

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE

Published Daily Except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO. 27-29 North St. Phone 2-6141

ROBERT W. RUTHE, Editor. HERB GREY, Advertising Manager. GERALD LATHAM, Business Manager.

ERIC ALLEN, Jr., Managing Editor. EARL H. ADAMS, City Editor. HARRY CHIPMAN, Telegraph Editor.

RICHARD JEWETT, Sports Editor. OLIVE STARCHER, Society Editor. DALE ERICKSON, Circulation Mgr.

An Independent Newspaper Entered as second class matter at Medford, Oregon, under Act of March 3, 1897.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES By Mail—In Advance: Per Copy 10c. Daily and Sunday—One year \$12.00.

By Carrier—In Advance—Medford, Ashland, Central Point, Eagle Point, Jacksonville, Gold Hill, Phoenix, Shady Cove, Rogue River, Talent, and on motor routes.

Daily and Sunday—One year \$15.00. Daily and Sunday—One month \$1.25. Carrier and Dealers—5c per copy.

All Terms Cash in Advance. Official Paper of the City of Medford. Official Paper of Jackson County.

United Press—Full Leased Wire. MEMBER OF AUDIT BUREAU OF CIRCULATION.

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

NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION AFFILIATE MEMBER

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 March 1, 1946

(It was Friday) Rainfall at Medford weather bureau station above normal during 1945, a annual report shows.

From Arthur Perry's Ye Smudge Pot column: March arrived today, like a lamb and on time. The month has no holidays requiring the banks to close, and the tontorial parlors to wish they had.

20 YEARS AGO March 1, 1936

(It was Sunday) Gumji Fujimoto who has been chef at Medford hotel opens coffee shop in Holland hotel.

Some 24 Boy Scouts to be honored at annual Court of Honor here Monday.

30 YEARS AGO March 1, 1926

(It was Monday) The San Carlo Opera company presents "Carmen" at Craterian theater tonight.

New Schuler apartments at the corner of Sixth st. and Oakdale ave. open for occupancy.

40 YEARS AGO March 1, 1916

(It was Wednesday) City financial report shows reduction in operating expenses of \$17,298 in two years.

Heavy snowfall in Siskiyou and Cow Creek canyon damages power lines; ushers in March.

What's the Answer? Can You Get 4 of the 7?

Copr. 1955, Editorial Research Report

1. The Vice-President can participate in all votes in the Senate, or in none, or only in certain ones?

2. Average medium-priced 4-tyres stay in good condition for about (a) 18,000, (b) 28,000, (c) 38,000 or (d) 48,000 miles?

3. Falangists are members of a dominant political party in Argentina, France, Italy, Mexico or Spain?

4. Americans spend more every year on clothing and shoes or on autos, or about equally on each?

5. Agriculture Secretary Benson predicts Pres. Eisenhower will or won't veto any new farm bill with rigid price supports, or says he doesn't know?

6. The city of Famagusta, recent scene of riots, is in which of these trouble spots: Algeria, Cyprus, Gaza strip, Morocco, South Africa?

7. Which of these is the Golden State: California, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Washington?

The Answers: 1. Only in cases of tie; 2. About 28,000, on the average; 3. Spain; 4. More on clothing and shoes; 5. Predicts he will; 6. Cyprus; 7. California.

4-H Club News Sewing Club

The S and R 4-H Sewing club of Eagle Point met Saturday, February 25, at the Edge home for a work session.

There were 12 members present. Marcia Ackerman was elected reporter.

A candy sale March 7 was planned. The next meeting will be March 10 at 1:30 p.m.

Marcia Ackerman, Reporter.

As Expected

To this department, the announcement from President Eisenhower he is willing to run came as an anticlimax.

For barring a heart set-back it was our belief from the first, that the pressure, within and without, would become too great for him to resist.

When the President's health continued to improve and his corps of doctors gave the "green light," then, as far as this portion of the audience was concerned, the suspense ended, and further interest in the "Yes" or "No" drama ceased.

