MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE
"Everyone in Southern Oregon Reads The Mail Tribune"
Published Daily Except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO.
27-29 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.
An Independent Newspaper
Entered as second class matter at Medford, Oregon, under Act of March 3, 1897
SUBSCRIPTION RATES
By Mail—In Advance: Per Copy 10c.
Daily and Sunday—One year $15.00
Daily and Sunday—Six months 8.00
Daily and Sunday—Three mos. 4.25
Sunday Only—One year $4.20
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 $18.00
Daily and Sunday—One month 1.50
Carrier and Dealers—10c per copy
All Terms Cash in Advance
Official Paper of the City of Medford
Official Paper of Jackson County
United Press—Full Leased Wire
MEMBER OF AUDIT BUREAU OF CIRCULATION
Advertising Representative: WEST-HOLIDAY COMPANY, INC. Offices in New York, Chicago, Detroit, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Seattle, Portland, St. Louis, Atlanta, Vancouver, B.C.

NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION 1956 AFFILIATE MEMBER

Oregon 1956 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
Sept. 4, 1946
(It was Wednesday)

City council votes to adopt a mercury vapor lamp system, in replacing Medford's aged lighting system on Main st.

From Arthur Perry's Ye Smudge Pot column: From the metropolis comes word, "the wild geese are honking overhead," an unfailing sign of fall. The "wild geese" are also honking on the highways.

20 YEARS AGO
Sept. 4, 1936
(It was Friday)

An open air concert in the city park will be given by the Medford Elks' band, at 8 p.m. tonight, according to F. Wilson Walt, director.

World war veteran's aid commission of which Col. E. E. Kelly is a member has issued a financial statement as of Sept. 1.

30 YEARS AGO
Sept. 4, 1926
(It was Saturday)

The new Oak Grove school is rapidly nearing completion for school to start Monday, Sept. 6.

The date of the first flight of the Seattle to Medford-Los Angeles air mail is Sept. 15.

40 YEARS AGO
Sept. 4, 1916
(It was Monday)

Medford's entire water system has been jeopardized by the passage of the O and C land grant bill by congress, according to City Attorney McCabe.

From Local and Personal column: Sam Richardson, Ernest McKee, Carl Glasgow and George Howard left here Saturday for the Upper Applegate and returned Sunday with two five-point bucks.

What's the Answer?

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

1. A widow will get under 1956 legislation the same social security annuity at 62 as at 65 under the old law; right or wrong?

2. Fatal auto accidents are generally agreed to be due chiefly to the car or the driver or about half to each?

3. A dividend in the form of additional stock is or isn't generally taxable as income when distributed?

4. Adlai E. Stevenson is (a) 3, (b) 9, or (c) 13 years younger than President Eisenhower, or one year older?

5. Rheumatic arthritis afflicts many more women than men, many more men than women, or about the same number of each?

6. Senator Kennedy (Mass.), a Catholic got many or few votes from the South for vice presidential nominee at the Democratic convention?

7. Sutton Place is a fashionable address in San Francisco, Washington, New Orleans, New York, Atlanta, Boston, or Chicago?

The answers: 1. Wrong: somewhat less. 2. Chiefly to the driver. 3. Isn't (but is when sold). 4. Nine years younger. 5. Many more women than men. 6. Many. 7. New York.

No Giveaways?

What is the truth about former Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay and his alleged "give aways?"

The innocent bystander, we believe, is bewildered. He hears they are all a fake and fraud on one side; he hears they are true and most damaging politically on the other. Moreover both sides are supported by evidence from supposedly reliable sources, with a flood of statistics.

What is true and what isn't?

• • • • •

WE would not advise the inquiring voter to consult the partisans on either side. We would suggest he—or she—look up an article in the May "Harpers" entitled, "Republican Give-Away—the charges and the facts," by Warren Unna, a well-known and responsible Washington reporter who did many weeks of research on the subject.

Certainly "Harpers" has a high, long established and well deserved record of reliability as well as respectability. To our knowledge none of the charges in this article have ever been refuted or publicly denied. It should therefore provide a good reference for any impartial inquirer who isn't interested in partisan propaganda on either side but is interested in the truth.

• • • • •

WE regret lack of space to reprint the article, but anyone interested could probably secure a copy of the May Harpers on file at the public library.

Meanwhile, here are a few of the facts regarding this issue and facts we are confident which are sustained by the record.

