

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE

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

ROBERT W. RUIH, 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 STANCHER, Society Editor. DALE ERICKSON, Circulation Mgr.

Subscription Rates: By Mail—In Advance: Per Copy 10c. Daily and Sunday—One year \$12.00. Daily and Sunday—Six months \$7.50. Daily and Sunday—Three mos. 3.50. Sunday Only—One year \$3.50.

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

NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION

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 11, 1946. (It was Monday) F. C. Hart, engineer of bureau of reclamation here, announces that office staff will be increased from 16 to 35 immediately.

From Arthur Perry's Ye Smudge Pot column: Primary election filings have been completed in this state. There is no plethora of candidates, as in former years. They are as scarce almost as hen's teeth, where formerly they were more plentiful than legs on a caterpillar.

20 YEARS AGO March 11, 1936. (It was Wednesday) F. Wilson Wait, director of music at Medford high school, announces that girls drum-and-bugle corps at the high and junior high school have started practice.

Roundup of wild horses in the Little Applegate district to start Sunday under the direction of Lee Port of the forest service.

30 YEARS AGO March 11, 1926. (It was Thursday) City dog catcher starts rounding up unlicensed dogs.

K. K. Kubli, of Portland and former resident of Jackson county, visits site of Galls creek quartz mine development, in which he has interest.

40 YEARS AGO March 11, 1916. (It was Saturday) George L. Treichler, agent for Overland here, arrives with first Silent Knight motor vehicle in valley.

Special children's show will be presented at Page theater here Saturday morning.

What's the Answer?

Can You Get 4 of the 7? Copr. 1955, Editorial Research Report

- 1. Stevenson has or hasn't campaigned in person to defeat Kefauver in the 1956 presidential primary in New Hampshire? 2. Which make of U.S. car is named for a President? 3. Special delivery on a first-class letter costs 10, 15, 20 or 25 cents? 4. The U.S. flag has eight rows of six stars, six rows of eight stars, or four rows of 12? 5. If you tip off the Treasury that some one is evading taxes, it may give you a money reward if your tip proves a good one; right or wrong? 6. The Sea of Galilee is within Israel, Jordan, Syria, or between Israel and Jordan, Israel and Syria, Israel and Egypt, or Jordan and Syria? 7. Which boxing champion was called the Brown Bomber? The answers: 1. Hasn't. 2. Lincoln. 3. 20 cents. 4. Six rows of eight. 5. Right. 6. Within Israel. 7. Joe Louis.

Charles Porter Slaters Luncheon Meeting Here

Charles O. Porter, Democratic candidate for congress, will speak at a noon luncheon at the Medford hotel Saturday, March 17. Porter will discuss his candidacy and issues of the coming campaign. The public is invited.

Dismiss Electoral College?

The Senate this week is expected to take up various plans to reform the ancient electoral college system of choosing the President and Vice President.

Wide support for reforming the system can be expected if proponents of various plans can only get together on the method. Substantial agreement on a compromise was reported by Karl Mundt (R-S.D.), advocate of one of the plans, last month. No plan accepted would, of course, affect the 1956 election. All plans are aimed at giving the popular vote more weight in electing the President and Vice President than under the present electoral system.

The argument runs something like this: New York State has 45 electoral votes. But the candidate who carries New York by, say, 55 per cent of the popular vote, receives all of New York's electoral votes under the present system. So 45 per cent of the state's voters are effectively disfranchised.

THE Senate Democratic policy committee has cleared for debate a proposed constitutional amendment sponsored by Senators Price Daniel (D-Tex.) and Estes Kefauver (D-Tenn.). The system it provides for would split the electoral vote of each state in exact mathematical relationship to the popular vote, including decimals.

The other proposal which has attracted wide support is that of Sen. Mundt and Rep. Frederic W. Coudert Jr., (R-N.Y.). This retains the electoral college, entitling each state to a number of electors equal to its delegation in Congress. The electors of a state would be chosen, however, "in the same manner in which its senators and representatives are nominated and elected."

IN OTHER words, the candidates for President and Vice President who won state-wide pluralities would get as many electors as the state had senators (two) and representatives-at-large. After that the national candidates with a plurality in each congressional district would get the elector from that district. Senator Mundt is agreeable to stipulating that the Daniel-Kefauver plan would go into effect unless a state specifically chose the Mundt-Coudert plan.