WE ARE convinced that from a purely personal standpoint the President would prefer NOT to run. He has never really liked the job and probably never will. Moreover, he is shrewd enough to know that such a blissful honeymoon as he has enjoyed for four years, can hardly last for four years more. Not only may his health suffer, in the meantime, but even though the ship-of-state may continue to ride on an even keel, relatively speaking, the "breaks" that have been so consistently favorable since 1952, may well be unfavorable or even go into reverse, before 1960 looms on the distant horizon.

And if this should prove true, "Ike" will find the White House job, even less to his liking than before, and make him long more and more for the privacy, relaxation and freedom of his Gettysburg farm.

IN OTHER WORDS it is our belief that in expressing his willingness to be a candidate for a second term, Mr. Eisenhower is following the line of duty, not desire, and this is all to his credit.

We wouldn't be surprised to learn that he had secretly hoped that quail hunting in the morning and 18 holes of golf in the afternoon, would have proved too much for him physically speaking. Then he would have had an "out" that a "good soldier" could have accepted, without feeling he had let his party—or his country—down.

BUT THE REVERSE proved true. The presidential health continued to improve in miraculous fashion, and as far as the future can be determined regarding cardiac reactions even such a conservative specialist as Dr. White, predicts Mr. Eisenhower will not only probably live out his term but should enjoy a considerable period of health and usefulness thereafter. We hope that will be the outcome.

LIKE ALL other good Republicans, Dr. White not only assumes President Eisenhower will be nominated by acclamation, but his reelection by another overwhelming landslide, is certain.

Well, there is no doubt about the first assumption. And as things now stand very little doubt about the second.

But while President Eisenhower's personal popularity has set a new high in recent political history, he is, we believe, far more popular than his party. And if ex-Senator Nixon should, as now seems likely, take over the Vice-Presidential spot again, he will, as we see it, lose votes rather than gain them.

So while it does look like a "shoo-in" today, we predict, it will develop into at least a contest before the campaign ends.—R.W.R.

The Better "Ole"

Secretary Dulles is getting quite a panning for that soothing syrup speech regarding Russia before the Senate Foreign Relations committee the other day. Even some of the Republican newspapers and correspondents are accusing him of withholding unpleasant facts and failing to support with any evidence, his claim that thanks to the free world policies, Soviet Russia is in a weaker position in the world today than was the case a year ago, and the USA stronger.

The main support given this claim consisted of a fact which no one denies, that the Stalin policy of threatening war, has been abandoned in Moscow, and the new policy is one of economic penetration and diplomatic manipulation rather than force.

We grant this is an improvement. But to maintain it was the direct result of defensive encirclement on the part of the democracies under U. S. leadership, just doesn't add up.

IN TAKING this stand, Mr. Dulles reminds us of the frequent spectacle of two dogs suspiciously and pugnaciously stalking each other, growling and snarling but maintaining an exceedingly slow and cautious pace.

The owner of one of the dogs comes from the house and gives a dinner-call, putting doggie's dish on the driveway.

The dog thus apprised breaks away and drives at high speed for food and the protection of his master.

WHAT DOES the other dog do?

He proceeds to whirl around in circles, tail high, teeth bared, growling and snarling louder than ever and making passes in the general direction of his recent opponent, but not taking any chances on actually encountering him.

But it was a great victory and he proceeds to celebrate it, returning home with head and tail high in the air and without a scratch.

In other words, Russia was not scared into a new policy by the Dulles diplomacy or any other, but voluntarily adopted a new one because of its long-delayed realization that war no longer pays.—R.W.R.

Cold War Expenses Seen High For United States This Year

By CHARLES M. McCANN United Press Correspondent This is likely to be an unusually expensive year for the United States in the cold war.

Pressure is building up all over the world, directly and indirectly, for American aid and economic help.

The reason usually cited is the threat of Communist aggression or the threat of Russia's world-wide campaign of penetration.

On the indirect side, the attraction of "neutrality" as between East and West is pointed out.

There seems to be good reason for suspicion that some foreign governments are using the Communist menace and the desirability of neutrality as a means of getting money for purely national interests.

In other words, that some governments are crying "wolf, wolf!" to get American aid and others are crying that they want

to be lambs, grazing in neutralist pastures while the big powers fight the cold war.

