

Medford Mail Tribune

Published Daily Except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO. 27-29 North First St. Phone 2-6241

ROBERT W. RUIH, Editor; HERB GREY, Advertising Manager; GERALD LATHAM, Business Manager; ERIC ALLEN, Jr., Managing Editor; EARL H. ADAMS, City Editor; HARRY CHAPMAN, Telegram Editor; RICHARD JEWETT, Sports Editor; OLIVE STANCHER, 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; Daily and Sunday—Six months \$6.50; Daily and Sunday—Three months \$3.50; Sunday Only—One year \$2.50.

Official Paper of the City of Medford; Official Paper of Jackson County; Member of Audit Bureau of Circulation; Advertising Representative: WEST-HOLLIDAY COMPANY INC.

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

Aug. 13, 1946. (It was Tuesday) Inability to obtain materials has delayed construction work on three Jackson county bridges.

From Arthur Perry's Ye Smudge Pot column: There is now a shortage of cars—railroad and motor.

20 YEARS AGO

Aug. 13, 1936. (It was Thursday) Tengwald agency announces today the sale of a modern five-room dwelling at 402 Park ave. to William A. Schulz.

United States civil service commission today announces a competitive examination for coppermith to fill existing and future vacancies in the Puget Sound navy yard.

30 YEARS AGO

Aug. 13, 1926. (It was Friday) Plans for holding American Legion's ninth annual convention in Paris, France, in September, 1927, are going forward without interruption.

J. W. Judy and P. B. McDonald, of Medford, are appointed distributors for Calpet gasoline, it is announced today.

40 YEARS AGO

Aug. 13, 1916. (It was Sunday) Charles Evans Hughes, Republican nominee for president, will arrive in Medford at 4 p. m., Thursday, Aug. 17.

From Local and Personal column: C. D. Colby returned to Medford Monday morning, after having spent six weeks in Merlin, Ore.

What's the Answer?

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

- 1. Which of these states has the most votes at the Democratic convention: Illinois, California, Texas, Pennsylvania, Ohio? 2. General Motors made considerably more or less than half of all cars produced in the first half of this year, or about half? 3. The Hambletonian trotting race is run in Kentucky, New York state, Ohio, Maryland, or Connecticut? 4. The present Bull market in stocks has lasted longer than any other in history: right or wrong? 5. A substantial part of all shares in the Suez canal is owned by the U.S. government: right or wrong? 6. The 10 states of the "Solid South" have a little over (a) 5, (b) 20, (c) 35 or (d) 50 per cent of the votes in the Electoral college? 7. An au gratin dish is one cooked with cheese, sherry, onions, garlic, capers, sour cream or mushrooms? 8. Pennsylvania, 2. Considerably more than half. 3. New York (southeastern). 4. Right. 5. Wrong. 6. Little over 20 per cent. 7. Cheese.

McCANN ON VACATION: Charles M. McCann is on vacation. His weekly news outlook and daily foreign news commentary columns will be resumed upon his return.

Young Offenders

The time has arrived for a full-scale reexamination of society's rules and attitudes toward its younger members—particularly those who get into trouble.

We would like to see the next session of the Oregon legislature, which meets next January, set up an interim committee—that handy and often helpful research device it uses so much—to conduct a two-year study of laws pertaining to juvenile cases.

The study should cover the provisions of Oregon law governing the handling of juvenile offenders, the administration of juvenile departments and courts and their relationship to the regular courts, the limits of jurisdiction of each, the opportunities for rehabilitation, the penalties and correctional methods available, the need for and administration of detention homes, and the relative responsibility of parents, police, prosecuting officials, courts, and the youngsters.

WE ARE not alone in our nagging sense of unease about the difficulty inherent in handling young lawbreakers. Trained juvenile officers, who have devoted their lives to the subject, would be among the first to admit that the pattern is not perfect, nor fool-proof, nor always effective.

