

ASHLAND EDITOR SUPPORTS TOM REEDER FOR DISTRICT ATTORNEY

The Following Is Reprinted from The ASHLAND DAILY TIDINGS Editorial Column — Written by the EDITOR, GRAHAM M. DEAN, October 30, 1956.



which to compile an average like a baseball slugger—a high percentage of convictions. But does he, in his zeal for a winning record, forget that as district attorney he is charged with protection of the innocent as well as prosecution of the guilty? Or is he only

One of the Jackson county political contests which is taking on substantial interest is the campaign between incumbent district attorney Walter Nunley and Thomas Reeder, the Democratic nominee.

Some indication that there is considerable dissatisfaction with the administration of the office by the current district attorney was evident two weeks ago when a group organized for a write-in campaign for Atty. O. H. Bengtson of Medford. Mr. Bengtson disavowed the campaign and that ended the write-in.

To review the situation, four years ago this newspaper supported Paul Haviland, then district attorney, for the GOP nomination, but Mr. Nunley was nominated on the Republican ticket and went on to win the election.

In the primary this spring, Mr. Nunley found opposition for the GOP nomination by George Rode of Medford and The Tidings felt that Mr. Nunley was the stronger of the two candidates and went on record to this effect.

At this time, for several reasons which will be set forth here, it believes that voters of Jackson county will do well to give their support to Mr. Reeder.

Mr. Nunley has his office wired with a tape recorder, a hidden microphone on the desk, and a control switch that can turn on the tape recorder without the knowledge of any person who may then be discussing any matter with him. Mr. Nunley explains that the equipment is used primarily for conversations with a suspected criminal and that this a legitimate purpose. We concede the legitimacy of such a tactic in crime detection, but the prime fact is that the hidden recording equipment is in the prosecutor's office where many persons discussing many type of complaints or business could be subject to an unknown and unwanted recording of the conversation. If the district attorney had his equipment installed in a room which he used for the interrogation of suspects, we would have no quarrel with his procedure, but this is not the case.

Any person visiting the office of the district attorney now has the uncomfortable knowledge that, without consent, the conversation is being permanently recorded.

But even more disturbing than this hidden recording machine which Mr. Nunley also says is primarily for dictation, is the apparent view of the district attorney on the function of his office. In a published advertisement for voter support, Mr. Nunley's message said: "His (Nunley's) percentage of wins over losses is above the national average for prosecuting attorneys."

This can mean only one thing: that the district attorney looks upon his office as one in

record in furtherance of his admitted desire to become circuit judge when retirement or death should end the career of Judge H. K. Hanna?

Four years ago, Mr. Nunley expressed the fear that gambling would become rife in the county because some slot machines were operating. He scented a gambling plot and he shut down the machines when he was elected. Yet some weeks ago on the matter of pinballs, he said he would not take action against them until after election because any action might be taken as a political move. This is a change of view in the last four years.

Mr. Nunley also proposes that the salary of the district attorney be increased to \$12,000 a year, yet the district attorney would retain the privilege of a private practice.

Now how does he stand with other members of the legal profession of the county? In a preferential poll taken by the county bar association, 36 attorneys expressed a preference for Mr. Reeder and only 15 for Mr. Nunley. Granting that there are probably a number of personal reasons which influenced some members of the bar, the substantial preference shown by the legal profession for Mr. Reeder reflects very poorly upon the standing of the incumbent.

Now let's take a look at Mr. Reeder. He is a relatively young man, but that should not be a deterrent to giving him support. He has served as an assistant attorney general of Oregon and for a short time as an assistant to Mr. Nunley. We do not believe that he regards the district attorneyship as a stepping stone to the bench; neither do we believe that he would seek to raise his salary to \$12,000 a year nor that he would regard his responsible office as a place to accumulate a good "batting average."

We believe the voters of Jackson county would do well to give their support to Mr. Reeder when they vote for the district attorneyship.

JACKSON COUNTY NEEDS YOUR VOTE

FOR

TOM REEDER DISTRICT ATTORNEY

Pd. Pol. Adv.—Republicans for Tom Reeder, Stanley C. Jones, Chairman

would take some of the conceit and so called pride out of them. Every time a big shot from England visits this country, it sure isn't a pleasure trip. They have up to date received or been given not a million but billions and have we ever received a dime back? No, you can bet we haven't, not even the interest. The worst part of it, they don't intend to. Then they go back to their country and say what an easy mark "Uncle Sam" is.

