

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE

"Everyone in Southern Oregon Reads The Mail Tribune"

Published Daily Except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO.

Subscription Rates: By Mail—In Advance: Per Copy 10c.

Official Paper of the City of Medford

NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION

NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION

Flight 'O' Time: Medford and Jackson County History from the files of The Mail Tribune.

10 YEARS AGO: March 10, 1947 (Monday)

20 YEARS AGO: March 10, 1937 (Wednesday)

30 YEARS AGO: March 10, 1927 (Thursday)

40 YEARS AGO: March 10, 1917 (Saturday)

What's Your IQ?: Nine or ten correct is superior; seven or eight is excellent; five or six is good.

1. Was Election Day in the United States always on a Tuesday?

2. When the second award of a medal for valor or achievement is made to a member of the armed forces, does the man get two medals?

3. Bible: Who baptized Saul?

4. Most roots now have grafted roots, true or false?

5. The name of which city means "brotherly love"?

6. Harriet Lane was the niece of a President and served as mistress of the White House during her uncle's term of office; name the President.

7. Is polycythemia a disease of the red or white blood cells?

8. In what country is Narsarsuaq?

9. Is the "ch" in "coche" pronounced cash or cotech?

10. "As high as Heaven, as deep as"—what?

Answers: 1. No. 2. No. 3. Ananias. 4. True. 5. Philadelphia. 6. James Buchanan. 7. Red. 8. Greenland. 9. Cosh. 10. "Hell."—Young.

Washington Paying Korean Vets Bonus: The state of Washington is paying a bonus to Korean veterans.

Any Washington veterans in Jackson county may contact Bionacci at the courthouse where applications may be secured.

What are We Waiting For?

As memorials to congress by the State Legislature are seldom important, so the defeat of the Hells Canyon memorial by one vote was not so important.

But as a party voting index it was significant. Every Republican voted against this approval of public power on the Snake, and every Democrat voted for.

As the Democrats have a majority in the House naturally the memorial passed by a comfortable total there. But with a 50-50 party division in the senate the result was a tie, 15-15, with the measure defeated because it failed to get the necessary 16 count by one vote.

THIS makes it reasonably clear that if the people of Oregon wish to get authorized federal power projects finished, or any new ones started, they better vote Democratic.

We grant Hells Canyon has become extremely controversial politically but the debate over this memorial plainly demonstrated that in this field the Republicans have learned nothing and forgotten nothing. All the old cliches about the evils of public power from the standpoint of our cherished "American way of life" were brought from the moth balls, shined up and fired at the opposition with all the exaggerated solemnity of a firing-squad delivering a salute to the "unknown soldier."

As usual an entirely false picture of the public vs. private power issue was presented, although the record of every federal multiple power project from TVA Tennessee to Bonneville, Oregon, refutes this.

IT WAS claimed, for example, that if a high federal dam was constructed on the Snake as recommended by the U.S. army engineers, in place of the three small dams by the Idaho Power company, not only would it cost the American taxpayers six or seven hundred millions, but the same taxpayers would lose a million dollars a year in taxes, and after all was said and done, the Idaho company project would, quote: "benefit Oregon and the Pacific northwest ALMOST as much as the high dam." (There is another prize winning understatement.)

THE only trouble with this argument is "it just ain't so."

Even the official examiner for the Federal Power Commission in an official report that was never overruled, declared "a high federal dam would be dollar-for-dollar the better investment and more nearly ideal development of the Middle Snake."

Why this decision was not accepted and followed by the F.P.C. has never been made clear. The reason given by one official in Washington was that Congress would never vote for another federal project in the west, so why authorize it. But only a short time later the Congress not only DID so vote authorizing the Upper Colorado project but at far greater cost to the American taxpayers, for whom the Grand Old Party has such strong sympathies, whenever Hells Canyon is the issue.

BUT just what does this expense in increased taxes and woeful loss in taxes to local governments add up to when a multiple project idea is adopted as it was, for example, at "TVA" on the Tennessee river? In the first place the project is self-liquidating. Every penny advanced by the government is over a period of years returned to the government through the sale and distribution of power, not directly to the consumer but through local cooperative distributing systems, and ALWAYS at a low and reasonable cost. In other words through a couple of generations such a project doesn't cost the taxpayers of the country one red cent.

MOREOVER at the end of that period, the government—that is the people of the country—own an extremely profitable and extensive light and power system, the services of which they get indefinitely at a minimum charge. Does that promote the public welfare or doesn't it?

AS FOR the much-advertised loss in taxes which the Idaho Power company, for example, would pay, if given the green light, is there anyone in the audience so naive they believe the company WOULD pay these taxes?

