

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE

Published Daily Except Sundays and Public Holidays... MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE... 212 1/2 South Fir St. Phone 2-2623

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 July 25, 1946... (It was Thursday) Sale of the large Gatchell home at 1121 South Oakdale ave. to George M. Roberts, was announced today.

From Arthur Perry's Ye Smudge Pot column: A tire shortage now means auto racing, a report states. The shortage affects professional racing on licensed tracks and has nothing to do with speedways in the residential districts.

20 YEARS AGO July 25, 1936... (It was Saturday) Recognition for the sales and merchandising record established during the past five years has been given the Lewis Super Service station by the B. F. Goodrich company, Akron, Ohio.

Amateur hour, after the fashion of the Major Bowes program, will be held at weekly luncheon meeting of the Kiwanis club.

30 YEARS AGO July 25, 1926... (It was Sunday) Since July 1 this year the Owen-Oregon Lumber company has been trucking marking all lumber shipped to lumber yards in Medford.

The premium list for the Jackson county fair, Sept. 15-18, is being printed and will be ready for distribution about Aug. 1.

40 YEARS AGO July 25, 1916... (It was Tuesday) The citizens and clubs of Medford are preparing entertainment for the State Editorial association annual convention here the first week of August.

An all-day picnic was attended by about 75 farmers and ranchers of the area, Saturday at Central Point.

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

- 1. Which one of these states has fewest electoral votes in electing a president: California, Illinois, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas?
2. About 40 per cent, 60 per cent or 75 per cent of all U. S. wheat growers voted last year to accept acreage controls at lower price supports?
3. Many more women than men die every year from overdoses of barbiturate pills, or many more men than women, or about the same number of each?
4. G. Bernard Shaw, famous playwright, was born 100 years ago in Northern Ireland, Southern Ireland, Scotland, England or Wales?
5. All six New England states voted for Eisenhower in 1952, right or wrong?
6. The March of Dimes campaign last January raised about \$1.3 million, \$5.0 million, \$15 million, \$50 million, or \$130 million?
7. The Oath of Hippocrates binds architects, dentists, doctors, government employees or members of a certain fraternal order?
The answers: 1. Texas. 2. About 75 per cent. 3. Many more women than men. 4. Southern Ireland. 5. Right. 6. A little over \$50 million. 7. Doctors.

Adjournment Before August?

As leaders and blocs in Congress were compromising right and left (sic) in the customary last-minute stampede to get major legislation enacted, the outlook was for sine die adjournment before the end of July. Thereafter only President Eisenhower could summon the 84th Congress back into session.

No longer does Congress provide in its adjournment resolution that it may call itself back into session by decision of its leaders. That was done during the Truman administration and the latter part of the F. D. Roosevelt regime.

It was done because Congress didn't trust the Chief Executive not to exceed his powers and prerogatives when it was not on hand to check him. In those years the adjournment was called "conditional" instead of "sine die." Actually, it was a recess, which might or might not extend all the way to the opening of the next session.

Adjournment on July 31, unless Congress sets some other date, is prescribed in the legislative reorganization act of 1946. The joint (La Follette-Monroney) committee that framed the measure explained:

"Representative democracy cannot remain truly representative if elected members are required to remain away from their constituencies for long periods... denied the interchange of ideas so necessary to our system... with intimate first-hand knowledge of the problems of the places they represent."

That adjournment date objective was met, or substantially met, in six of the following ten years, including 1946 and last year. Congress failed to meet it in four of the ten years. As was to be expected, the adjournment objective was realized in presidential election years—1948, 1952 and now 1956.—E.R.R.

When G.B.S. Was Born

The city of Chicago in particular will celebrate Thursday, July 26, as the 100th anniversary of the birth of the eminent playwright and pamphleteer George Bernard Shaw. He was born in Dublin of sadly impoverished Protestant "gentry". His mother found it necessary to become a music teacher, and Shaw explained later that he didn't so much throw himself into the fight against poverty as throw her into it.

When G. B. S. was born Victoria had been on the British throne for 19 years, and hostilities had just ended in the Crimean War. In Ireland the great potato famine of the Forties had turned Irish nationalism away from the peaceful approach of its former leader, Daniel O'Connell, who had died nine years before Shaw was born.

Revolutionary outbreaks on the Continent in 1847-48 had encouraged violence in Ireland, and the habeas corpus writ had been suspended there. Archaic land laws exploited the farmers for the benefit of absentee landlords, many of them English.