I am a World War I veteran, put 14 months in England and France, we landed in England and the Limeys said we were too late. They have not forgotten about the beating we gave them years ago and I really think if it came to a showdown and the Limeys thought they would lose, that they would go over to the other side.

I have often heard that charity begins at home, but not according to the United States or big hearted Uncle Sam.

I have heard all the candidates running for office say what he will do. Well they can do something about this, that happened a couple of days ago. How many troops did they send to Korea? Then the going got rough, they said they had things to do in other parts of the country that were more important.

What if our boys sat down and refused to fight for England? If England wants war, let her fight it, and leave our boys out of it.

Look at the billions of dollars we gave Yugoslavia and India and they both went to Russia. I think it is about time that we of these United States get together and do something about it. Do we want more widows and orphans, not counting the boys who gave their lives?

H. J. Walker, Gold Hill, Ore.

More of Those Questions

To the Editor: As Mrs. Brandenburg so aptly put it—"fluoridation involves a fundamental emotion, the determination for parents to protect their young from harm." That is exactly the reason I'm writing this letter.

I might not be opposed to fluoridation if these things were not true:

(1) Early in this year invitations were sent out to certain influential people to come to meetings about fluoridation. Why weren't these public meetings, since this is a public measure and will affect everyone? This fluoridation movement was made known only when a very alert individual called it to our attention in our local paper—several months after the first fluoridation meeting.

(2) Why do they use our Christmas Seal money to print these invitations? I understood this money was to be used exclusively for tuberculosis—x-rays now cost \$1.75—If there was a surplus why wasn't it turned over to another community for tuberculosis?

(3) They say to ask your doctor—but if you say your doctor is opposed—they say—"Oh, he's a crackpot," or something of the same. (Throughout the country, doctors do not agree on the safety of 1 ppm.)

(4) I have met four people locally who were allergic to the toothpaste. If it reacts on the outside—why won't it react on the inside?

(5) My aunt is a public health nurse—a very wonderful person. I asked her what she thought of fluoridation, she said, "I think it's alright—the doctors endorse it." But when I asked her what she knew about fluorides or what she had read, she said "nothing." Yet she is in a position to influence others. Frankly I think many doctors are guilty of the same thing.

(6) They say they've had years of research—I find that this research deals mostly with natural fluoride — their 10-year experimental work at Newburgh-Kingston, which consists mostly of x-rays on certain groups, leaves much to the imagination and much to be assumed. Opposing medical men refer to animal experimental work where it definitely has proved harmful.

Food for thought, why hasn't New York City adopted it? Why have so many cities thrown it out after trying it? If doctors were always right long ago or would have died long ago or been childless. Frankly I think the methods employed should be enough to make you vote "no."

Mrs. Barbara Miller, 728 Newtown, Medford, Ore.

Emotionalism Dominates

To the Editor: When an advertisement appears in the paper, stating its anti-fluoridation views I think they should more accurately state they are anti-American Dental Association, anti-American Medical Association, anti-U. S. Public Health Service, anti-reputable medical

doctors, anti-reputable dentists, anti-previous fluoridation success, and anti-children's teeth. I feel that any group or organization with this many "antis" is not realistically analyzing the facts placed before them, but have allowed emotionalism to dominate their thinking.

I am going to vote for fluoridation in the coming Tuesday election because of the objective facts presented by the authorities. I respect the opinion of my doctor and dentist.

G. Flory, 571 Pierce rd., Medford, Ore.

Keep Water Pure

To the Editor: Just a few words about this toxic fluoride in our good and pure drinking water. I have heard many say they would leave Medford if it was put in our good water.

I note in an article that Dr. Dierdorff put in your paper that it would make no difference if people did leave Medford. They would get fluoride just the same out of fish, potatoes, corn, and milk. Well he is right on this. So why put this artificial sodium fluoride, which all know is deadly poison, when all we have to do is to just eat more fish, corn, potatoes, and drink more good wholesome milk, and not force such deadly stuff down our throats just to make money for the aluminum companies. There has been much said about trusting our doctors. Yes, we should trust our doctors, and go to them if we want our children to have fluoride and get a prescription for such poison and take it as he prescribes and not go to the voter to decide for us.