Oregon law, generally, leans toward the philosophy that a youthful lawbreaker is not, in truth, a criminal. But the law is not consistent. Depending on how the case is handled, one teen ager could end up in the penitentiary for committing the same offense which would result in another youth being warned and remanded to his parents' custody.

This is only an example of what can happen. Perhaps the present laws are the best that can be devised, but we doubt it. Serious study and consideration is needed, for the juvenile offender of today can well become the criminal of tomorrow. Anything to prevent this is all to the good.

WE DON'T know just why the problem has become more serious, and there are probably as many different answers as there are people who have given thought to the subject. But we do know that difficulties involving teen-agers have increased.

Teachers, police authorities and other informed observers have noted the rapid rise in "juvenile delinquency," particularly in big cities; health officers testify to frightening increases in the venereal disease rate in minors; the National Education association has issued a survey of its teachers which reveals that impertinence and discourtesy, failure to do homework, drinking, stealing, sex offenses, cheating, fighting and other symptoms have shown signs of increasing in the past 20 years.

We are not saying the "younger generation is going to the dogs." That's an old saw which is not true. By far the greatest majority of young people is composed of good, honest, decent kids. But it is equally true that the minority of trouble-makers is increasing, and likely becoming worse.

THIS minority of kids in trouble — and making trouble—is too important to shrug off. It represents a potentially valuable resource gone wrong, and a potential threat to society which is dangerous.

If a change in society's rules and regulations and procedures can help, the change should be made. If the laws are wrong, they should be righted. If they are good they should be enforced and if possible made better.

But laws, however good, are not the entire answer. As we see it, the family—the unit on which our entire concept of social organization is based—is the key factor. Anything which can be done to strengthen, to solidify, to make more wholesome, family relationships would be to the lasting benefit of us all.

Parents have a heavy responsibility and a serious duty in the raising of their children. Too often they do not realize this fact.

NEWSPAPERS, at least those in Oregon, are not blind to their own curious responsibility. One of the problems involved is whether or not to publish the names of youngsters who break the law.

The Corvallis Gazette-Times recently, after long study and soul-searching, announced a new policy in this regard, which declared that the names of juveniles aged 14 or over who commit felonies or offenses against the person would be published, and that the names of habitual minor violators in the same age group would be published upon recommendation of police authorities.

This is a reversal of an almost-universal custom among Oregon papers not to publish the names of offenders less than 18 years old.

THE Mail Tribune, which has long followed the general policy, also has given much thought to making some similar change, and has decided against it, for the time being at least.

We queried judges with jurisdiction over young offenders, prosecuting officials, juvenile officers, and police authorities. Some believe the ends of justice and crime prevention would be better served by the publication of names; others disagreed on the basis that publicity would hinder the chances for rehabilitation and leave a black mark on his record.

No policy is automatically good forever without reexamination, and we shall continue to ponder the equities and the rights and wrongs of such a move.

IT IS unhappily true that there are a few young people that no one can help to achieve a decent, law-abiding, creative life—not parents, not police, not judges, not the legislature, not the penologists.

It is equally true that many who get off to a bad start CAN and MUST be helped to the right path.

It is up to all of us, individually, and collectively as "society," to do whatever needs to be done to achieve this. At the moment, what this is, is not always clear and may never be. But we must keep trying to find it.—E.A.

Republicans Outscore Demos in 1956 Support of Ike's Program

Washington (CQ)—Republicans in Congress outscored Democrats by 24 per cent in their legislative support of President Eisenhower in 1956.

This was the key finding of Congressional Quarterly's annual analysis of Presidential support. Basis for the study was a tabulation of 99 roll-call votes in 1956 on which the President's position at the time the vote was taken, pro or con, was a matter of record.

The study showed that Republican Senators and Representatives, as a group, scored 72 per cent, up from the 63 per cent registered in 1955. By contrast, Democrats as a group scored 48 per cent, down from 54 per cent in 1955.

Conversely, GOP members voted against the President only half as often as Democrats in 1956. Opposition scores, based solely on votes cast against the President's position: Republicans—19 per cent, down from 25 per cent in 1955; Democrats—40 per cent, up from 36 per cent in 1955. Support and opposition scores add to less than 100 per cent because of failures to vote.