It was to be 14 years after Shaw's birth before the Parliament in London began to enact remedial Irish land laws, and most of these failed to go to the root of the distress. Reform bills of 1867-68 gave a little more power to English and Scottish voters, but the Irish "Reform" bill of 1868 benefitted only Irish city-dwellers, keeping Irish farm tenants largely unenfranchised.

George Bernard Shaw as he emerged into affluence from poverty-stricken years in London as a hack-writer was not blind to the ills of his native land. Yet his zeal for Socialism through "gradualism" took in every land and every race. At his death in 1950 at the age of 94, he left a gross estate of over \$1 million.—E.R.R.

To Ban Eavesdropping on Juries

"Knowingly and willfully, by any means or device whatsoever, to record, listen to, or observe proceedings of grand or petit juries" is likely to be made a crime by this Congress. A bill (S 2887) to that effect was passed by the Senate on March 26 without opposition and received the unanimous approval of the House Judiciary committee on July 18.

It is true that little time remained after the House committee action to get the bill to the House floor for a vote. However, there was little or no opposition to it. It embodies a proposal of Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., endorsed by President Eisenhower.

THE BILL was instigated by the secret recording, with concealed microphones, of the deliberations of federal juries in six civil cases at Wichita, Kans., during May 1954. The jury-tapping was done by a University of Chicago Law School team in connection with a research project, financed by the Ford Foundation, into the administration of justice. The listening-in was agreed to by attorneys for both sides and presiding judge Delmas Hill.

Dean Edward H. Levi of the Law School said that jury-tapping had been approved by "many outstanding lawyers and judges" as "useful... in improving the administration of justice." And federal circuit judge Orie L. Phillips was quoted as saying it could show a judge if, how and why his charge to jurors had puzzled or even misled them.

However, the Justice Department hold that if "jurors suspect eavesdropping, 'however well intentioned,' it would deter them from freely discussing a case among themselves. Chairman James O. Eastland of the Senate Judiciary committee has said that jury-tapping violates the whole constitutional right to a jury trial. And the U. S. Supreme Court in 1929 held that a mere suspicion of 'surveillance' could well prevent an 'average juror' from 'calm judgment' and make jury service repugnant to citizens 'fit for juries.'—E.R.R.

Mollet's Government May Last Until Next Fall, McCann Says

By CHARLES M. McCANN United Press Correspondent

French Premier Guy Mollet's government seems pretty certain to last until next fall at least.

When he took office February 1 as head of France's 23rd post-war cabinet, it was predicted that he would last only a few weeks. His shaky coalition, based on his own Socialist party and the Radical Socialist party, commanded but 183 out of the 627 seats in the National Assembly, the dominant house of Parliament.

Mollet was faced by an explosive situation in North Africa and threatened inflation at home.

Expect Parliament Adjournment But in the intervening months he has survived an endless series of votes of confidence on all sorts of issues.

He faces the last of the votes this week. He is expected to win them, then to adjourn parliament until some time in October.

He looked over the weekend as if Mollet's position was threatened.

He proposed to impose a special 10 per cent income tax to raise the \$450 million which, it is estimated, will be the cost of fighting the rebels in Algeria for the next two years.

Unexpectedly strong opposition developed. Political experts believed that Mollet might be overthrown.

Again Rides Out Storm

But he decided Tuesday to beat a strategic retreat. Finance Minister Paul Ramadier agreed in Mollet's behalf, at a meeting of the Assembly's Finance Committee, to float a loan sufficient to finance the Algerian war for this year.

Ramadier said the government would demand a 10 per cent income tax rise to pay next year's costs. But Mollet was expected

Matter of Fact

By Joe and Stewart Alsop

CLEAN BOMBS AND DIRTY BOMBS

A few days ago, Atomic Energy Commission Chairman Lewis Strauss issued a statement about the recent Pacific hydrogen tests, which could be of historic scientific and strategic importance. It could also be a thoroughly disingenuous and wholly false in its reassuring implications. The statement was as follows:

"It has been confirmed that there are many factors, including operational ones, which do make it possible to localize to an extent not heretofore appreciated the fall-out of nuclear explosions."

There is little doubt about the primary purpose of the statement. Lt. Gen. James Gavin's recently released testimony that a major hydrogen attack would cause "several millions deaths," and that the death area would "back up well into Western Europe" naturally caused a furor in Europe. Strauss' statement was clearly intended to reassure

the Europeans.

BUT the real meaning of his statement is far less clear. It could mean that the Atomic Energy Commission has succeeded in achieving a "clean bomb"—a bomb with little or no radioactive side effects. It can be reported authoritatively that research contracts for a "clean bomb" have in fact been let. But it can also be stated authoritatively that the technological hurdles which must be overcome to achieve such a bomb are immense.

