

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE
"Everyone in Southern Oregon Reads The Mail Tribune"
Published Daily Except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO.
27-29 North First St. Phone 2-4141

NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION
AFFILIATE MEMBER
Oregon NEWS PAPER PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION

Flight o' Time
Medford and Jackson County History from the files of The Mail Tribune 10, 20, 30, 40 and 50 years ago.

10 YEARS AGO
Oct. 11, 1946 (Friday)
In observance of Columbus day, a legal holiday, some businesses in Medford will be closed all day Saturday.

For Arthur Perry's Ye Smudge Pot column: Republicans are reported enthused by their new slogan: "HAD ENOUGH?—VOTE REPUBLICAN!"

20 YEARS AGO
Oct. 11, 1936 (Sunday)
New CCC company arrives here from Texas to occupy Camp Prescott and work projects in Prescott Memorial park.

All Royal Arch Masons in southern Oregon will attend a joint meeting in the Masonic temple in Ashland Tuesday.

30 YEARS AGO
Oct. 11, 1926 (Monday)
This will be one of the greatest moisture years in southern Oregon for years if rain continues to fall as it has since September.

Membership of the Roosevelt Parent Teacher association reaches 125.

40 YEARS AGO
Oct. 11, 1916 (Wednesday)
The Morgan-Guggenheim-Vanderbill-Belmont "golden special" train is campaigning to tell women of the country to vote for Hughes.

Rogue River Valley Canning company promises to become a great asset to Medford and area.

50 YEARS AGO
Oct. 11, 1906 (Thursday)
The Snowy Butte Orchard, near Central Point, is an industry of which every resident of the valley should be proud.

Members of the 500 club were entertained Tuesday afternoon by Mrs. William Hyde Stalker.

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

1. Count Pulaski of Poland fought for the U.S. in the French and Indian Wars, Revolutionary War, War of 1812, or Mexican War?
2. Of all GIs in Europe more than half are draftees, or more than half are Regular Army, or is about 50-50?

3. What make of car has a series called the Montclair?
4. A tendency toward migraine headaches often, is inherited; right or wrong?
5. About one-third, one-half or two-thirds of all U.S. families owe no debt of any kind?
6. Hawaii is or isn't the largest of the Hawaiian Islands?
7. Alger Hiss was brought to trial for perjury under President Roosevelt, Truman or Eisenhower?

WRONG OFFICE?
Washington — (U.P.) — Democratic National Chairman Paul M. Butler was out of campaign headquarters when a group of Arlington, Va., Young Republicans brought him a present. They left a "Happy Birthday Ike" cake with a receptionist.

"The Voter" and McKay

The "Oregon Voter" should either change that quotation from George Washington at the mast-head which has been carried ever since its founding in 1915 or change its tactics as far as its all-out support of Mr. Douglas McKay for the U. S. Senate is concerned.

That mast-head reads as follows, quote:

"If, to please the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterwards defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and the just can repair. The event is in the hand of God."

—GEORGE WASHINGTON.

Very good.

BUT the current issue of this political and financial weekly prints with its apparent approval the findings of Tom Purcell, Editor and Publisher of the Gresham Outlook, the punch-line and conclusion of which is as follows, quote:

"The people (of Oregon) believe that McKay will represent them and not his own convictions."

Could anyone conceive of a more complete refutation of a periodical's long standing declaration of faith than that?

Imagine the situation if the former Secretary of the Interior should be chosen to represent this state in the senate under any such pledge.

Let it be assumed he had certain convictions about what the government should or should not do.

Unless he knew—and how could he KNOW?—that what he believed was popular back home he would not stick to his beliefs, but would discard everything in his overriding determination NOT to displease the people.

What a farce that would make of representative government. And what a frustrating and really futile experience it would be for the incumbent!

Certainly the people of Oregon—or any other state—would not deliberately choose any candidate to represent them, who had no convictions or having them would refuse to stand up for them for fear they might be unpopular?

THE people of course, haven't the time to analyze every bill that comes up in the congress, and if they did they would not have the inclination.