STILL other plans have been suggested, some more complicated than these two, some less so.

The smart money is probably on the Daniel-Kefauver plus the Mundt-Coudert compromise. But even with Senate passage, the measure would probably have trouble in the House. The Daniel-Kefauver plan is substantially that of the Lodge-Gossett amendment defeated in the House after Senate passage in 1950.

And of course any amendment that passed the Senate and House by two-thirds vote would still have to be ratified by legislatures of 36 states to become effective.—E.R.R.

Dropping the Co-Pilot

Alexander Throttlebottom, in the musical of Thee I Sing, had been nominated for Vice President by the simple process of putting a number of names on slips in a hat and pulling one out. Throttlebottom didn't win; he lost—that is, had his name drawn.

That wouldn't seem so funny today, when the Vice President is recognized as a responsible, highly powerful, and even portentous office.

The last time the Republicans dropped the co-pilot—or refused to nominate the incumbent Vice President, Charles G. Dawes, was 1928. However, one thing should be made clear—the relationship between the GOP organization and Vice President Dawes had hardly been akin to the close ties between the Eisenhower Administration and Vice President Richard M. Nixon.

Dawes had been regarded as somewhat disloyal to the administration. He had refused to sit with Coolidge's cabinet, though invited to do so, as Coolidge had done under Harding.

GEN. DAWES in 1928 was an imposing figure. After making a bad start by bawling out the Senate on its rules, he had earned wide respect in that body as its presiding officer. He had considerable support for the presidential nomination in the East, also in the Midwest grain states. Nevertheless, Herbert C. Hoover, recently resigned as Secretary of Commerce, won a decisive majority on the first ballot for President at the 1928 GOP convention.

Backstage at the convention a list of seven candidates for Vice President was circulated. The list was finally narrowed down to Dawes, Sen. Charles Curtis, and Channing Cox of Massachusetts. It was then tentatively agreed, Hatch wrote, to give Dawes first chance.

BUT there was his "unsoundness" on the handling of a controversial bill. In a telephone conversation he refused to agree that the recent veto by Coolidge had shelved the bill for four years. He refused in a second call to say publicly the bill had been disposed of. He was unpopular with organized labor.

And the leaders were afraid that if nominated for Vice President, Dawes would stage a "sensational refusal." His friend, Gov. Frank O. Lowden of Illinois, in 1924 had rocked the GOP convention by declining the nomination for Vice President after it had formally and finally been made—one of only four men in U.S. history to do so. So Dawes was dropped, the name of Curtis was put before the convention, and Curtis received an all but unanimous vote on the first ballot.

Sen. Hiram W. Johnson of California pridefully turned down the chance to be Warren G. Harding's running-mate. He could not have known of course that Harding would serve less than 2½ years of his term. Times have changed. Today the nomination for Vice President of either party would scarcely be considered "beneath" any worthy man.—E.R.R.

Views of Ike, Adlai and Estes On Major Issues Are Compared

By Congressional Quarterly

Washington—The Presidential primary season starts Tuesday in New Hampshire with the famous grin (President Eisenhower), the coonskin cap (Sen. Estes Kefauver, Tenn.) and the high-toned speeches (Adlai E. Stevenson) in open contention.

Do Republican Eisenhower and Democrats Stevenson and Kefauver have a fairly common middle ground of agreement on issues developing in the midst of the primary campaigns? Or is their fundamental philosophy different?

Voters analyzing the policies of the three men will find their statements broad enough to cover individual issues so that fundamental differences tend to be blurred. Nevertheless the analysis shows three areas of sharp disagreement. The Differences

The positions of the three candidates also differ in the emphasis placed on the execution, interpretation or administration of certain programs.

But the fields of disagreement narrow to what could be the top domestic issues of the Presidential campaign: agriculture, taxes, and public vs. private power.

There are shades in the disagreement here, too. But the three men tend to differ in basic philosophy in these fields more than in others.

In agriculture, for instance, the President says he is "unalterably opposed" to 90 per cent of parity support prices for farm crops. He favors flexible price supports plus the soil bank conservation program as a major means of bringing farm crops and prices into line.