Previous efforts to make a "clean bomb" (which would be a fusion bomb, rather than a fission-fusion bomb, like the "dirty" bombs now in both American and Soviet stockpiles) have met a "technological blank wall." If the AEC scientists have in fact overleapt the blank wall, and invented this entirely new kind of bomb, then a new chapter has opened in the nuclear era, and the strategic situation has been altered in a significant way.

But if the AEC has invented a "clean bomb" why did not Strauss openly boast to the world about this humanitarian achievement? And why should he make his cryptic reference to "operational factors"? And why was uranium 237, radioactive by-product of the "dirty bomb," found by Japanese scientists after the Pacific tests?

THESE questions suggest that the real meaning of the

to put off that demand until the time came.

Thus it appeared, unless the situation changed suddenly, that Mollet and his government were safe at least until the next session of Parliament in October.

That would mean that Mollet had kept together one of the weakest governments since the war for more than eight months, whatever might happen in the new session. The average life of post-war governments has been about seven months.

Mollet has survived partly by skillfully angling for the support of nominally opposing National Assembly groups, including the Communists, on various specific issues.

In The Day's News

By Frank Jenkins

More on foreign affairs today—including foreign aid:

Egyptian officials are saying in Cairo that Egypt's man-on-the-jobback Premier Nasser will announce on Thursday of this week "decisive steps in answer to the U.S. and British withdrawal of offers to put up money" to build a huge dam on the Nile river.

A Cairo newspaper compares the British and American action to a "demand for a pound of flesh," and asserts that in the case of the big Aswan dam Egypt "refused to agree to conditions that would bind its independence."

TOUGH talk, you say, from a proposed borrower to a proposed lender?

Well, it IS tough talk. But, under the circumstances involved in this Aswan dam deal the Egyptians are talking straight facts. After all, what have been saying to them, in substance, is that if they'll be good and STAY ON OUR SIDE, we'll dig down in our pockets and build a dam for 'em.

That may be good striped-pants diplomacy, but it ISN'T good business—and I have the feeling that in our economic dealings with foreign countries we'd better stick to straight business principles.

THAT brings up an interesting little story that failed to get

much play in the news. Rutgers University recently conducted what it termed an international summer banking school. One of the bankers present was Vladimir Geraschenko, first assistant chairman of the U.S.S.R. (Soviet) state bank. In the course of the sessions, he made this interesting statement:

"Other countries won't stop development of Russia's economy by banning Russian imports. Such countries will only hurt themselves."

That is a challenging statement. But I think he is right. Let's put it this way:

Russia's greatest present need is food. She hasn't been able to produce enough of it to go around, and as a result vast masses of her people are hungry. History tells that hungry people are apt to cause trouble.

Our greatest present need is to SELL food. We have vast surpluses of it stored up in bulging warehouses. We have been giving some of it away in bondoggling deals, but we can't seem to reduce the surplus much. The value of our stored-up surpluses still holds around eight billion dollars—and we're just at the beginning of a new harvest.

What we need is to sell our agricultural surpluses to people who will CONSUME them.

BUT, someone will say, that

would STRENGTHEN RUSSIA—and we mustn't do anything that would strengthen an enemy.

Here's the other side: If the Russians import their food from us instead of growing it themselves, they will ultimately WEAKEN their economy. They will weaken it in this way: By buying their food abroad, they will neglect the development of their agricultural industry by failing to build it up. In the event of war, we would immediately cut off our food imports to the Russians and because they had neglected to build up their own agricultural economy they would then be left in a tight spot.

The British have been in that same tight spot in two wars.

I CAN'T help feeling that this Russian banker was talking plain common sense. Russia needs to buy food. We need to sell food. Buying and selling create TRADE. When trade is carried in soundly, in accordance with fundamental business principles, it is a great builder of friendship. The seller values his customers, and doesn't want to lose them in a foolish quarrel (nearly all wars are foolish). The buyer values his honest suppliers and wants to stay on good terms with them.

JAZZ FOR ARGENTINA

Buenos Aires (U.P.)—Dizzy Gillespie and his band, the first big-time American jazz group to play here in more than a decade, will open a six-night stand Saturday, it was announced Tuesday.

Stassen's Stop-Nixon Campaign Hits Snag

By LYLE C. WILSON United Press Correspondent

Washington (U.P.)—There wasn't much left of Harold E. Stassen's stop-Nixon campaign today except the mystery of who said what to whom last Friday at the White House.