There has been enough money paid to TV and radio, and in ads, to pay for enough fluoride to supply the whole Jackson county for ten years, if given to those who want it, and would go to your doctor for prescription, and take it as you please. Who is paying for all of this? All doctors are not in favor of fluoride in our drinking water by a long shot. I have much literature to this effect, since this question has come up if any one wants to see it.

Have we lost our freedom that we can not drink good pure water? Dear people of Medford, you had better be careful how you vote. And vote no. The health or life you may save might be your own, or your children. God bless us and keep our water pure.

Ross J. Turman, 112 Newtown st., Medford, Ore.

Pharmacist's View

To the Editor: As a pharmacist, I see quite a bit of the local doctors and dentists, and have had a chance many times to discuss the issue of fluoridation with them. It's been interesting to me to note the uniformity of their views in favor of its adoption, since on issues having to do with health they are far from unanimous.

Another observation is the increasing enthusiasm among the doctors who know the most about the question, and have given it the greatest study. This has been true also when interested doctors have addressed local groups to inform them on the benefits and safety of fluoridation—these civic groups have changed from indifferent to actively supporting—some to the extent that they were willing to contribute money to the furtherance of his educational campaign.

These things convinced me that if all the people could get the facts on fluoridation, undistorted by quotes out of context, they would bring this great benefit to Medford and not allow a campaign of fear, based on ignorance, make them hesitate.

Who should know better about a matter of health than those men who devote their entire life to protecting it. Join with the overwhelming majority of doctors, dentists, nurses, and pharmacists of Medford in voting for this measure, number 56.

Charles R. Bowls, 516 Park, Medford, Ore.

His Responsibility

To the Editor: Several opponents of fluoridation have recently stated that I am against fluoridation. I want to make my stand on this issue clear. After studying the authoritative research that has been done on this public health measure to decrease tooth decay, I would not fulfill my responsibility to this community without endorsing the fluoridation measure. Those who are willing to approach this issue with an open mind can be assured of the following:

1. The use of 1 ppm fluoridation. (More Communications on Page 5)

(Continued From Page 4)

District Attorney they so wisely elected in 1952 prove beyond any doubt that he is the man for this job. His work in bringing two ruthless killers to justice is an outstanding example.

Mr. Nunley has greatly contributed toward making this county a safer place to live by his excellent cooperation with the law enforcement agencies. I worked for the Medford Police Department for three years and could see first hand how Mr. Nunley and his office does everything possible to help them in their work. He is well-liked and has the respect and confidence of these law enforcement officers. This cooperation provides incentive for these men which directly benefits the people of this county.

With crime increasing in the United States we are certainly fortunate to have such an able man as Mr. Nunley for our District Attorney. As he has proven to us by his record, he should be retained in this capacity.

Aron Christlieb, 13 North Main, Ashland, Ore.

"Helpful, Dedicated"

To the Editor: There seems to be much discussion concerning Mr. Walter Nunley, our District Attorney.

As an employee of Jackson county for almost seven years in the county assessor's office, I had the opportunity to observe at first hand some of the working of his office.

Among many other things, the District Attorney is the legal advisor for the officials of the county. I would like to state that in any matter pertaining to our problems, Mr. Nunley was always courteous, helpful and dedicated to the affairs of the people of this county.

Andrew Lawver, Rt. 1, Box 168, Talent, Ore.

No Help From "Babe"

To the Editor: Once upon a time I read a book on "Oregon History" and found out that all our great rivers and lakes were dug by Paul Bunyan with the aid of Babe the blue ox. After reading the large pamphlet, put out by the Republicans, I find I have been misinformed all these years, and that the work was done by Doug McKay, without any aid from "Babe."

George Walter, 635 Glenwood Drive, Ashland, Ore.

Support No. 4

To the Editor: The county coroner, Carlos Morris, has given his public reasons why he is opposed to Measure No. 4, which authorizes the legislature to prescribe qualifications for the office of coroner.

There might just be a private reason for this opposition, too! His office as county coroner means that Mr. Morris' funeral home gets an average of about 50 funeral services each year from "coroner cases."

He has also stated that if this measure is passed, it would mean an increased expense, to each county, of \$25,000 to \$35,000 per year.

In Klamath county, which is comparable to Jackson county and many other counties in the state of Oregon, a qualified person, Dr. George Adler, M.D., has been the county coroner for the past 25 years. In Klamath county the budget for the coroner's office is less than \$1,000 per year, while in Jackson county the budget has been \$1,200 per year.