Stevenson and Kefauver agree that 90 per cent of parity should be part of the farm law. Stevenson says the soil bank program, while commendable, is not the entire answer to the problem of falling farm prices.

Tax Views Kefauver voted for a \$20 tax cut for individuals in 1955. Stevenson sees a need to assess national defense policies and spending programs before considering tax cuts. He says he would favor tax cuts for low income groups first, when they are made. The President says he wants no tax cuts until a balanced budget is achieved.

President Eisenhower has proposed a "partnership" policy for power development. He envisions the sharing of the cost of resource development by the groups benefiting the most. Stevenson would push for multi-purpose resource development—power as a factor would be involved with flood control and irrigation.

Kefauver, a booster for TVA, says a federal program "with real determination behind it" will succeed.

In Foreign Policy In the foreign policy field, two principal areas of disagreement in emphasis have been developing and probably will continue. First, both Stevenson and Kefauver contend the administration's defense policy, particularly in the area of guided missile development, has lagged so that Russia is gaining the lead in research and production. The President's reply is that while the Russians may lead in certain aspects of this field, the U. S. leads in others and also in overall research and development.

The second disagreement in emphasis lies in the matter of foreign aid and its tangents. Both Kefauver and Stevenson stress the need for developing economic assistance programs, especially in the Far East, rather than emphasizing security pacts and military aid. The President, in the State of the Union message and subsequent statements, stresses military pacts and security arrangements. However, he has called for a foreign aid program with long-range commitments, to which Congressional Democrats react coolly.

Immigration In the field of immigration, the President recommends amending the McCarran-Walter immigration act. He would base quotas on the 1950 census rather than the 1920 census. Stevenson feels the whole act should be rewritten. Kefauver agrees with Stevenson.

In the touchy matter of segregation, all three agree the Supreme Court decision ordering desegregation of schools must be observed. The President says he thinks there are sufficient laws to bring about a gradual program of integration. Both Stevenson and Kefauver advocate gradualism in desegregation, have asked the President to call in Negro and white leaders from the South in an effort to prevent violence and misunderstanding. To date, the President has let the matter alone.

Copyright 1956, Congressional Quarterly

Today and Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann

MR. FAULKNER'S LETTER

Life magazine publishes a letter addressed to the people of the northern states by William Faulkner, the eminent novelist.

Mr. Faulkner is a native of Mississippi. He speaks as a Southerner who not only believes in "the simple in a controversially immoral, but also that this discrimination is an evil which will be cured eventually by the Southerners themselves.

The point of this letter is to warn Northerners that discrimination will not be cured, will in fact become all the sharper, if legal coercion used to enforce the Supreme Court's decision.

Mr. Faulkner, as a Southerner who is opposed in principle both to segregation and to enforced integration, regards his position as being in the "middle." He sees himself as pressed from two sides between the Citizens Councils on the one hand, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the other. He is between those who would uphold "white supremacy" by nullification of the Supreme Court's decision and those who would use the Federal power to abolish segregation. Like he asks, will Southerners like himself if Federal enforcement is attempted. They will go, so he says in effect, with the resistance of the Citizens Councils.

THE burden of Mr. Faulkner's plea is that the Northerners should not now press for Federal enforcement. For this would make it impossible for Southerners like himself to work for the gradual acceptance of integration.

To this there is something which must be said for the Northerners who will understand and sympathize with Mr. Faulkner's argument. These Northerners include the President and Gov. Stevenson, and they are quite surely a majority today. But their position is threatened by the Southern extremists who not only proclaim the doctrine of nullification but, as in the Lucy case in Alabama, connive at mob violence.

For the moderate Northerners it is impossible to accept the gradualism that Mr. Faulkner advocates if at the same time they have to acquiesce in what happened at Alabama University. To do so would be to surrender two elementary principles. One is, as Mr. Faulkner defines it, that discrimination by race is immoral. The other is that the laws of the Union bind all who live within the Union. To acquiesce and not to protest would make the middle position unprincipled and in the end untenable.

THE situation is one in which all the strong passions tend to run to the two irreconcilable extremes—towards the fierce defense in the deep South of the white way of life, towards a militant demand by the Negroes and their friends for the vindication of their indubitable human rights.