President Eisenhower has asked for \$4.860 billion for the foreign aid program in the fiscal year which starts July 1.

It is expected that in a message to Congress next Monday the President also will ask for authority to spend \$100 million a year for the next 10 years for long-range foreign aid projects.

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles said in a speech Saturday that the government should be empowered to commit \$100 million a year for several years to aid under-developed countries.

Unless that power is given, he said, "we take a risk which is quite unjustified, having regard to the small cost of avoiding it."

Washington dispatches say that congressional leaders are either lukewarm or hostile toward this program. It is an election year.

But the pressure on the United States government from abroad, great as it is now, is likely to increase.

President Giovanni Gronchi

of Italy offers the suggestion that the United States ought to pay more attention to economic cooperation among the North Atlantic Treaty countries.

That would cost a lot of money.

The threat of Chinese Communist aggression against its neighbors is a reason for substantial aid to the countries concerned.

Prince Norodom Sihanouk of Cambodia, who was long firmly on the Allied side, has declared himself a neutralist. Thailand is reported considering a trade agreement with Red China.

Russian Officers Soviet Premier Nikolai A. Bulganin and Communist party chieftain Nikita S. Khrushchev offered aid to India, Burma and Afghanistan during their visit to South Asia.

That is likely to entail corresponding offers by the United States.

Partly because of the Communist sale of arms to Egypt, American aid to that country for building its gigantic Aswan dam has become urgently necessary.

Greece is angry over Britain's refusal to give up its colony of Cyprus. Russia is trying to take advantage of that. It may mean more American money.

West Germany, some suspect, is using its value to the Allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to cut down—of cut off—contributions to the American, British and French armies on its soil.

These are only some of the situations the United States faces.

Obviously, American aid to many countries—ally, neutrals and potential neutrals—is going to be necessary. It will be up to the State Department, with what money it may get, to decide which bids for aid are justified.

Today and Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann

GETTING RID OF THE SURPLUSES

Secretary Benson's statisticians have made a calculation that but for the accumulated

"farm surpluses"—now reported to be worth nearly eight billion dollars—farm prices might be 10 per cent higher and the income of farmers some 20 per cent higher.

As these surpluses cannot be sold here at home without wrecking the market, the temptation to get rid of them abroad is naturally very strong.

Sen. Bridges has let it be known that the Senate Republican Policy Committee is disturbed over reports of "resistance" by the State Department and the Defense Department.

The Policy Committee is also agreed that the Administration should be "pushed, pressured and encouraged" to step up surplus disposal.

THE trouble with this idea is that so many of the allied and friendly countries abroad also have surpluses which they need to dispose of. Our efforts to get rid of parts of our surpluses at cut-rate prices, easy terms and as out-right gifts are being denounced, accurately enough, as dumping.

Thus New Zealand has protested that "dairy products are now being dumped at prices well below those ruling in world markets."

Mr. C. D. Howe, the Trade Minister of Canada, a country also bedeviled as we are by a wheat surplus, has complained that "markets generally are disorganized by U. S. surplus disposal measures."

Thailand and Burma, themselves recipients of certain of our surpluses, are protesting that we are dumping rice, which interferes unfairly with their rice export trade. Uruguay has made a protest against our agreement to supply Brazil with wheat and other farm products, contending that they compete unfairly with Uruguay's trade with Brazil.

No wonder the State Department is not finding it easy to dispose of the surpluses in a hurry. The department is, in fact, in a jam. It is under pressure from Congress to dump the surpluses and under attack abroad from the countries which suffer from the dumping.

IT IS almost certainly an error to think that our farm troubles can be solved, or even appreciably alleviated, by the effort to get rid of the surpluses abroad.

In 1955 we made strenuous efforts under a number of different acts. The Administration got rid of something over two billion dollars' worth of surplus commodities of which a little over one billion was disposed of abroad. But the surpluses accumulated at home are bigger than they ever were.