That is why we have representative government. That is why instead of going to Washington themselves, the people select the best qualified men they can find to represent them. Not only honest men, but with the courage to stand up for what they believe to be right—to be best for their state and nation.

And we refuse to believe that the people of Oregon—a majority of them at least,—want to send merely a rubber stamp to Washington without any convictions or if he has them, lacking the courage to stand up and fight for them.

That wouldn't be representative government, it would be representative bankruptcy.

FOR the sake of argument,—and mortification of the spirit—let it be assumed that the former Interior Secretary wins a seat in the Upper House. And let it be further assumed that while there a measure were introduced which, unlike the Ellsworth bill would put the Forest Service in control of the sale of its timber, including the determination of whether timber rights were or were not justified by mineral values found.

That would be in accord with tradition and practice for over a quarter of a century.

And as frequently mentioned it has not been—but should be—the law.

AND let it be assumed also that the incumbent were flooded by wires, letters and phone calls from large lumber and timber interests in the state, who have to buy their timber via competitive bidding in the open market, to speak for and vote for the bill.

Would former Secretary McKay do it? If he means what he now says, he would, for no referendum could be held and he would have to take this response from home as a valid indication of how his constituents felt.

In other words he would to please the people do what he himself has disapproved, and what would in substance completely discredit the record of his administration as Secretary of the Interior.

Afterwards at a caucus of his own party, how could he "defend his work" to his associates—or for that matter to himself?

His only recourse would undoubtedly be to admit that what he recently said in an introductory speech at Eugene he meant—every word—to wit:

"The issues don't amount to anything, it is only the votes that count."

—R.W.R.

In The Day's News By Frank Jenkins

Secretary of State Dulles makes a new move on the Suez checkerboard. He calls for an agreement by ALL PARTIES that this vitally important waterway must not be used by ANY COUNTRY as an instrument of its national policy.

He told the United Nations security council this morning that without this assurance there is little chance of settling the Suez problem and suggested that a system be set up to insure against any such national action.

FIRST let's untangle the big words that all diplomats use. What Dulles is proposing is that all nations shall get together and agree sensibly that NOBODY will throw up a roadblock along an international highway and hold up all passers at the point of a gun until they agree to submit to any and all terms proposed by the highwayman.

That is an ancient dodge. The robber barons along the Rhine waxed fat on it for generations. They built their castles at strategic spots along the great river that was the highway of Western Europe in the Middle Ages. Every time a boat came along they would sally forth and collar it by military force and compel the merchant who owned it to PAY TRIBUTE TO THEM.

It was a wonderful racket and while it lasted the robber barons lived high up on the hog.

LET'S now take a sharp look at Nasser. What's he up to? CONSIDER this situation: Western Europe must have oil if it is to live and prosper in the modern world. It has no oil of its own. Its natural source of supply is the oil of the Middle East—which reaches Western Europe most economically

THE ELECTION ... And You

(The following space is made available on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Sundays during the election campaign to the two major political parties so that they may publish, without charge, material concerning the presidential election race. Offerings are limited to 400 words, must have the approval of the county chairman of the party, and must be submitted not later than 2 p.m. the day before publication on week days, at 11 a.m. Saturdays for Sunday publication.)

REPUBLICAN STATEMENT

Edward L. McCarthy, a furnace control man at the Dart Union company plant, Providence, R.I., and a rank-and-file member of Local 4418, United Steelworkers of America, Providence, was an alternate delegate to the 1956 Republican National Convention at San Francisco.

"This is my union card. I belong to the United Steelworkers of America, Local 4418. I'm here because millions of us union members voted for Ike in 1952. I'm here for another reason, too. I'm here to tell you that we're going to vote for Ike again in 1956."

"I agree with what the president of the AFL-CIO said about a year ago. He said: 'Right now, we never had it so good.' And I know why he said it. We have over 17 million in the unions now—more than ever before. We have over 66 million jobs—more than ever before."

"We don't have as many strikes as we used to. And with the government keeping its nose out of them, they don't last as long. We had only half the strikes last year as we had in 1952."

"We get more pay than we ever had before when a war wasn't going on. Our fringe benefits are bigger, too. And as my pay goes up, every dollar of it still buys as much as it did before."