Of course, as everyone knows, they wouldn't. They would merely add the tax costs to their rates, and as always the consumers would pay via the nostrils.

AND there one comes to the crux of the entire problem.

Not only is it a question of getting more power—the maximum—but getting cheaper power—the minimum.

And we don't believe there are many who would deny that there is the crying need of the people of Oregon and the people of the northwest.

FINALLY there is the multiple purpose item in the federal project that by the nature of things, and our established financial system CAN'T be included in any private power development.

Again taking the "Tennessee Valley Authority" as an example, such a trustworthy and conservative news commentator as Marquis Childs, in the equally trustworthy and conservative Oregonian, recently stated that in the matter of flood control alone, this federal T.V.A. development on the Tennessee river saved one city—Chattanooga—in the recent floods an estimated \$65,000,000.

Of course there would not be a similar flood danger on the Snake but there would be on the Columbia, and on both there would be material, collateral benefits in the area of water storage, navigation and irrigation.

In the Day's News

By FRANK JENKINS

At his news conference Thursday morning, President Eisenhower discussed the problem of inflation. He said it may be necessary to CUT SOME FEDERAL SPENDING in order to FIGHT inflation.

He added that he has ordered an intensive review of the budget to see where spending can be slowed down.

LET'S put it this way: The danger of inflation was present when the budget was being put together. Heavy government spending tends to INCREASE the danger of inflation. But the budget, as presented to the Congress still called for the spending of nearly 72 BILLION dollars—the highest peacetime budget in history.

The size of it scared a lot of people, including a lot of common, ordinary taxpayers with no political axes to grind. In the uproar over the staggering size of the budget, it is becoming reasonably apparent that too much spending isn't popular among the VOTERS.

THIS is the moral: If spending is to be cut, the VOTERS will bring it about. Whenever it becomes apparent that excessive spending of the taxpayers' money LOSES votes instead of WINNING VOTES there will be economy in government again.

But not before then.

INTERESTING little tale: Popular Science magazine predicts that glib-tongued home-repair swindlers will bilk Americans out of half a BILLION dollars this year.

Hmmmmmm! Let's put it the other way around:

AMERICANS THIS YEAR WILL PERMIT THEMSELVES TO BE BILKED OUT OF A HALF BILLION DOLLARS BY SMOOTH-TONGUED SLICKERS.

IN SHORT we can think of no better summing up on this issue of public vs. private power on the Snake or elsewhere than to quote the official examiner of the Federal Power Commission when, after a thorough examination of all items involved, declared in his official report, quote:

"The high dam would be dollar-for-dollar the better investment and the more ideal development of the Middle Snake."

Why then don't we have it? What are we waiting for?

That, we believe, is the \$64,000 question for the present administration to answer.—R.W.R.

News Tips versus News

A mildly irate subscriber phoned this office last week and asked why we allowed the radio to best us on important news.

"What news?" was asked.

The "important news" proved to be that Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt had broadcast the fact that her choice for the Democratic presidential nomination in 1960 was Oregon's senior senator, the right Honorable Wayne Morse.

We admitted that was "news" to us and we promised to check. The result of the "check" was to show that Mrs. Roosevelt never declared over the air, or anywhere else, that Senator Morse was HER choice for the presidential nomination.

She had declared in her personal column in "McCall's magazine" that while she refused to name her three favorites for such an honor, she did say to an inquirer, that her list of qualified men for the nomination would include the following:

Former Ambassador Chester Bowles. Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon. Governor G. Mennen Williams of Michigan. Senator Joseph Clark of Pennsylvania. Governor Edmund Muskie of Maine.

No preferences were expressed and there was no indication that the order in which the names appeared had any special significance.

As the record shows the item was not carried by any of the press associations, and, as far as known, was not played up by any newspapers in the state or even sent out by McCall's publicity department.

However had any of these things been done the Mail Tribune, a long time and unwavering supporter of Oregon's senior Senator, would have considered it newsworthy and put the item under a proper head in a proper place.

But that did not happen.

HOWEVER, the reason we mention it editorially now, is to emphasize one of the minor headaches in the newspaper business, namely the receipt of so many unsolicited news items, that don't happen to be true.

Mrs. Roosevelt, of course, did not choose Wayne Morse as her favorite candidate for the Democratic nomination three years hence, she only mentioned him as one of five prominent Democrats she considered of presidential timber—from a news angle quite a difference. But it was and is, of course, a great compliment to Senator Morse.

WE WELCOME news tips from any source, and would do nothing to discourage the practice. But we do have our moments when we wish more of the "tips" were based upon the facts rather than assumptions so often contrary to them.—R.W.R.