The basic fact of the matter is that only 10 per cent of our total agricultural production is exported, and though the world market is important for certain crops, the problem cannot be solved by pushing it off on to the world markets. It is not possible to dispose of the surpluses quickly even by a combination of such devices as giving them away, selling them for currencies we do not need, or bartering them for foreign commodities that we would buy anyway.

FOR US to push very hard along these lines, essentially that of dumping, would almost certainly do us more harm abroad than it does us good here at home.

For we must not lose sight of a cardinal element of the new

Some parts, some comparatively small part of our surpluses, cannot be disposed of abroad through commercial channels. Appreciable amounts can still be gotten rid of abroad through programs designed to help remedy undernourishment and raise economic productivity, provided these programs are wisely conceived and administered as aid programs and not as dumping measures.

But in the main we should regard these surpluses as a reserve to be drawn upon in time of disaster at home or abroad, when there are great crop failures or natural catastrophes such as floods, typhoons, earthquakes, drought.

These surpluses cannot really be disposed of in the world market any more than they can be disposed of in the domestic market, and as an economic factor in supply and demand there is nothing to be done with these surpluses except to isolate and neutralize them.

Copyright 1955. New York Herald Tribune Inc.

ALL THIS is not to say that some parts, some comparatively small part of our surpluses, cannot be disposed of abroad through commercial channels. Appreciable amounts can still be gotten rid of abroad through programs designed to help remedy undernourishment and raise economic productivity, provided these programs are wisely conceived and administered as aid programs and not as dumping measures.

But in the main we should regard these surpluses as a reserve to be drawn upon in time of disaster at home or abroad, when there are great crop failures or natural catastrophes such as floods, typhoons, earthquakes, drought.

These surpluses cannot really be disposed of in the world market any more than they can be disposed of in the domestic market, and as an economic factor in supply and demand there is nothing to be done with these surpluses except to isolate and neutralize them.

Copyright 1955. New York Herald Tribune Inc.

ALL THIS is not to say that some parts, some comparatively small part of our surpluses, cannot be disposed of abroad through commercial channels. Appreciable amounts can still be gotten rid of abroad through programs designed to help remedy undernourishment and raise economic productivity, provided these programs are wisely conceived and administered as aid programs and not as dumping measures.

But in the main we should regard these surpluses as a reserve to be drawn upon in time of disaster at home or abroad, when there are great crop failures or natural catastrophes such as floods, typhoons, earthquakes, drought.

These surpluses cannot really be disposed of in the world market any more than they can be disposed of in the domestic market, and as an economic factor in supply and demand there is nothing to be done with these surpluses except to isolate and neutralize them.

Copyright 1955. New York Herald Tribune Inc.

ALL THIS is not to say that some parts, some comparatively small part of our surpluses, cannot be disposed of abroad through commercial channels. Appreciable amounts can still be gotten rid of abroad through programs designed to help remedy undernourishment and raise economic productivity, provided these programs are wisely conceived and administered as aid programs and not as dumping measures.

But in the main we should regard these surpluses as a reserve to be drawn upon in time of disaster at home or abroad, when there are great crop failures or natural catastrophes such as floods, typhoons, earthquakes, drought.

These surpluses cannot really be disposed of in the world market any more than they can be disposed of in the domestic market, and as an economic factor in supply and demand there is nothing to be done with these surpluses except to isolate and neutralize them.

Copyright 1955. New York Herald Tribune Inc.

ALL THIS is not to say that some parts, some comparatively small part of our surpluses, cannot be disposed of abroad through commercial channels. Appreciable amounts can still be gotten rid of abroad through programs designed to help remedy undernourishment and raise economic productivity, provided these programs are wisely conceived and administered as aid programs and not as dumping measures.

But in the main we should regard these surpluses as a reserve to be drawn upon in time of disaster at home or abroad, when there are great crop failures or natural catastrophes such as floods, typhoons, earthquakes, drought.

These surpluses cannot really be disposed of in the world market any more than they can be disposed of in the domestic market, and as an economic factor in supply and demand there is nothing to be done with these surpluses except to isolate and neutralize them.

Copyright 1955. New York Herald Tribune Inc.