To wit:

> "Historically, the nation's 264 Wild Life refuges have been held sacred and off-limits to oil exploitation with two exceptions, in cases where the original owners never did surrender their mineral rights on the refuge land; and in cases where the government entered into cooperative agreements with oil companies which were drilling nearby to prevent them from sucking out all the oil from underneath the government's land . . . In August 1953, Secy. McKay shortly after taking office issued a stop-order on further leasing, ostensibly to tighten up the regulations. Last Oct. 27th he assured an audience in Corvallis, Oregon, 'I can tell you flatly that no new regulations will be authorized unless they give far more protection to our refuges than they did before the "stop-order."'
>
> Then began some of the choicest bits of double-talk in Washington for some time.
>
> Interior now concedes it granted some 274 leases between August 1953, when the stoporder began and December 2, 1955 when it was revoked. Not many more leases have ever ben granted in the 34 years of refuge history."

One naturally inquires what sort of a "stop-order" was that?

Then what did Secretary McKay do under his new regulations.

We again quote:

> "Interior granted the Frankfort Oil company of Oklahome a subsidiary of Seagrams Distilleries permission to seek oil on 12,000 acres of the Locasine Wild Life Refuge under non-competitive terms at the minimum 50 cent per acre fee and 12½ per cent royalty. The lease was curiously dated Dec. 1st, 1955, the day before McKay's new regulations permitting it had even been promulgated. Interior later explained the lease had originally been 'back-dated'—at the oil company's insistence!"

Was this a desirable imprint on the nation's business as the GOP claims as contrasted with the public welfare? Or was it the reverse?

• • • • •

THE much publicized Al Sarena case is next cited but we hope enough has been written in this department to convince any fair-minded observer that while it undoubtedly was "within the law," it was such a direct and flagrant violation of the basic principles of timber conservation that the author of the article captioned the "deal" as follows:

> "A sizable portion of nationl timber in Oregon is now being cut over by a private company under the legalistic guise of complying with the federal mineral laws."

• • • • •

BUT there was nothing wrong with this we are told by the enthusiastic McKay supporters.

If there was nothing wrong with what the Al Sarena company DID, why did the administration (with a national election approaching) make such haste to render it wrong — make what this company DID do impossible in the future.

That just doesn't make sense, and anyone who knows anything about the history of this case knows it doesn't.

But that is the claim over and over again. Moreover anyone who dares criticize this policy as just another "give away" is accused by the GOP sharp shooters as guilty of everything from deliberate misrepresentation to character assassination. How silly can they get?

• • • • •

THE article continues with other "give aways" condensed as follows, quote:

> At least one parcel of national forest in Minnesota has gone into private hands through a secret long-term lease with International Nickel. This company tried to get this valuable land with a 99 year lease but failed under the Democrats. When the Republican administration came in a 50-year irrevocable option was granted, but when the author of the article tried to get a copy he was informed it was in the "confidential files of Secretary McKay!"

Then there was the Hells Canyon high dam "give away" to the Idaho Power Company when the "expert" of the Federal Power commission admitted the high dam would produce "the maximum development of the area." But Secretary McKay ruled otherwise, withdrew his predecessors objections to private power development there and according to Mr. Unna, told the FPC that it would be "nice" if the Idaho Power applications were approved.

Of course that settled it. And this with the opposition of the anti-public power Democrats in the South, defeated the High Dam project on the Snake. Perhaps for all time.

What was that a "give away?"

• • • • •

THERE is more of the same in this article and as stated we wish those in doubt regarding the justification of the "Give Away" charge would read it.

Another point in the article's favor is that the author does not try to make out that Secretary McKay is a devil with sharp horns and a forked tail. He takes pains to point out that in the area of the federal park service and the preservation of the Whooping Crane the Republican record is better than the Democratic. But he does maintain not only that the charges of "give away" under Secretary McKay are justified, but in some instances more than the Democrats have claimed. Here is his conclusion, quote:

> "A good many Republican projects might have resulted in "give aways" had the Democratic congress not thwarted the administration—there are national resources still in danger of being given away."

• • • • •

SO what does the above all add up to?

As we view it merely this:

As Secretary of the Interior, Douglas McKay WAS responsible for innumerable "give aways." The record is plain and indisputable.

But he denies any, claims he is being misrepresented and maligned, and cries to high Heaven in protest that he would get more votes today in Texas than in Oregon for in Oregon "the people are still yackety yacking about the Tidelands oil."

• • • • •

WELL there is the "pay-off."

The people of Oregon—at least many of them —ARE still "yackety yacking" about the Tidelands oil because that was the biggest "give away" of all. The millions—in fact billions — derived from the off-shore oil should have gone to all the people of the country including Oregon for the benefit of education, instead of to a few big oil companies, via leases from 3 or 4 of the fortunate oil states.

