

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE

"Everybody in Southern Oregon Reads The Mail Tribune" Published Daily Except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO. 7-29 North Fir St. Phone 2-6141

ROBERT W. RUHL, 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.

Entered as second class matter at Medford, Oregon, under Act of March 3, 1879.

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

Official Paper of the City of Medford Official Paper of Jackson County

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 May 10, 1946 (It was Friday)

Ernest Piercy and Farrel Snider designated by CAA as examiners in Medford area for students seeking aircraft pilot certificates.

From Arthur Perry's Ye Smudge Pot column: Giles Gitz, the veterinarian, flaunts a new auto '46. Man or beast could feel proud to be run over by it, if unavoidable.

20 YEARS AGO May 10, 1936 (It was Thursday)

Plans being completed for newly organized local AAUW branch's formal installation banquet Saturday.

The Valley View bridge across Bear creek, will be completed and open to traffic Saturday. Paul Rynning, county engineer, announces.

30 YEARS AGO May 10, 1926 (It was Tuesday)

Miss Ada Brewster, home demonstration agent for two years, resigns to move to Minnesota.

From Local and Personal column: The American Legion auxiliary will hold their regular monthly meeting in the parlors of the Baptist church this evening.

40 YEARS AGO May 10, 1916 (It was Wednesday)

An average of fruit losses by frost taken by J. Cecil Alter of the local weather bureau, found 25 per cent average.

The board of education met in regular session last night.

What's the Answer? Can You Get 4 of the 7? Copr. 1955. Editorial Research Report

1. President Eisenhower voted as a legal resident in the recent Republican primary in New York, Pennsylvania, Kansas, or District of Columbia?

2. Mother's Day has been a national celebration for less than 25 years, about 25, or more than 25?

3. The U.S. has more women teachers than nurses, or more nurses, or about the same number of each?

4. Is any present U. S. Supreme Court justice foreign-born?

5. The name of Seiberling in U. S. business is associated with steelmaking, grocery chains, rubber products, West Coast banking or electronics?

6. "Walk softly and carry a big stick" was advice from President Washington, Lincoln, T. Roosevelt, Coolidge or F. D. Roosevelt?

7. A herpetologist studies herbs, the heart, snakes, skin diseases, or geological formations?

The answers: 1. Pennsylvania. 2. For more than 40 years. 3. More teachers. 4. Yes, Justice Frankfurter came here from Austria when 12. 5. Rubber products. 6. T. Roosevelt. 7. Snakes.

It's Up To the People

We see by the "East Oregonian" that a former state senator by the name of Rex Ellis of Umatilla County, has offered to pay \$1000 to anyone who can prove that any of the McKay "give-aways" was outside the law.

Former Senator Ellis takes no risk in making such a wager and undoubtedly knows it. In fact as far as our observation goes no one has accused the Secretary of the Interior of breaking the law,—had he done so, undoubtedly a federal court would have stepped in long ago.

IN FACT, it has been stressed in this department repeatedly that the issue between the two parties as far as the GOP "give-away" program is concerned is not a question of morals but of POLICY, not a question of law enforcement vs. non-enforcement, but a question of what will promote the general welfare of the country,—the public interest,—and what will benefit only private interests.

THE tidelands oil case is a perfect example of what we mean. The Supreme Court held in two or three decisions that the nation, not the abutting states, had the paramount interest in these submerged oil fields, and the petitions of the states for ownership were denied.

So a law was drawn up which gave the primary oil rights to the states thus invalidating the Supreme Court rulings. The court had held the states (California, Texas, Louisiana and Florida) could achieve this right, IF the congress wished to give it to them, via enabling legislation. Needless to add, congress as then constituted, DID.

SO THERE you are. Nothing illegal.

Just a change in long established policy regarding coast line waters, thereby depriving Oregon and 43 other states of millions of dollars in revenue, and the educational system of the country of billions.

But this action did help the lucky four states who have leased wells thus acquired to a few of the larger oil companies and operators, and it will eventually mean billions to the latter.

All "within the law." But the second portion of former Senator Ellis' wager reads as follows, quote:

"Or prove Uncle Sam did not get adequate cash return for any resources turned over to private interests."

That is another kettle of fish and it doesn't smell so good.

For here is the perfect example of a "give-away" that not only did not give Uncle Sam an adequate return, but didn't give him ANY return. In fact but for an amendment the Democrats finally forced through, to the "give-away" measure, the government would not even have retained control of the oil in the area in and beyond what is known as the continental shelf.

But nevertheless, we don't expect Mr. Ellis to turn over that \$1000, for no doubt he would claim nothing is "adequate compensation" for our bureaucratic government when everything goes to a few states, and the highly regarded private enterprise system.