There is little reason to believe that the issue can now be dealt with in the South as it was after the Civil War—by nullification with the assent of the North. There is a new dynamic factor in the situation today—the rise of the American Negro to a position of very considerable economic and political power.

We have seen the first beginnings of what this may bring in the boycott in Montgomery. There the Negro population have practiced passive resistance—the classic tactic of weak and subject peoples. There is

every reason to suppose that uncompromising and militant resistance by the Citizens Councils in the deep South will—if it closes the door to gradual reform—cause the Montgomery example to spread.

YET we can have no great hope that mutual warnings like Mr. Faulkner's and mine, that these pious exhortations to reason and moderation, will in themselves be heeded. The basic weakness of the middle position is that it does not now, that it does not as yet, represent a practical and concrete program on which men of moderate temper have agreed to unite.

Mr. Faulkner says "go slow now." But how slowly can we go without nullifying the Constitution? Northerners say, "Take your time but show good faith." But what would be enough compliance to prove good faith?

The Supreme Court has accepted the responsibility of judging these questions as they are presented to the Federal court. But what seems to be missing is a consensus of enlightened opinion as to what issues it is necessary and wise to present to the court and in what order. For the formation of such a consensus it may prove necessary to call upon the President for leadership.

Copyright 1956, New York Herald Tribune Inc.

Matter of Fact

By Joe and Stewart Alsop

WASHINGTON — Both the magnitude and the urgency of the American defense problem are pretty well summed up in what may be called the B-52 problem, which is due to cause widespread and embittered public debate in the months immediately ahead.

Secretary of the Air Force Donald Quarles has now told both the Senate and House Armed Services Committees that he is perfectly satisfied with the existing B-52 program. This means that Secretary Quarles is satisfied with a current monthly output of only four of these long range jet bombers which have become the essential instruments of strategic airpower, although the Soviet output of their comparable "Bison" bombers is already three times higher than American B-52 output.

One man who is conspicuously dissatisfied, however, is the brilliant commander of the U.S. Strategic Air Command, Gen. Curtis LeMay. It must have taken some courage for Gen. LeMay to tackle the B-52 problem again this year. In 1952, he was tentatively slated to become Chief of Air Staff. He was actually brought into the Pentagon on a sort of trial basis. But his insistent demand for an expanded B-52 program got him into a hot row with the then-Secretaries of Defense and the Air Force, Robert A. Lovett and Thomas Finletter. So LeMay missed the top job in 1952, and was returned to SAC command.

YET courage is one quality that Gen. LeMay has never lacked. In the budget-making period this year, he rather stormily demanded an emergency effort to step up B-52 output to the level of 40 to 50 planes

per month, and to raise the production goal far enough to provide SAC with no less than 1,900 B-52s.

LeMay was turned down flat by the balance-the-budget-firsters, but at present the Air Staff is all but unanimous that he ought not to have been turned down. And the wise and moderate chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Richard Russell of Georgia, is now demanding an increase of 1,500,000,000 in this year's Air Force appropriations, mainly to provide LeMay with more B-52s.

The B-52 program LeMay wants will cost a pretty penny.

THE bill for each of these great planes is \$8,000,000; and the kind of increase in B-52 strength that LeMay wants would require tremendous concurrent increases in SAC's tanker fleet and air base system on this continent. But if you are a survival-firster instead of a balance-the-budget-firster, Gen. LeMay's arguments appear to be absolutely unanswerable.

In brief, LeMay's Strategic Air Command now comprises 11 truly long range groups, whose obsolete B-36s are now being very gradually replaced with B-52s, plus 28 medium range groups equipped with B-47s. Numerically, the present ratio is 330 inter-continental bombers to 1,420 medium range bombers, for there are more planes in the B-47 groups than in the long range groups.

The B-47 groups are planned to operate from overseas air bases, while the long range bombers are planned to operate from this hemisphere. All are to participate in the first strike, and Gen. LeMay insists that SAC cannot do its assigned job with a total striking power of less than 1,850 bombers.

