party socialism isn't what it is cracked up to be. The circle is complete. That is why the general elec-

tion would clearly hurt the Democrats far more. The hurt could be especially painful to Adlai Stevenson. As in the case of the offshore oil issue in 1952, Stevenson will also certainly have to declare himself on natural gas. A stand against the gas interests might well lose him a lot of Southern and South-Western delegates. And Stevenson needs those delegates badly, for the first-ballot win which he is clearly planning for next summer's convention.

1955, New Work Herald Tribune Inc.

Something for the left wing (government-run-everything) Democrats to think about: The right wing coalition government of Prime Minister Robert Menzies won a LANDSIDE victory in Australia's general elections.

Two and a half hours after the counting began, the right wing coalition appeared certain to win 71 seats out of a total of 122 in the all-powerful Australian house of representatives. At that hour, the opposition Labor party had won only 47 seats, with four seats (districts) remaining doubtful.

In the present house (which will be replaced by the new one) the right wing coalition party held only 64 seats against the Labor party's 57. A majority is 62—which left the right wing coalition a narrow majority of only three.

In the new house, chosen yesterday, they appear certain of a majority of at least nine.

WHY IS the Australian election significant? In order to answer that question, we'll have to recite a little history.

IN AN effort to lift itself by its bootstraps, the English-speaking-world began somewhat more than two decades ago to swing toward socialism. This swing began in Australia and New Zealand—which, led by Labor parties, went all-out for government-run-everything. The swing reached Britain in 1945, when the Conservative party, headed by Winston Churchill, was thrown out and the British Labor party came into power.

This swing was reflected in our country by the New Deal-Fair Deal administrations which remained in power from 1932 until 1952.

KEEP THIS in mind: This broad swing toward socialism—government-run-everything, make everybody rich and happy by the simple process of passing a law—BEGAN IN AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND. The counter-swing—that is to say, the swing AWAY from government-run-everything socialism—STARTED IN AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND several years ago. Both countries threw out Labor governments and voted in more conservative government.

THEN came the counter-swing in Britain. Britain, too, threw out the socialist-leaning Labor party—which, in its years in power had gone a long way toward socialism, embracing government ownership of steel, coal, transportation, etc.

Britain also—following the lead of Australia and New Zealand—confirmed its swing swing against Labor party socialism at a succeeding election.

Now Australia confirms again its verdict that Labor party socialism isn't what it is cracked up to be. The circle is complete. That is why the general elec-

tion would clearly hurt the Democrats far more. The hurt could be especially painful to Adlai Stevenson. As in the case of the offshore oil issue in 1952, Stevenson will also certainly have to declare himself on natural gas. A stand against the gas interests might well lose him a lot of Southern and South-Western delegates. And Stevenson needs those delegates badly, for the first-ballot win which he is clearly planning for next summer's convention.

1955, New Work Herald Tribune Inc.

Something for the left wing (government-run-everything) Democrats to think about: The right wing coalition government of Prime Minister Robert Menzies won a LANDSIDE victory in Australia's general elections.

Two and a half hours after the counting began, the right wing coalition appeared certain to win 71 seats out of a total of 122 in the all-powerful Australian house of representatives. At that hour, the opposition Labor party had won only 47 seats, with four seats (districts) remaining doubtful.

In the present house (which will be replaced by the new one) the right wing coalition party held only 64 seats against the Labor party's 57. A majority is 62—which left the right wing coalition a narrow majority of only three.

In the new house, chosen yesterday, they appear certain of a majority of at least nine.

WHY IS the Australian election significant? In order to answer that question, we'll have to recite a little history.

IN AN effort to lift itself by its bootstraps, the English-speaking-world began somewhat more than two decades ago to swing toward socialism. This swing began in Australia and New Zealand—which, led by Labor parties, went all-out for government-run-everything. The swing reached Britain in 1945, when the Conservative party, headed by Winston Churchill, was thrown out and the British Labor party came into power.

This swing was reflected in our country by the New Deal-Fair Deal administrations which remained in power from 1932 until 1952.

KEEP THIS in mind: This broad swing toward socialism—government-run-everything, make everybody rich and happy by the simple process of passing a law—BEGAN IN AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND. The counter-swing—that is to say, the swing AWAY from government-run-everything socialism—STARTED IN AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND several years ago. Both countries threw out Labor governments and voted in more conservative government.

THEN came the counter-swing in Britain. Britain, too, threw out the socialist-leaning Labor party—which, in its years in power had gone a long way toward socialism, embracing government ownership of steel, coal, transportation, etc.

Britain also—following the lead of Australia and New Zealand—confirmed its swing swing against Labor party socialism at a succeeding election.

Now Australia confirms again its verdict that Labor party socialism isn't what it is cracked up to be. The circle is complete. That is why the general elec-

tion would clearly hurt the Democrats far more. The hurt could be especially painful to Adlai Stevenson. As in the case of the offshore oil issue in 1952, Stevenson will also certainly have to declare himself on natural gas. A