"And I'll tell you this, too. Being in a union doesn't make you any different from anyone else. Just because you join a union or a club or a church doesn't mean you lost your citizenship—not in this country. So I figure that what's good for America is good for me and the unions and everybody."

"Peace is just as good for my family as for anyone's. So is a strong national defense. So is the kind of government that keeps taxes down."

"And so is having the kind of President who makes you proud just to look at him. I say Ike Eisenhower is good for America. And like I say, what's good for America is good enough for me. So I'm glad to second his nomination, and I'm going to do everything I can to get him re-elected."

The process of free collective bargaining has been strengthened by the insistence of the Eisenhower administration that labor and management settle their differences at the bargaining table without the intervention of the government.

DEMOCRATIC STATEMENT

Everyone who goes to the polls on Nov. 6 must candidly face the fact that either of the presidential candidates may not live out his term, if elected. The people will vote for a vice-president with the consciousness that he may some day be president. Therefore it is important to scrutinize the principles and voting records of both candidates—Kefauver and Nixon.

In almost every respect Kefauver and Nixon, sitting in the United States Senate, were on the opposite side of the fence. Kefauver invariably voted in the interests of the many, Nixon favored the few.

Let us take some of the crucial roll calls. Nixon showed himself no friend of the farmer. He voted to cut soil conservation funds, kill 90 per cent for wheat, against continuation of the farm tenant loan program. On every one of these issues Kefauver was on the side of the farmer.

Nixon voted to exempt the natural gas monopoly from federal price regulation; exempt railroads from anti-trust laws and kill attempts to curb freight rate discrimination against the South and West.

Nixon also approved of the motion to kill the "oil for education" amendment which would provide that revenue from federal operation of submerged oil lands be used for the schools. In contrast, Kefauver was on the people's side on each issue.

Nixon is known as a foe of public power and river improvements. He voted to cripple TVA and BPA by denying them adequate funds, to cut funds for rivers, harbors and flood control, and curb the activities of the Rural Electrification Administration. Kefauver, as is well known, is one of the most eloquent friends of public power in the Senate.

To the majority of voters, we think, the facts speak for themselves. Nixon is the candidate of the special interests, Kefauver of the common people.

Matter of Fact By Joe and Stewart Alsop

The One-Edged Sword
Louisville, Ky.—There is one issue here, and one only, which really makes the pulses of the voters beat faster. It is the one issue which is never mentioned at all by any of Kentucky's four Senatorial candidates. The issue is, of course, the racial integration of the schools.

This reporter spent many hours interviewing voters in four districts of this city, carefully chosen by a professional public opinion expert to represent an economic and political cross-section. The purpose was to test, not only voting intentions, but the voters' reactions to three subjects—the President's health, Adlai Stevenson's divorce, and school integration.

The reactions to questions about the President's health and Stevenson's divorce were curiously similar. "Why, that never entered my head," people would say, often in a tone of protest tinged with indignation, or: "Why, I don't think that has any bearing at all."

ONCE in a while—perhaps once in 15 interviews—someone would say that the President's health was "something you had to think about." But in every case the voter who expressed such doubts had already made up his mind to vote Democratic on other grounds. In short, Democratic strategists who are counting on "the health issue" as a central Stevenson asset would appear to be fooling themselves—an observation born out of other pulse-feeling expeditions in other parts of the country.

By the same token, we found not a single voter—no one who admitted that he was influenced in any way by Stevenson's divorce. This was as true of Catholic voters as of others. One man said "I'm a Catholic and I suppose I ought to think about it, but I don't."

Communications

Letters to the Editor must bear the name and address of the writer although under certain circumstances the use of a pen name or initials for publication is permissible. The Mail Tribune reserves the right to edit all letters with an eye to clarification and condensation. Letters submitted for publication must not exceed 400 words.

'How Silly' Is Right!

To the Editor: Some there are who would vote for Douglas McKay if he had horns and a tail and some there are who would vote for Wayne Morse if it had been proven that he stole the Washington Monument. This letter is not addressed to those whose heads are already made up, but rather to those who sincerely wish to make a valid choice between the two.