But most of Gen. LeMay's force, being medium range, is hopelessly dependent on the overseas bases. Loss of those bases would cut his B-47 striking power almost exactly as much as the destruction of four-fifths of his B-47s on the ground before the war even started. Without the overseas bases, therefore, SAC could not possibly do its assigned job. Gen. LeMay might wound, but he

could not kill the enemy.

THIS dependence of SAC on overseas bases is now being rendered acutely perilous in two different ways. Politically the bases are becoming less and less reliable, because of the general weakening of the Western Alliance. Strategically, the bases are becoming more and more vulnerable. The prime purposes of the Soviets' new ballistic missile of 1,500 miles range are to intimidate the American Allies who control LeMay's overseas bases; or if need be, to destroy those bases in one vast, widespread simultaneous missile strike.

In two years time or a little more, therefore, these already doubtful foreign bases, on which SAC is so dependent, will quite certainly become utterly dependable. At that time, Gen. LeMay's power to kill may be lost any morning. He may be left, any morning, with only enough power to wound. By that time the Soviets will also have a large, wholly self-contained force of long range jet bombers, with no crippling dependencies of any kind, and plenty of power to destroy this country.

WHAT lies ahead, in sum, is a period when Gen. LeMay can only be sure of wounding the enemy, while his Soviet opposite number can be sure of destroying the United States. Gen. LeMay wants to replace his medium range B-47s with long range B-52s in order to maintain his power to kill during this interim period before the intercontinental ballistic missile will again change the power balance.

In these circumstances the sublime satisfaction of Secretary Quarles is a trifle hard to comprehend.

Copyright 1956 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

POTLUCK

(By M-T Staff and Contributors)

"Beanie," our beauty-parlor specialist informs us, is a privileged character.

Beanie is a parakeet. He (She? It?) is owned by Mrs. Mary Kerr of the East Side Beauty salon, who often permits (him? it?) out of its (his? her?) cage. The chartreuse-colored bird then takes pleasure in flitting about, mostly in the room with the hair-driers. Sometimes it will sit on a cord alongside of the chairs, or on a magazine rack. And occasionally an unsuspecting patron will be surprised as the small creature will light on her shoulder.

Beanie picks at the magazines with interest, sometimes—a habit which motivated one of the operators to suggest he be named Readers Digest.

City officials are not entirely without a sense of humor. At last week's council meeting which included students participating in Student Government Day, Councilman Stanley Jones remarked that an ordinance prepared by the students sounded better than many he had heard prepared by City Attorney Frank Farrell, to which Farrell replied, "Yes, but the city attorney has to bring in the ordinances directed by the council."

And Mayor Earl Miller said that he was pleased to note several very attractive young ladies among the members of the student council. "I think the mayor is very fortunate," he said. "Look what the city of Medford gave me to work with." The regular council is all-male.

Inasmuch as next Friday is St. Patrick's day, we are reminded of the Irishman who bought a boat, but was undecided what to name it. He saw an Englishman's boat named Henry VIII, and a friend suggested he name the boat George VI—a suggestion he rejected with some violence. But inspiration dawned. He obtained paint-bucket and brush and vigorously painted the inspired name on bow and stern: MARCH XVII.

Chivalry in Medford is not dead. A local secretary was walking down Main st. on an errand recently when she saw a car where the parking meter time had expired, and a short distance behind it, a policeman checking parking meters. Philanthropically, she put a penny in the meter.

At that moment a man stepped out of a store and said, "I say, I don't believe that's your car." The secretary agreed that it wasn't. The man, who had seen the policeman, asked her to wait a minute.

He stepped into a flower shop and emerged with a large bouquet of yellow asters which he presented to her on the spot.

A staff member last Wednesday was interviewing Robert A. Boyer when he noted that Boyer had failed to mention his four-month-old daughter, Sharon Marie. Boyer immediately went into enthusiastic detail about his only child but when the reporter

could not kill the enemy.

THIS dependence of SAC on overseas bases is now being rendered acutely perilous in two different ways. Politically the bases are becoming less and less reliable, because of the general weakening of the Western Alliance. Strategically, the bases are becoming more and more vulnerable. The prime purposes of the Soviets' new ballistic missile of 1,500 miles range are to intimidate the American Allies who control LeMay's overseas bases; or if need be, to destroy those bases in one vast, widespread simultaneous missile strike.