In short his proposition is one of that familiar type known as "heads I win, tails you lose," for he would not only make the rules but define them.

SO WHAT? Well just this: Here is the one real and vital issue separating the two major parties today.

Reducing it to its simplest terms it comes down to the classic remark by the Secretary of Defense, and former President of General Motors, Mr. Wilson when he said:

"What is good for the country is good for General Motors and vice versa."

Had he left out that "vice versa" there would have been no complaint—except perhaps from his former Board of Directors.

But when he said "vice versa" he said what was good for General Motors WAS good for the country, and there has never been any question that is what he meant. Moreover, that today is the basic political philosophy of the Grand Old Party, and those who have failed to realize this have only to study the record to be convinced.

IN other words see that General Motors makes its billion dollars a year and General Welfare can take care of itself.

Nothing unlawful, nothing illegal in that. Like the issue between Public and Private Power it is not a matter of morals, but of principle and belief.

Those who believe this theory will agree with former Senator Ellis that handing over natural resources that belong to the people of the country so private business may enjoy enormous profits is OK, preserving them for the benefit of both this and future generations is all wrong, and contrary to what they term the "American way of life."

WHAT do YOU believe, Mr. and Mrs. Voter? Do you want more and more of this "give-away" or do you want it stopped?

The answer can't be given by lawyers however able, or courts however high, but only by the American people, with their votes.—R.W.R.

Westerberg's Herd Listed at DHIA Top

Richard Westerberg had the top herd for April, according to the herd summary of the Jackson County Dairy Herd Improvement association. Average milk from the 42-head herd was 974 pounds and average butterfat was 45.6 pounds. Other herds in the top five were owned by Hubert and

Austria's Friendly Political Parties in Hot Vote Campaign

By CHARLES M. McCANN United Press Correspondent

Austria's two big political parties are fighting each other ferociously in the final stage of a national election campaign.

The voters will go to the polls Sunday to elect a new Parliament for a four-year term. Then, after the returns are in, the leaders of the contending parties will shake hands and get back to the business of running the country together in a coalition as they have done since 1945.

The campaign is being fought between the Conservative People's Party and the Socialist Party.

If the People's Party wins, Chancellor Julius Raab will keep his job. If the Socialists win, Vice Chancellor Adolf Schaerf will be the head man and Raab will step down to the No. 2 post.

The coalition began to come apart in January over purely domestic issues.

Oil Field Problem. The chief one was the future of the valuable oil fields which have been returned to Austria after 10 years of Soviet Russian exploitation.

Raab's right-of-center People's Party wants control of the fields to be turned over to a company of which the government would own 51 per cent of the stock. The Socialists, naturally, want them to be almost entirely nationalized.

There are other issues, too, like the proper method of giving farmers higher prices for their milk.

But even though the conservatives and the Socialists decided to call an election one year before schedule, they had rather a hard time getting hot in their campaigning.

Now, however, the two parties are calling each other enemies of the people in speeches and election posters, and accusing

each other of trying to strangle Austria's new freedom.

Dispatches from Vienna note that the posters are sometimes nearly identical. One, for instance, shows the villainous opposition party in the act of throttling a worker. The conservatives also warn the people against following the Socialists "down the road toward Marxism."

Nobody pays much attention to that. The Socialists are just as anti-Communist as the conservatives are.

Overwhelms Austria's Neighbors. Kremlin Communism overwhelmed Austria's neighbors on the south-east, east and north after the war. But the Communists never did well in Austria. They entered the first election, in 1945, confidently—and came out with 5.4 per cent of the

vote. In the elections of 1949 and 1953 they polled about 5.25 per cent. If they get that many Sunday, they will be lucky.

In the 1953 election, Raab's men won 74 seats in the 165-seat lower house of Parliament and Schaerf's won 73.

Vienna dispatches say that no big turnover in voting is expected Sunday, and that things will go along about as usual afterward.

Austria, after nearly 40 years of political and economic misery, is doing well. It is ripped to pieces by the 1919 St. Germain Peace Treaty, most savage of all those of World War I. The Austro-Hungarian Empire covered 261,030 square miles and had 28,500,000 people. Now Austria's area is 32,375 square miles. Its population is 7,000,000, but Austrians seem content.

Today and Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann

THE RUSSIANS IN LONDON

London—The Soviet visits to London were carried out on two planes, one being a public

counter of views between the two governments.

Much has been written about the public encounter, about the silence of the crowds and about the row at the Labor party dinner. We can readily exaggerate the significance of that side of the affair.

In France or Italy, with their large Communist parties, a cool and rather unfriendly public reception would have been news. But in Britain the Communists are negligible as a political party. The elements of a popular front, such as Moscow now hopes for, do not exist.