ALL THIS is not to say that some parts, some comparatively small part of our surpluses, cannot be disposed of abroad through commercial channels. Appreciable amounts can still be gotten rid of abroad through programs designed to help remedy undernourishment and raise economic productivity, provided these programs are wisely conceived and administered as aid programs and not as dumping measures.

But in the main we should regard these surpluses as a reserve to be drawn upon in time of disaster at home or abroad, when there are great crop failures or natural catastrophes such as floods, typhoons, earthquakes, drought.

These surpluses cannot really be disposed of in the world market any more than they can be disposed of in the domestic market, and as an economic factor in supply and demand there is nothing to be done with these surpluses except to isolate and neutralize them.

Copyright 1955. New York Herald Tribune Inc.

ALL THIS is not to say that some parts, some comparatively small part of our surpluses, cannot be disposed of abroad through commercial channels. Appreciable amounts can still be gotten rid of abroad through programs designed to help remedy undernourishment and raise economic productivity, provided these programs are wisely conceived and administered as aid programs and not as dumping measures.

But in the main we should regard these surpluses as a reserve to be drawn upon in time of disaster at home or abroad, when there are great crop failures or natural catastrophes such as floods, typhoons, earthquakes, drought.

These surpluses cannot really be disposed of in the world market any more than they can be disposed of in the domestic market, and as an economic factor in supply and demand there is nothing to be done with these surpluses except to isolate and neutralize them.

Copyright 1955. New York Herald Tribune Inc.

Matter of Fact By Joe and Stewart Alsop

WHOSE OX IS GALLED?

Washington—The grand Senatorial investigation of political contributions by big business

looks very much like turning into an investigation of political contributions by big labor. Not to put too fine a point on it, the grandees of the AFL-CIO are scared pink.

What scares them is the composition of the select committee that the Senate has now named to look into the whole problem of campaign financing.

Sticking out like a sore thumb among the four Republican committee members is Sen. Barry Goldwater of New Mexico, who has been raising the roof about the political activities of labor organizations for some time now.

The committee chairmanship will be allotted, in defiance of the seniority rules, to the young, evangelical Democrat, Sen. Albert Gore of Tennessee. If Senator Gore wants to let the chips fall where they may, it is unlikely that anyone will stop him since there is deep fear in the Senate of any suspicion of a cover-up.

But Senator Gore is clearly going to be made to understand that the chips will be very large indeed. And that some of them will fall in a rather hard and wounding manner, on members of his own faction of the Democratic party.

BESIDES Senator Goldwater, the other three Republicans

on the select committee, Thye of Minnesota, Bridges of New Hampshire and Purtell of Connecticut, will certainly go along with a move to look into the political money that comes from big labor as well as the money that comes from big business. Equally certain, at least one of the Democratic committee members, Sen. John McClellan of Arkansas, will favor such a move.

Some labor leaders have already warned the Senate Democratic leadership of danger ahead. And well they might. Labor contributions take the form of under-the-table money almost as often as business contributions. And it is a reasonable bet that almost every Democratic Senator who is even moderately pro-labor has received some campaign help of this kind.

EVERY practical politician knows, of course, that there is no truth whatever in the extreme right-wing view that labor money in politics equals or exceeds business money. The total political outlays of the labor organizations certainly do not amount to one fifth and probably do not amount to one tenth, of the political outlays of big business. Furthermore, except in Congressional elections in the South, at least three quarters of the money from business sources goes to the Republicans.

Yet the fact has to be faced that a really full and complete inquiry will deeply embarrass everyone, on both sides of the political fence. And this fact in turn suggests that everyone, on both sides of the fence, has been pretty mealy-mouthed about this business of campaign contributions, which has meanwhile been getting out of hand in all directions.

The behavior of an arrogant minority of the oil industry during the recent natural gas bill fight, which brought on the present inquiry, suggests how far out of hand the whole business has got. But there are plenty of other indications.

IN THE Ohio election that returned the impeccably honest Robert A. Taft to the Senate in 1950, for example, at least \$3,000,000 must have been spent, over-all, on the Republican side. Yet Truman Newberry was driven from the Senate in 1922, because it was proved that he had spent \$95,000 to defeat the elder Henry Ford in the Michigan election in 1918.