Morse has accused McKay of a "giveaway" at Al Sarena. If the charge is true McKay has done something at least improper if not definitely dishonest. If the charge is false the accuser knows that it is false and solicits your vote on the basis of false charges.

What are the facts about Al Sarena? I don't know and I doubt if you do. In the storm of conflicting testimony the facts are obscured. One central fact does stand out however. McKay could have had no conceivable motive for doing anything in any way improper in this case. It is absolutely unbelievable that a Republican cabinet officer would imperil his reputation and the fortunes of the Eisenhower administration to do anything for a family of Alabama Democrats.

An improper action to favor a wealthy Oregon Republican? Maybe. Something off color for an Alabama Democrat? How silly can you get?

Dick House
The House of Insurance
Fluhrer Building
Medford, Ore.

'Here We Go!'

To the Editor: Since sodium fluoride is a by product of the Aluminum Corporation, and since the public must decide

workers' districts—the idea that racial liberalism goes hand in hand with unionization is simply not true, at least in these parts. In this respect, in fact, the Catholic church has done a far more effective job of persuasion than the unions—"We've had colored children in the parochial schools for some time now," one Catholic worker said, "and it's worked out all right." He was typical of others.

As one moves away from the crowded low income areas into the middle class districts like Highlands or Crescent Hills, one finds a milder reaction. Once in a while, a person will even express approval of the integration program—"Color's only skin deep," one man said, and a woman remarked that "it's all according to the good book."

BUT even in such areas, the white people oppose integration by an overwhelming majority. The political implications of this almost universal feeling are suggested by the hostility to Kentucky's Gov. "Happy" Chandler which is found everywhere in Louisville. Chandler is heartily disliked for many excellent reasons. But the unpalatable truth is that he is disliked most for one of the few really responsible acts of his career—calling out the National Guard to prevent rioting over integration in the Negroes, Kentucky.

Regarding the issues which really hit home to the voters is not usually a laudable practice in a democracy. But in these special circumstances, it is to the credit of all four major candidates in Kentucky that not one of them has seized the one-edged sword of integration, to slash his opponent's jugular with it. For the Negro vote is a surprisingly small minority of the total in this border state. And there is much political hay to be made from the integration issue, by any politician who wished to do so at the risk of sparking a general racial conflagration.

Copyright 1956 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

Today and Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann

THE MAIN QUESTION

It is rather generally agreed among experienced newspaper correspondents that the campaign is a contest between a resurgent Democratic Party and Eisenhower personally, who is so much stronger than his party. The observers are also agreed that they are not finding the contest interesting.



I wonder whether the main reason for that does not lie in the fact that while the real issue turns on Eisenhower personally, it is almost impossible to debate that issue. This would account in a large part for the widespread feeling in both parties that the issues which are being discussed do not come to grips with the realities of the election.

AT HIS press conference on Friday the President was asked two questions by Mr. E. P. Morgan of the American Broadcasting Company. They skirted the central issue of the campaign. Mr. Morgan reminded the President that "one of the reasons impelling you to run for re-election was your desire to strengthen and re-vitalize the Republican Party."

He then asked the President whether the new constitutional amendment, which prohibits a third term, would "blunt" his leadership in a second term and cause it to pass to Mr. Nixon. He followed this up with a second question, whether the President considered Sen. Dirksen and Sen. Bender, whom he has endorsed, "completely re-energized as Eisenhower Republicans."

THE point of these two questions was to raise, though indirectly, the problem of the relation between Eisenhower personally and the Republican Party. Mr. Morgan's first question, about the third term amendment, points to the probability, which is almost a certainty, that the President's conduct whether it is to be put in their water supply or not I wish to tell the public my experience with Aluminum.

I have practiced in Medford for 44 years. During that time I have had a good many patients complain of a chronic condition of boils. I had them dispose of their aluminum cooking ware and put in Stainless Steel copper bottoms and they had no more trouble.

I have had cases of stomach trouble that cleared up after changing to stainless steel. I have also had cases of ptomaine poisoning due to food cooked in Aluminum vessels, and allowed to remain in them. A vessel that is not safe to let food stand in is not as safe to cook in as it should be.