There is a general agreement in London that talking with

Malenkov, Bulganin and Khrushchev is quite a different thing from what it has been to talk with Molotov. The conversations seem to have gone well in the sense that the speaking was plain, unemotional and matter of fact.

The language was that of unadorned, unself-conscious and unshamed power politics—of alliances, bases, oil, bombers, missiles, steel and ships. In terms such as these, the conditions not of friendship but of co-existence were freely discussed.

Although there was no formal agreement, there seems to have been progress towards a meeting of minds about the Middle East. There is some reason to think that the ground was prepared for this during Malenkov's exploratory visit to England. He had then been told in the plainest terms, particularly by the Labor leaders, that the survival of Israel, and the maintenance of the West European oil supply from the Middle East, were fighting matters. Malenkov, at least, seems to have acknowledged explicitly the validity of these two British interests. A few days after his return home, the Soviet government issued its statement in support of the U.N. mediation.

The talks with Bulganin and Khrushchev brought further confirmation of the shift in Soviet Middle Eastern policy. It transpired that the Soviet Union does not itself need or want the oil of the Middle East. We are not faced, therefore, with a conflict of vital interests between the Soviet Union and Western Europe each seeking the oil of the Middle East. Moreover, the Arab states do not have in the Soviet Union an alternative customer for their oil.

The Russian visitors, I was told, said frankly that they would make trouble for Britain in the oil fields in order to nullify the Baghdad pact. In their eyes, this pact is a military arrangement leading to the establishment of United States Strategic Air Force bases in Iraq and Iran. They were given assurances that the pact was purely defensive. But it is not probable that they believed these assurances. There is something here for diplomacy to do.

We can have cautious confidence that for the near future at least the danger of war in the Middle East has been reduced. The danger lay in the encouragement, which came near to being incitement, of Nasser by the Soviet Union, bent on forcing its way into the Middle East.

The danger was averted by two actions. One was Britain's making it plain to the Kremlin that an Egyptian military adventure means British intervention certainly, and American intervention most probably. The other was the action, initiated in Washington, to take Palestine to the United Nations. This brought the Russians into the Middle East peaceably and legitimately.

So far, we may say, so good. 1956 New York Herald Tribune, Inc.

Pensioners Confess To Scheme To Beat Ponies

Detroit—(U.P.)—Two old-age pensioners yesterday confessed to a "sure fire" scheme to beat the ponies. Paul Carro, 82, and Paul A. Eifer, 70, said they made their bets with counterfeit \$10 bills they made themselves.

Matter of Fact By Stewart Alsop

THE POWERFUL MR. JOHNSON

Washington — Sen. Lyndon Johnson's smashing victory over Gov. Allan Shivers in Texas is one of those events which shake up and transform the whole political scene.

His victory makes Johnson one of the two or three most powerful men in the Democratic party. It renders a Southern bolt at the Democratic convention, on which some Republican strategists fondly counted, far less likely, since Johnson stands squarely for party loyalty.

At the same time, the Johnson triumph assures him a very strong, perhaps a decisive, voice at the convention. All this is obvious enough. But it leaves unanswered the most interesting question: Is Johnson himself now to be considered a serious contender for the nomination?

Johnson can have virtually the entire Southern delegate vote without lifting a finger. He can certainly have the 1956 equivalent of the 294 votes for Senator Richard Russell, the Southern candidate in 1952. But his supporters claim that he can go well beyond that.

He has important support in the west, where he is much admired by such men as Sen. Mike Mansfield of Montana and Gov. Ed Johnston of Colorado. Even before his Texas triumph, Johnson got important offers of financial help for a Presidential candidacy from Massachusetts, California and other states. (He turned them down politely.) Since his victory, such offers have of course multiplied. Johnson admirers are now talking about his going to the convention with 400 delegate votes or even more.

In the circumstances, it would hardly be surprising if Senator Johnson began to think long and hard about making a real effort for the nomination. He tells all and sundry that he will not seek it, but "if it comes my way, fine." But he will not go further than that, and he is no man to show his cards before he needs to.

Even those very close to him do not know whether he intends to make a real try, although it is known that his wife, Lady Bird Johnson, heartily dislikes the idea, largely because the Senator had a heart attack less than a year ago.

The heart attack is, of course, one of the great obstacles to a serious Johnson candidacy, if only because it would remove the "health issue" on which the Democrats are perhaps over-optimistically counting. Another, and more serious obstacle, is his reputation as a conservative among the Northern Liberal-Labor groups.

In The Day's News

By FRANK JENKINS

Testifying before a senate appropriations subcommittee in Washington, Defense Secretary Wilson insisted it isn't true the Russians are far outstripping the United States in terms of air power.

But, he said, we are taking no chances. So we are raising the production schedule for the inter-continental heavy jet bomber—the BIG one that can fly from continental U.S. to continental Russia—from 17 per month to 20 per month.