In sum, the figures back up the Republican claim that Republicans in Congress would act more favorably on President Eisenhower's program. In 1954, Democrats argued that, on the contrary, they would support the President more than members of his own party. This year, however, Democrats are out to put their own man in the White House, and might well choose to make a campaign virtue of their opposition to much of the Eisenhower program.

What goes for the parties, however, doesn't necessarily go for individual Senators and Representatives, whose scores varied widely on both sides of the aisle. For example, of the 16 Republican Senators seeking reelection in November, eight supported the President 80 per cent or more of the time, while four did so less than 50 per cent of the time.

On the Democratic side, only two of 14 Senators seeking reelection supported the President more than half of the time. Only one Member of Congress, Rep. William A. Dawson (R-Utah), scored 100 per cent in Eisenhower support, voting with the President on each of 34 test

votes in the House. Highest scoring House Democrats were Reps. Sidney R. Yates (Ill.) and Harrison A. Williams Jr. (N.J.), each with 79 per cent. In the Senate, the highest Republican score was made by Sen. Edward Martin (Pa.) with 95 per cent; the highest Democrat, Sen. Spessard L. Holland (Fla.) with 66 per cent.

GOP House Leaders Joseph W. Martin Jr. (Mass.) and Charles A. Halleck (Ind.) both scored 85 per cent support. Martin scored 9 per cent opposition, Halleck 3 per cent. Democratic Majority Leader John W. McCormack (Mass.) and Whip Carl Albert (Okla.) scored 62 and 59 per cent support, respectively (35 and 38 per cent opposition).

In the Senate, Minority Leader William F. Knowland (R-Calif.) scored 88 per cent (12 per cent opposition). Whip Everett Saltonstall (Mass.) 89 per cent (8 per cent opposition) and GOP Policy Committee Chairman Styles Bridges, 62 per cent (15 per cent opposition). Democratic Majority Leader Lyndon

B. Johnson (Texas) scored 49 per cent (48 per cent opposition) and Whip Earle C. Clements (Ky.) 32 per cent (54 per cent opposition).

Although Republican support of the President increased in 1956, his position prevailed less often than in any of the three preceding years of his Administration. The President won his point on 69 of the 99 test votes, or 70 per cent of the time. A majority of Republicans, present and voting, sided with the President on 66 of the 69 victories. On 43 of the 66 votes a majority of Democrats likewise supported the President.

Of the President's 30 defeats, 23 were the work of Democrats, a majority of whom voted against the President's position while a majority of Republicans stood with him. Four of the defeats, however, were inflicted by bipartisan majorities on votes concerning social security, foreign aid and veterans' pensions. (Copyright, 1956, Congressional Quarterly)

Adlai Still Best Bet, Writer Says—If You Must Make Bet

By LYLE C. WILSON, United Press Correspondent

Chicago (UP)—Adlai E. Stevenson of Illinois, still is the best bet for this year's Democratic presidential nomination—if you must bet.

Stevenson has the most delegates. He is generally acceptable to the South. He is an established national figure with support well distributed in all parts of the United States.

That falls short of assuring Stevenson's renomination by the Democratic National convention meeting here today. But it is more than can be said of any other avowed Democratic candi-

date, favorite son or dark horse.

Stevenson had it in the bag, or close to, until former President Harry S. Truman derailed him by expressing the opinion that Gov. Averell Harriman of New York was the Democrat best qualified to be president of the United States.

Mr. Truman's statement slowed and may have stopped the drift of favorite son and uncommitted delegations to Stevenson. It gave Harriman a chance to win the nomination where he'd had no chance before.

Mr. Truman has taken a long chance at the risk of his own prestige as an elder statesman and his party's showing next November. It is a fact that there was a substantial Southern bolt against Mr. Truman's presiden-

Matter of Fact

By Joe and Stewart Alsop

ADLAI AND AVE: Chicago — Even if you forget about the politics, and consider only the characters and relationships of the two men, the contest between Adlai Stevenson and Averell Harriman is an absorbing human drama.