From my own experience I disposed of all Aluminum cooking ware long time ago. I do not want any more of it. Neither would I want to have to swig water the rest of my days that contains fluoride.

If Sodium Fluoride will help to keep down dental decay in children they should have the benefit. However they should have it in accurate dosage amounts and only as long as it is necessary. Parents can, through their physician and druggist, get a good grade of fluoride and give controlled dosage to their children.

Wallace & Tiernany Co. of New Jersey sell the machines that puts the fluorides in the water.

Dr. W. W. Howard, D.O. 201 Medical Center Bldg. Medford, Ore.

Non-farmers now comprise 87 per cent of the nation's population. The figure is expected to reach 90 per cent.

trol of his party will decline during a second term. For during his second term the question of who is to succeed him will play a deciding part in the calculations of candidates, of the party leaders in Congress, and of the managers of the party organization.

There is every probability that Mr. Nixon's power and influence will be enormously greater in a second term than they have been in the first. For in the first term all political interests and hopes have depended on what Eisenhower would do in 1956. In a second term, they will depend on what Nixon wants, or in the last analysis, on what men like Mr. Len Hall and the party managers want.

SPEAKING literally, the third term amendment is, in regard to Eisenhower, of no practical consequence. This is because it is so utterly improbable that four years hence Mr. Eisenhower would even consider running for a third term. The President had no personal axe to grind when he called the amendment unwise. For in his case it is irrelevant. Whereas Roosevelt was 58 when he finished his second term and ran for a third, Eisenhower would be 70. For that reason alone, he himself, the country, and above all the professional politicians, will, if he is re-elected, treat him as a President who will retire at the end of his term.

There can be little doubt, therefore, that his influence will be diminished and that he will as time goes on become increasingly a political lame duck.

THE basic problem, which it is so hard to discuss in the campaign, is that of the succession: How is the power of the President's office to be exercised in the next four years? This problem has many facets since no one can predict what will actually happen. Mr. Morgan's first question raises the problem of Eisenhower's declining influence in a second term, even assuming that his health and vigor are wholly adequate.

Mr. Morgan's second question, whether to consider Dirksen and Bender as Eisenhower Republicans, also points to the problem of the succession, from 1956 to 1960 if the President is incapacitated, after 1960 in any event. Dirksen and Bender are of no great consequence in themselves. They merely illustrate the question whether Eisenhower has in fact done anything serious and substantial about what he dreams of doing, to make a realizable and modernized Republican party. For Dirksen was a virulent opponent of Eisenhower's first nomination and Bender is an undistinguished old-fashioned Republican.

THE President's answer to Mr. Morgan's question was that Sen. Bender has supported his legislative program and that Sen. Dirksen, at his request, led the fight for the foreign aid appropriations. That was hardly an answer to the real meaning of the question. For this is an election year. Both Dirksen and Bender are up for re-election. Self preservation has demanded that they cling to Eisenhower's coat tails. The question is whether they are really Eisenhower Republicans who can be counted upon to carry on when Eisenhower is in retirement or is no longer in the White House. Or will they not look for a leader who represents what they really believe?

It is hard, I repeat, to spell out the basic problem of Eisenhower's re-election. But the crux of it is whether Eisenhower's popularity is evanescent, something peculiar to him personally, or whether it is substantial and enduring in the sense that he has provided for the future, and has rallied the men who will carry on, if necessary without him.

Copyright 1956 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

Church Services
For those who are actively engaged in the work of their respective churches, we believe that baptisms, weddings, and funerals should rightfully be conducted in the church.
These are, and should be, events of religious background and significance and their ceremonies belong in the church.
For that reason it is our policy to make no extra charge for funeral services conducted in the church.
Chapel Mortuary
Across from the Courthouse
Frank Morgan—Harold Snodgrass
FUNERAL DIRECTORS

Mother—Give Your Child Aspirin
Just As The Doctor Orders
ST. JOSEPH ASPIRIN FOR CHILDREN
World's Largest Selling Aspirin For Children