As has frequently been stated in taking such action probably no laws were broken. Congress passed a law to invalidate the Supreme Court ruling. But it was utterly wrong from the standpoint of correct public policy, and it is on the basis of public policy vs. the public welfare that the two large parties are now split.

There is little doubt that former Governor McKay believes that there was nothing wrong in his "give aways," — giving government timber to mine owners for $5 an acre; turning over oil in game preserves to big oil operators, etc., etc., was and is in his political philosophy just good business. Business is business isn't it? What is good for General Motors is good for the country.

That is not only the convicition of former Secretary McKay, it is the conviction of the entire right wing of his party.

So the entire issue of "Give Aways" comes down to this:

Do the people of Oregon wish to be represented in the Upper House for 6 years by a Senator who believes in such a doctrine, or by one that does not believe in it and can be depended upon to fight it?

It will be up to the people of Oregon on November 6th to decide.—R.W.R.

Matter of Fact

By Joseph Alsop

IKE LOSING WORKERS

Seattle—As of now, and here in cities of the Northwest, President Eisenhower has lost one of the great assets that gave him his resounding victory in 1952. Four years ago, he won just about 55 per cent of the total vote in this city and Portland, and their surrounding counties. He achieved this commanding majority in these normally Democratic urban counties, moreover, by making great inroads into the normally Democratic working class vote. Indeed, he actually carried many workers' districts, like one here in Seattle which this reporter has just polled. Today, however, the working class districts are rather solidly returning to their former Democratic allegiance.


Joseph Alsop

Among middle and upper middle income voters, you find virtually no change of sentiment The rare eccentrics who went for Stevenson four years ago are still for Stevenson today. The vast majority who went for Eisenhower four years ago are still enthusiastically for Eisenhower.

• • •

IN THESE streets with the bigger house, the handsomer lawns, the more elaborate gardens, in fact, 2½ days of very hard search revealed only a single switch voter. He was an old, sharp-nosed callused grandfather, who was tending a grandchild and pruning the roses in his son-in-law's handsome front yard garden in Portland.

A baker of French Canadian origin, he was a traditional Democrat and had been a Stevenson voter in 1952. But he was also a very prudent man with a small fortune in utilities stocks, as he proudly explained. His son-in-law was a successful investment banker. "So I guess I vill joost vote for Ike this year," he concluded. "My son-in-law, he persuaded me. Besides, this public power is no good."

But in the working class districts, a very different picture was rapidly revealed. In a settled working class sector of Ivon street, and in two blocks full of new workers' houses on Bybee boulevard in Portland; and in very similar blocks of southwest 48th and 49th streets here in Seattle, the proportion of switch was very high indeed. None who had voted for Stevenson four years ago was now thinking of voting for Eisenhower. But somewhat more than one in four who had voted for Eisenhower were now preparing to vote for Stevenson with varying degrees of enthusiasm.

• • •

THESE were not streets of slum houses, either. The houses were not large, but they were comfortable, neat and generally well kept. There were many pretty, well-tended gardens, lush with that rich green that is the enviable quality of good northwestern gardens. The people living in these streets were not all manual workers, either; they included a scattering of prosperous small businessmen. And except for a few old people and one family on the U.S. government payroll, all the workers were benefiting from the high wages that the more skilled American workers now receive.

Four years ago, furthermore, Eisenhower had done well among these people. The blocks that were polled in Seattle, for instance, were perfectly average blocks of the 32nd precinct of the 34th district, which Eisenhower carried in 1952 by a vote of 255 to 233. This time, unless the trend changes, the precinct ought to go for Stevenson by three to two. The margin might be even bigger, for those who do not want to vote for Eisenhower but had not yet made up their minds to vote for Stevenson have not been included in the total of 25 per cent of switchers from Eisenhower mentioned above.

• • •

THE places polled were professionally selected by Lou Harris, who is an adept of the polling art. Shoe leather was not spared to get the largest sample possible in the short time available. Results were obtained from eighty houses and apartments. The pattern was similar from street to street, and the pattern here in Seattle exactly reproduced the pattern in Portland.

I am as confident that the results are representative as it is possible to be in view of the relative smallnes of the total sample.

Who, then, were these switchers; will their switch endure; and what will be its effects? To question one, the answer is that the switchers are quite ordinary members of the strong working class backbone of urban America including a fairly high proportion of women voters. To question two, the answer is uncertain. Everyone still says that "Ike is a fine man." There is no great personal enthusiasm for Stevenson, except among the more passionate Democrats who voted for him last time. Hence the campaign could change the picture — but this could also work either way.