The two men have of course never been a major grandee of the wartime Roosevelt administration when Stevenson was a very minor figure in the Navy Department.

Harriman was a desperately serious candidate in 1952 when the reluctant Stevenson got the nod that Harriman hoped for.

Stevenson's endorsement of Stevenson for the Democratic nomination in 1956 was plainly offered without very careful thought.

None the less, Stevenson was quite exceptionally embittered by the subsequent transformation of Harriman from supporter into rival.

When Harriman announced his "active" candidacy on June 9, Stevenson prepared what must surely be the sharpest public statement recently penned by a serious American politician.

Stevenson wrote that he was "not surprised" when Harriman withdrew his support of the Stevenson candidacy immediately after the President's heart attack.

But he was surprised, he added, when Harriman chose to announce his own active candidacy on the same day when the President underwent a major operation, even while the nation was praying for the President's recovery.

This sarcastic attack on Harriman's motives was fortunately suppressed by Stevenson's astute campaign manager, James Finnevan. Yet the episode is still significant, as proof of the immensity of the gulf between Stevenson and Harriman.

The gulf was ordained, one suspects, just by the difference in their characters; and the incidents that produced it were, quite literally, incidental.

Stevenson is supremely articulate but often self-doubting. Harriman struggles to express himself, verges on the titanic, but he is never afflicted by self-doubt. Stevenson detests a rough and tumble fight. Harriman has an incomparable zest for battle.

Stevenson wants to be sought, and still insists that the Presidency should seek him. Harriman's whole life story has been a succession of choices of new objectives, which he has sought

with remorseless determination and almost unvarying success. You might, indeed, almost compare the two men in terms borrowed from the great and terrible seventh scene of the first act of Macbeth.

AS Macbeth is accused of doing, Stevenson tends to "let I dare not wait upon 'I would' like the poor cat in the adage".

As for Harriman, his motto might well be Lady Macbeth's bold and scornful cry, "We fail! But screw your courage to the sticking place, and we'll not fail!"

From this difference in character, in turn, flows the marked difference in the political performances of the two men. Stevenson is like a boxer with a brilliantly polished style, beautiful foot-work, and fine intelligence in the ring, whose stylistic excellence has won him an immense following among the ringside experts.

But a minority of those same ringside experts—former President Harry Truman, for instance—think that Stevenson is all style and no punch, which is rather a defect in a boxer. Meanwhile, Harriman is like a big, lumbering fighter, totally devoid of style, heavy in footwork, given to thrashing about, but with a punch that kills when it lands.

And this killing punch has won Harriman the support of that same minority that thinks Stevenson has no punch.

The comparison can be carried too far, of course. Stevenson showed he could summon up a real punch in the California primary. Harriman displayed some pretty fancy footwork when he got himself elected Governor of New York.

BUT there is enough truth in this comparison to explain a lot of things, including the much-criticized fervor with which Harriman is seeking the nomination. He does not believe that President Eisenhower can possibly be beaten by stylish fighting. He is genuinely convinced that there is a chance of beating the President with his kind of attack. He may be wrong, but his convictions are deep and sincere, and it is hard to see why he should not act on them.

Meanwhile, the differences between the two men are even now producing practical results. Because Harriman is thought to be unlikely to make any great effort to carry New York for his rival, Stevenson has already assigned Thomas K. Finletter to organize a New York Citizens for Stevenson movement.

By the same token, the word is already being proved that if Stevenson is both nominated and elected, he will be highly unlikely to make any use of Harriman's undoubted talents. Altogether, the gulf between Stevenson and Harriman is bad luck for the Democrats.

(C) New York Herald Tribune Inc.