Chapel Mortuary, Latwiler Funeral Home; Perl Funeral Home, SIGNED BY: Frank Morgan, Harold Snodgrass, C. M. Latwiler and Frank Perl.

The Two Canals

To the Editor: Surely the papers are wrong when they say Eisenhower, Dulles and other government officials were angry with Britain and France for protecting the Suez Canal and trying to get it back. Because of the neutrality of the canal so every country could use it, England was to keep it open. The laws protecting the Suez Canal are the same as the ones protecting Panama Canal. I believe a French company had done a

great deal of work on the Panama Canal when we entered into a treaty with the government of Panama in 1904 to build the canal; also a second treaty with Britain guaranteeing the neutrality of the canal but giving us the right of ownership and defense. So if our government officials are angry with Britain and France, will they let others take over the Panama Canal that taxpayers paid for? Also blood, sweat and tears went into building of both canals and they were to be used by all the world, not just a chosen few.

Think, before you vote. Eisenhower may be able to handle his job as president during normal times. But could he stand the duress of being president during a world war? Are we, the voters so dumb as to sacrifice another good man to death as we did Roosevelt? Haven't we learned our lessons yet? Let's retire him to his farm where he and his wife spend all their free time and want to live as civilians. His years as a public servant have been many.

Gladys Hamilton, Route 2, Box 488, Medford, Ore.

America Needs Friends

To the Editor: During the primary stages of this campaign, the Republicans' main strategy was to make the name Eisenhower and the word Peace synonymous, but at this most inconvenient time, armed conflict has broken out in two different parts of the world. Now, in order to silence the "touché" which might be in order, the Republicans have changed strategy and now the headlines read, "Eisenhower—Experienced in Matters of War!"

This headline may well be true, but what has that got to do with the Presidency of the United States? Thirty-three great presidents preceded President Eisenhower and few of them had the military experience like can boast of. True, they would probably have made lousy Generals in time of war and threatening war, but they made good presidents, and that's what counts in the White House. In times like these, Eisenhower's military experience would be irreplaceable in the Army, but of very little use in the White House.

In time of war, military minds are essential, but just as essential, if not more so, are minds that are capable of mapping out effective diplomatic strategy. Diplomacy is a substance that our present administration is starving for the need of.

In the last four years, we have not only failed to make new friends, but we have lost many of the old ones. Britain and France have clearly shown us their disregard for our world standing. Whether their actions were right or wrong I would not judge, but they surely didn't feel that the opinion of John Foster Dulles was of any great importance.

I feel that the check and balance system of statesmen in the White House and Generals in the Army is a vital need in tumultuous times such as these. I would rest easier if the arrogance of John Foster Dulles and crew were replaced with a graciousness and common humility such as that of Adlai Stevenson. America needs her friends abroad, we are not so great and powerful that we can stand alone against the world, and only fools and egotists would believe so.

Beverly Johnson, 110 Renault, Medford, Ore.

"Perfidious Albion"

To the Editor: Well, here we go again. Just what the Russians and the Communist friends have been waiting for. Leave it to England to set the fuse that will no doubt start another war, and what a war! I can never recall a war that those Limeys have ever won by themselves. Always ready to start a war and then when the going gets rough, they holler for help. I have often thought what would happen if help was refused, maybe it

"WRITE-IN" to Retain

JUDGE

Wm. McALLISTER

for JUDGE of the

SUPREME COURT

POSITION NO. ONE

We urge you to take this ad to the polls with you and write in WM. McALLISTER on the Non-partisan Judiciary ballot, as illustrated below. He is eminently qualified and should be retained as Judge.

Here's the Way to Do It

NON-PARTISAN BALLOT FOR JACKSON COUNTY, OREGON NOVEMBER 6, 1956

OFFICIAL JUDICIARY BALLOT

FOR JUDGE OF THE SUPREME COURT, Position Number One Write in One

301 X Wm. McAllister

Non-Partisan Committee McAllister for Judge 55 South Barnburg, Medford, Oregon Eugene Thordike, Chairman Mary Greiner Kelly



VOTE

FOR MAYOR — 2 YEAR TERM

128 X PAUL J. SELBY

Pd. Pol. Adv.

Selby for Mayor Committee