In two years time or a little more, therefore, these already doubtful foreign bases, on which SAC is so dependent, will quite certainly become utterly dependable. At that time, Gen. LeMay's power to kill may be lost any morning. He may be left, any morning, with only enough power to wound. By that time the Soviets will also have a large, wholly self-contained force of long range jet bombers, with no crippling dependencies of any kind, and plenty of power to destroy this country.

WHAT lies ahead, in sum, is a period when Gen. LeMay can only be sure of wounding the enemy, while his Soviet opposite number can be sure of destroying the United States. Gen. LeMay wants to replace his medium range B-47s with long range B-52s in order to maintain his power to kill during this interim period before the intercontinental ballistic missile will again change the power balance.

In these circumstances the sublime satisfaction of Secretary Quarles is a trifle hard to comprehend.

Copyright 1956 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

asked how her name was spelled there was a long pause. "You mean you don't know how to spell your daughter's name?" the reporter asked.

"Well," Boyer stammered, "we haven't had her very long."

A bartender who has permanent lodgings in a local hotel has a fondness for popcorn. He keeps a bowl-type electric popper in his room so that he can satisfy his craving.

After getting off work at about 3 a.m. recently he decided to pop some corn. The transom window was open and the smell of freshly popped popcorn wafted through the hallway. Presently there was a knock on the door and he opened it to find a woman who lived down the hall that was also a popcorn lover.

In a few minutes there was another knock. And this time it was a man he had never seen before, just coming in from a night on the town. He'd smelled the popcorn and had a craving. The bartender also uses his popper to cook artichokes in.

In the Day's News

By FRANK JENKINS Late Thursday afternoon the senate of the United States faced up to a situation and made what appears at the moment to have been a firm decision on a critical political issue.

By a vote of 54 to 41, it defeated a proposal to have cotton, corn and peanut crops supported at 90 per cent of parity. The vote is generally interpreted as a major victory for the Eisenhower-Benson program of FLEXIBLE price supports.

THE political significance of the vote is indicated by the fact that for the first time in 20 years ALL THE MEMBERS OF THE SENATE WERE PRESENT AND VOTED. Every senator stood up and was counted. None ran for cover.

The last time that happened was in 1936. The issue then was overriding a Presidential veto of the soldiers' bonus bill. Like the farm bill now, the soldiers' bonus bill had explosive political possibilities.

On both occasions, there was one vacancy caused by death so that the membership of the senate was only 95. On both occasions, every member was present and stood up and was counted.

LET'S keep Thursday's situation straight in our minds. It wasn't a final vote. It came on a Democratic-sponsored amendment to have COTTON, CORN AND PEANUTS supported at 90 per cent of parity. The other so-called "basic" crops—wheat, notably—were not included.

The political situation is this: If the Democrats are to win this fall, they MUST carry the South solidly. The South is primarily concerned with cotton, corn and peanuts. If cotton, corn and peanuts could have been brought under the protection of the 90 per cent of parity umbrella it would have been a sign in the sky to the agricultural interests of the South that the Democratic party is the party for the South to tie to.

That was the political significance of it.

BESIDES— If cotton, corn and peanuts could have been brought under the shelter of the high parity umbrella, it would have been a practical certainty that wheat—the other big controversial crop that is already in staggering surplus—could have been brought under. The wheat states are also politically important.

So— If the cotton-corn-peanuts amendment had won, return to high parity support would have been in the bag and the flexible support policy would have been in the ash can.

That is the long and the short of it.

THE political battle for the farm vote isn't over yet. Thursday's vote was only the first skirmish. But it was a sharp and bitter skirmish. Its sharpness and its bitterness are indicated by the fact that no member of the senate felt that he could afford to dodge a vote on the cotton-corn-peanuts amendment.

The majority was decisive enough—unexpectedly decisive, it appears from the general comment this morning—to lead to the hope that the flexible support policy will not be thrown out in favor of return to high parity and its inevitable consequence of disastrously accumulating surpluses.

Nevada is the driest state with an annual average of just 8.6 inches of rainfall, based on a 64-year record.

Of all the workers in the U.S. only about 19 per cent are self-employed, according to census reports.