He told the subcommittee he would have preferred to keep these figures secret (meaning why stir up the Russkies to up their schedules also), but added: "Because of the confusion and doubt that have arisen on this matter I believe it is desirable to set the record straight."

WHY the confusion and the doubt?

Congressional Quiz

(Copyright, 1956 Congressional Quarterly)

CONGRESSIONAL QUIZ ST HD

Q—A President who had just been renominated by his party for another term made the following statement: "I have not permitted myself, gentlemen, to conclude that I am the best man in the country, but I am reminded in this connection of an old Dutch farmer who remarked that it was not best to swap horses while crossing a stream." Was the President: (a) Franklin D. Roosevelt (b) Abraham Lincoln (c) George Washington?

A—(b) Abraham Lincoln, in an address to a delegation of the National Union League that had called to congratulate him on his renomination in 1864.

Q—Who stated his policy in the following much-quoted terms: "There is a homely adage which runs, 'Walk softly and carry a big stick; you will go far.'"

A—Theodore Roosevelt. The phrase became a slogan to describe his strong foreign policy and his advocacy of military preparedness.

Q—At the 1948 Democratic convention a speaker asked, "What is a bureaucrat? A bureaucrat is a Democrat who holds an office that some Republican wants." Was the speaker: (a) Adlai E. Stevenson (b) Woodrow Wilson (c) Alben Barkley?

A—(c) The late Alben Barkley, whose humor was a famous trademark.

Q—What American made the following statement: "It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world." (a) George Washington (b) Thomas Jefferson (c) ex-Sen. Burton K. Wheeler.

A—(a)—George Washington. The often-quoted sentence was part of Washington's farewell address. The phrase "entangling alliances" frequently attributed to him actually originated with Thomas Jefferson.

Q—The only Democrat to be given his party's nomination for the Presidency three times without ever being elected concluded a speech at the 1896 nominating convention with these words: "You shall not press down upon the brow of labor this crown of thorns, you shall not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold." Who was he?

A—William Jennings Bryan. His oratory was on the subject of the gold standard.

Q—Can you name the author of this statement: "These unhappy times call for the building of plans that rest upon the forgotten, the unorganized but indispensable units of economic power, for plans . . . that put their faith once more in the forgotten man at the bottom of the economic pyramid."

A—Franklin D. Roosevelt, in a radio speech in April, 1932, when he was governor of New York.

Well, this is a campaign year—and in campaign years the outs must claim, in order to get back in, that the ins are leading us into disaster.

Let's keep the record straight. If the Democrats were in and the Republicans were out, the GOPs would be claiming what the Democrats are claiming now.

That is inherent in our political system.

SPEAKING further of campaign year politics, the Democrats, who are out and want back in, are insisting that under the Eisenhower administration Big Business is in the saddle and is riding high, wide and handsome, using its spurs, and the little man is getting it where the chicken got the ax.

LET'S take a look at the facts. According to the Office of Business Economics of the U.S. Department of Commerce, our nation's working men and women received 69 PER CENT of our national income during the Eisenhower years from 1953 to 1955, whereas during the Truman years from 1950 to 1952 they received only 65.7 per cent.

Looking at the other side—During the Truman years 1950 to 1952 corporation profits after taxes amounted to SEVEN per cent of the national income, whereas during the Eisenhower years from 1953 to 1955 they amounted to only SIX per cent. Politics is a strange trade.

LET'S turn now to the weather. On the 8th day of May, the temperature in New York City was only 35 above. There was snow in Maine and Vermont. At the summit of Mount Washington in New Hampshire (a mere molehill, according to Western ideas of a mountain) the temperature was one degree below zero.

Why bring that up? It always makes us feel better to hear that somebody else is having it worse than we are.

Ballot Seeks Higher Cost of Haircuts

Portland—(U.P.)—A mail ballot was being taken today to determine if barbers here want to raise prices from \$1.50 to \$1.75 for haircuts. Shaves would not be affected.

Designed for a REAL PRINCESS

Mother

PERSIAN PRINCESS Continental FRENCH PURSE... pastels in Gahna Cowhide... gleam with tiny jewels.

PRINCESS GARDNER

\$500 plus tax

Swem's BOOKS - GIFTS - RECORDS

At the Hour of Need



PHONE 2-8030 DAY OR NIGHT

A Reverent Tribute

CHAPEL MORTUARY

Across from the Courthouse Frank Morgan - Harold Snodgrass FUNERAL DIRECTORS

Dr. Ralph S. Anderson CHIROPRACTIC PHYSICIAN Has Opened Offices At 100 MADISON PLACE Between Queen Ann and Jackson Street BY APPOINTMENT ONLY PHONE 2-5997