Stassen's Republican allies the day before that the Republicans drop Vice President Richard M. Nixon and nominate Massachusetts Gov. Christian A. Herter for his job was a two-day wonder while it lasted.

It lasted until 5 o'clock Tuesday night. Republican National Committee Chairman Leonard W. Hall then announced that Herter would nominate Nixon for vice president at next month's national convention.

The Friday Huddle That collapsed the Stassen trial balloon in flames. It enabled Nixon's closest associates to smile again for the first time since Monday when Stassen announced a national campaign to bounce Nixon. It enabled them

also to give attention to a question which occasionally baffles Republican party professionals. It goes like this: "Why does Ike do some of the things he does?"

There is, for example, that Friday White House huddle between the President and Stassen at which Stassen told Mr. Eisenhower in advance of his stop-Nixon drive. Who said what to whom? What were the circumstances under which Stassen immediately thereafter decided he had a go-ahead to start a campaign to keep Mr. Eisenhower's young friend off the 1956 Republican ticket?

The President did not pull his party rank on Stassen. Instead, he permitted his cabinet subordinate and disarmament adviser to pot-shot Nixon where it hurt. Stassen called on Nixon to withdraw and on the President to take the situation over and take a firm public position on the issue raised.

Stassen's Statement "It is for each of them to make their views known at an appropriate future time," was the way Stassen put it, which is about as bluntly as a subordinate could tell his boss what to do. Stassen hurried his statement, to the public just in time to take the publicity shine off the President's return from the Panama conference.

Hall said Herter telephoned him Tuesday morning saying he would "consider it a privilege" to nominate Nixon. Herter and Nixon also discussed the matter. Nixon authorized Hall to say he was "very pleased" by Herter's action. Herter told Hall he would have a further statement today in Boston.

Some of Nixon's friends suspected a White House plot against the vice president. Others could not believe such could be. They found comfort in Mr. Eisenhower's warm greeting of Nixon Tuesday at the airport on returning from Panama, and from White House Press Secretary James C. Hagerty's firm stand that Nixon is the man.

They were vastly disturbed, however, by the mystery of that huddle. The haunting question was—and is—why did Mr. Eisenhower let Stassen pot-shot Nixon if he really wants him again as a running mate?

The answer may come next week if there is a White House news conference. This week's has been cancelled.

Q—Four of the following five proposals were part of President Eisenhower's 1956 legislative program; he was opposed to one of them. Which one was the President against: (a) higher postal rates; (b) federal aid for school construction; (c) statehood for Hawaii; (d) 90 per cent price supports for farm commodities; (e) an expanded highway program?

A—(d) 90 per cent price supports for farm commodities. A bill including this provision was vetoed by the President April 16. He favored instead flexible or sliding scale price supports for crops.

Q—In a recent Presidential campaign a candidate made an issue of the record of Congress, calling it a "good-for-nothing" and a "do-nothing" Congress. Can you name: (a) the candidate; (b) the year of the campaign; (c) the Congress to which he referred?

A—(a) Former President Harry S. Truman; (b) 1948; (c) the 80th Congress.

Q—The Taft-Hartley labor law was passed by Congress in 1947 over the Veto of President Truman, who subsequently urged the law's repeal. President Eisenhower also has taken a position on the controversial labor law. Does he want it: (a) repealed; (b) left as it is; (c) amended?

A—(c) Amended. President Eisenhower has said the Taft-Hartley act was "sound legislation" but should be amended to "correct a number of defects."

Q—A bill to provide federal aid for school construction failed in the House by 30 votes July 5. Advocates of federal aid said the bill was defeated when the House adopted an amendment by Rep. Adam C. Powell Jr. (D-N.Y.). The Powell amendment would have: (a) apportioned federal funds among the states on the basis of need; (b) denied funds to states operating segregated schools; (c) required state as well as federal grants for school construction.

A—(b) Denied funds to states operating segregated schools.

Use Tribune Want Ads

IMPORTED O.F.C. CANADIAN SCHENLEY WHISKY 6 YEARS OLD

Jim Says: You Still Have Time to Take Advantage of Our Gigantic STOREWIDE CLEARANCE ALL PRICES SLASHED! Here Are Just A Few Examples of Our Tremendous Values! Ladies' Skirts Values to 6.95 1.99 and 2.99 MEN'S Dress Slacks Reg. 6.95 to 18.95 1.99 to 14.95 BOYS' Stretch Socks Now 39¢ HUNDREDS OF OTHER WONDERFUL BUYS! CRATER DEPT. STORE CENTRAL POINT, OREGON