What is urgent, therefore, is not to plough through all the seas of mud that are certainly there to be ploughed through by the investigators of campaign contributions. What is really urgent is to subject this business of campaign contributions to reasonable controls, and to establish sensible, workable, non-utopian standards for the future. With his usual good sense, Senate Democratic leader Lyndon Johnson of Texas has seen exactly this point.

JOHNSON has therefore caused to be prepared a revision of the existing statutes, which does three things of cardinal importance, as well as many useful but minor things. First, it brings under control the phony committees that candidates habitually create, often by the score, to conceal the amount of money spent in their campaigns.

Second, it sets a realistic ceiling—20 cents per voter in each state—on the amount of money a candidate can spend in a Congressional or Senatorial fight.

And third and most important of all, the Johnson bill requires full and complete disclosure of every campaign of whatever kind, so that everyone will know who's influencing whom.

With the political campaigns growing more astronomically costly every year, the need for something like Senator Johnson's bill has become more and more acute. And if the present ruckus causes the bill to pass, the net result will be excellent.

(C) 1956, New York Herald Tribune, Inc.

In The Day's News

By FRANK JENKINS

Our neighbors of Old Mexico don't believe much in signs. At least their highway engineers don't. In the U.S.A. you know always where you're at, and how far it is to the next place. If the signs erected by our state highway departments don't tell you, the billboards will—so many miles to so-and-so's hamburger stand, and so on.

But in Mexico—well, it's different. Time doesn't matter so much in this part of the world. If you just keep on going you'll get there sooner or later.

Between towns maybe 200 or 300 miles apart, there may be no more than two distance signs. If you want to keep track of where you're at and how long it will be till you get there you need to keep a close check on your speedometer.

YOU do know, of course, when you're approaching a town. At the edge of each village or hamlet or town or city, there will be a sign reading Poblado Proximo—meaning town coming. But these signs are so close to the city limits that by the time you get them read you'll be well into the middle of things.

THERE is a sure sign, however, of the proximity of a town or a city. Miles before you get there, you'll begin to overtake burros loaded to the ears with firewood. Or what in Mexico passes for firewood. It has been cut out in the brush that covers the hills. The cutting has been done, in the main, with a machete— a tool without which every Mexican beyond the limits of the great cities would be helpless.

The big sticks may be as much as half the diameter of your wrist. The little ones will be as small as lead pencils. The average will be a shade larger than a broom handle.

THE cubic volume of the wood he carries will be about twice the cubic volume of the burro. This is a rule to which there are few exceptions. What a burro can carry is one of the natural wonders of this part of the world.

HOW, you ask, can one heat a house, even a small one, with twigs like that? The answer is simple. Down in this part of the Western Hemisphere they just don't heat their houses.

If an unexpected cold snap comes along, the Mexican just wraps his serape around him and shivers it out. I'm talking, naturally, of the average Mexican. The people in the big houses, who can afford to buy their wood— or who possess trucks manned by retainers—have fireplaces. They are very cheerful affairs indeed, for the wood is as dry as tinder and burns with a brilliant and beautiful flame.

The bulk of this wood that is

M. Massie of Grants Pass in her letter of Feb. 22 gives a safe method which she quotes from Dr. F. B. Exner of Seattle. Would it be out of order to ask Dr. Merkel to explain in these columns why some such method could not be instituted here?

Anna M. Streed 36 North Peach St. Medford, Ore.

packed in on burros is too precious to be used for heat. It is cooking fuel. The poorer Mexican, like the rest of us, has to eat, and his food has to be cooked. So he has to get out in the brushy hills and rustle his fuel.

With the aid of his trusty machete and his burro, he wandles when it is related to her that the poor of Paris were starving for bread, Marie Antoinette is reported to have said: "Why, the poor things! If they haven't any bread, why don't they eat cake?"

Being an American and, like Marie, being accustomed to the good things of life as a matter of course, you may ask: "If these poor Mexicans can't afford firewood, why don't they cook with gas or electricity?"