In The Day's News

Speaking to the conservation and wildlife group of the Veterans Luncheon club in Portland, Douglas McKay, Republican candidate for U.S. senator from Oregon and a former secretary of the interior, asserted that in his opinion the eventual answer to the problem of disposal of the Klamath Indian forests (as a part of the process of termination of federal control of the Klamath reservation) probably lies in purchase of the reservation, or at least its timber lands, by the federal government for sustained yield operation. He added: "Otherwise, piecemeal sales to the highest bidders would be an ever-present threat, whether sold by the Indian owners or the federal government. Piecemeal sale could not, in my opinion, insure continuous sustained yield practices—and this great pine forest (one of the finest in the west) should still be producing logs a thousand years from now."

I THINK he is right—and I believe most people who have given careful thought to the problem involved in termination of federal control of the reservation will agree with him.

But it must be kept in mind if this proposal is to be carried into effect Public Law 587 must be amended rather radically.

PUBLIC Law 587, which sets forth the details of termination of federal control of the Klamath reservation, assumes that some of the Indians will want their share in cash, to be used as they choose, and that others will prefer to stay with the reservation, which is their heritage from their forefathers. In order to make this possible, the law provides the following steps:

- 1. Determine the number of members entitled by blood lines to share in the liquidation. That has been done. There are 2,003 of them. 2. Appraise the value of the tribal property. That is in the process of being done. 3. Determine by election what members want their money in cash, so that they can get out and go on their own. 4. In order to get the money to pay off those who want their share in cash, the law provides for sale of enough of the assets of the reservation to make up the amount needed.

IT is this last provision that provides the problems.

The BIG problem is that the timber constitutes nearly all the LIQUID AND IMMEDIATELY SALEABLE property of the reservation. To get the money, it will have to be sold, as Mr. McKay says, by piecemeal to the highest bidder.

That raises another problem. After the timber is sold off, the value of the remaining assets of the reservation will be subject to doubt. Those members of the tribe whose inclination is to stay with the home of their forefathers will WONDER IF THEY CAN AFFORD TO DO SO.

The possible result of that will be to increase the numbers of those who will elect to take their share in cash.

ANYWAY it is looked at, the processes provided by Public Law 587 lead to problems. There is the obvious problem of what will happen if the timber is sold off by piecemeal to the highest bidder. That would be almost certain to result in a wild boom while these piecemeal lots of timber were being harvested and an inevitable bust when the timber was all cut.

Another problem is the inevitable break-up of the traditional way of the Indians.

THESE problems, of course, are IMMEDIATELY PRESSING over in the Klamath Basin. But they are large enough to command the interest of the entire state of Oregon. The Klamath Indian reservation is 50 miles square—or, in its original form, some 2,500 square miles. That is an area sufficient to affect materially the economy of the entire state.

Solution of these problems in a satisfactory manner calls for leadership of the highest quality, and I am glad that Mr. McKay has opened them up to the widest possible discussion.

Dead line Sunday. Classified is at noon Saturday; 10 a.m. Monday for Monday; other days 9:30 Monday day.

Before Our Day

GEO. N. TAYLOR

"Wherefore by one man sin entered into the world and so death passed upon all men in that all have sinned." Romans 5:12 — BIBLE.

But God yearned for us and He sent Christ his other self. Christ had no sin even if He did live here and was tempted like as we. Then our sins were put on Him and He died for us. On the 3rd day after His death, He arose from the grave and ascended back up to glory. Settle it in your heart that Christ died for your sins and God sees your page cleared and He gives you eternal life. Then eat the Bible and pray out the old sin ways, so you become Christ's new creation with cheer, hope and peace for this world and eternal life over there.

This sponsored by a Scappoose family—adv.

Local woman national hero



Contributes to national welfare through volunteer election work

She won't get a medal. Nor will the thousands of others who are giving their time and energy to the coming election. They should all get a medal—every one of them, the registration and election clerks, the precinct workers, and all the others—your neighbors who are making it so easy for you to protect your rights by voting. But all their work is for nothing unless you do protect your rights... unless you register in time and vote on election day. Be sure you're registered, keep your voice in government, and help make this November the biggest vote producer in history.

Published as a public service in cooperation with The Advertising Council and the Newspaper Advertising Executives Association.