AS FOR question three, if there is this proportion of switching from Eisenhower to Stevenson among the mass voters of Portland and Seattle, the election is more of a horse race in Oregon and Washington than anyone has yet dared to suggest. Indeed if Eisenhower also suffers from defections among the farm voters, in reportedly disaffected eastern Oregon, for instance, Adlai Stevenson could conceivably carry these two states.

Nasser's Suez Canal Decision May Create Pattern for Future

By CHARLES M. McCANN
United Press Correspondent

This will be a big week for President Gamal Abdel Nasser of Egypt.


Charles McCann

If Nasser takes a moderate attitude in the negotiation which started in Cairo Monday, the tension which resulted from his nationalization of the Suez Canal may be materially lessened.

If he continues to act tough, a long and dangerous period in international affairs will be in prospect.

The best that can be hoped to come out of the Cairo talks is that they may lead to others on the future control of the canal.

A five-nation committee representing 18 nations which use the canal has presented Nasser with a series of proposals calling for international control of the world's most important waterway.

Acceptance Unlikely

It seems unlikely that Nasser will accept these proposals. He holds that the control of the canal is purely an Egyptian affair. He says he is prepared to "guarantee" that there shall be free canal traffic for all nations. All nations, that is, except Israel, with which Egypt and its fellow Arab countries are still technically at war.

Great Britain and France, especially, feel that any guarantee which Nasser might give if the canal were put under sole Egyptian authority would be worthless.

They regard him as an unscruplous, blindly ambitiious dictator. As British Prime Minister Anthony Eden has put it, any concession to him will only mean further trouble in the future.

"With dictators you always have to pay a higher price later on, for their appetite grows," Eden said.

Military Action Lessens

It is highly unlikely Nasser realized just what a momentous decision he made when he announced the nationalization of the canal on July 26.

Nasser may or may not have foreseen that Britain and France would threaten direct military action against him.

The possibility of such action has lessened for the present, largely due to the United States. However, the possibility remains.

It seems highly unlikely that Nasser foresaw some other results of his action.

Britain and France have been brought closer together as the two powers most intimately concerned in the Suez dispute.

Cooperation Weakens

Cooperation between the United States on one hand and Britain and France, its closest allies, has been weakened because of American opposition to forceful action against Nasser.

France's prestige as a great power has been increased.

Turkey, as the strongest power in the whole Middle East, has become much more important to the Western Allies.

Any possibility that Britain might loosen its control of Cyprus has all but disappeared. Cyprus— on which French as well as British troops are now landing — must remain a British base not only as long as the present Suez dispute continues but as long as Nasser remains in power, because neither Britain nor France ever will trust him.

70,000 Persons Jam State Fair Grounds In Salem Labor Day

Salem — (U.P.) — The Oregon State Fair moved into its fourth day of perfect weather here today. More than 70,000 persons jammed the fairgrounds Labor day.

By contrast, last year's Labor day mark was 57,530. Labor day this year also saw the biggest parimutuel mark ever set at Lone Oak race track with a record take of $179,904.

In cattle judging events of the fair, John Boeckli, Portland, placed champions in the Brown Swiss division. His son, John, showed the junior champion and reserve champion bull. All other Brown Swiss awards went to Chris Schlungger, Portland.

In the Guernsey breed, M. C. Flemming, Troutdale, took several awards with H. C. Stuive, Woodburn, showing the senior and grand champion bull. L. B. Erb, Jefferson, had the junior champion bull and Orville Brown, Woodburn, the reserve champ.

New Winner

A new winner in cattle this year was Edward Gath, Turner, who showed the champion female in Herefords. Clemens Hereford ranch, Philomath, entered the reserve champion female and Double ranch took the reserve prize for bulls. Herbert Chandler showed the grand champion bull.

Meadowland dairy of Portland, James A. Madsen, Gresham, and Carol Buckley, Vernonia, shared honors in the Ayrshire class.

First sheep winners were named yesterday. Ahrens brothers, Turner, took the Romney championships; Kenneth McCrea, Monmouth, showed the best Dorsets; and Claude Stuesloff, Salem, had champion Southdowns.

J. G. Kassner, Oregon City, and George and Ruth Coscrip, Eherwood, showed champion Corriedales.

STAR CONFINED

London — (U.P.) — Movie star Marilyn Monroe has been confined to bed for three days to recover from a stomach ailment, her studio said today. A studio spokesman said the ailment was "nothing to worry about."