Matter of Fact

By Joseph Alsop

WHERE WE COME IN Paris—For the Soviet citizen, the gradual evolution of the iron society in which he lives and



Joseph Alsop

has his being must be a matter of really passionate concern. And this same evolution should also be a matter of deep interest for Americans. All the same, the evolution of Soviet society that began with the death of Stalin has neither softened nor deflected Soviet foreign policy.

On the contrary, while considerably more supple than their late master, Stalin's heirs have actually proven somewhat more adventurous. And on the basis of a rather intense experience in the Soviet Union, this reporter is convinced that a wholly new generation of Soviet leaders will probably have to come to power before there is any real change in the meaning of "peaceful coexistence."

Thus the fundamental Western problem remains unaltered except in detail. In the satellite area of Central Europe, to be sure, the Soviets have recently suffered a severe setback. But by the ruthless use of their great military power, they have recovered a large part of their losses, at least for the time being. Meanwhile, the West has also suffered severe setbacks, especially in the troubled Middle East. And the Western losses have most conspicuously not been recovered.

AT the present juncture, moreover, the West has found no effective way to exploit the Soviet setbacks. Yet the Soviets are exploiting the Western setbacks with great daring and astuteness. Thus Soviet world strategy has actually gone forward. What then is the nature of this Soviet strategy which the Western allies must somehow find means to parry?

It comes in three parts. Towards the United States, the Soviets present a firm military front. At the same time, they seek bilateral negotiations between the two giant powers, but always and on strictly Soviet terms.

In all the vulnerable ex-and semi-colonial areas in which the Western powers have vital interests, meanwhile, the Soviets are doing everything possible to transform the inflamed native nationalism into a weapon against the West. In Stalin's time, the center of this effort was the Far East. But the great innovation of the Khrushchev era has been Soviet intervention in the Middle East, where Stalin hardly raised a finger after his retreat from Azerbaijan.

In his talk with me, for instance, Nikita Khrushchev openly indicated active Soviet support for nationalization of the Middle Eastern oil sources, whence flows the economic lifeblood of Britain and western Europe. Thus he revealed the Soviet aim. The masters of the Kremlin do not want Communist satellites in the Middle East. They want Soviet-backed, venge-

fully anti-Western Arab governments which will nationalize the oil sources and take other steps of a similar nature.

THUS Britain, particularly, is to be ruined. France and the other western European powers are to be weakened. And by this economic flank attack, the chief trans-Atlantic partners of the Western alliance are to be knocked out of the great power game.

But while they are thus encouraging their Arab friends to strike at the vitals of Britain, France and the other European nations, the Soviet leaders are shrewdly seeking quite another sort of success in Britain and France. In both these countries, the men of the political right place the whole blame for the setbacks in the Middle East on the follies of American policy, conveniently forgetting their own follies. And on the political left, the American alliance has always been a source of profound disquiet.

In this confused state of public opinion, the Soviet leaders hope to make great gains with still another weapon—the cold fear which always inspires wishfulness and bad judgment. With virulent anti-Americanism already rampant, they are going to brandish their new arms. (It is a fair bet that they will shortly make some sort of public showing of an intermediate range ballistic missile with an atomic or hydrogen warhead, which will inspire very cold fear indeed.) And they are going to say to our partners in the Western alliance:

"These Americans are terrible people anyway. If you only were not linked with them, we should be nice as pie to you. So why do you run the risk of being devastated by these dangerous toys of ours in a quarrel between us and the Americans, just because you obstinately continue to grant the Americans bases in your countries?"

ONCE again, in the interview he granted me, Nikita Khrushchev quite discernibly hinted at this Soviet approach. He also quite confidently predicted that the American overseas bases would eventually be liquidated. By these means, in sum, the masters of the Kremlin hope to organize a gigantic upset of the world balance of power, only comparable to the upset in the European balance of power that occurred in the Thirties.

If you look at this Soviet foreign policy cold bloodedly, without the cheap self-indulgence of easy indignation, you have to admit that the Kremlin's masters are very far from stupid or weak. Their strategy, alas, is prudently bold, well adjusted to the means at their disposal, and on the whole well calculated to attain the aims they have set for themselves.

In truth, the Soviet strategy leaves only one key question unanswered. If the world balance of power is successfully upset as planned, how will the suddenly aroused United States then react?

Copyright, New York Herald Tribune Inc.

POTLUCK

(By M-T Staff and Contributors)

We were told, the other day, about the salesman driving along Highway 99 near Central Point in a delivery truck, which suddenly lost a wheel. The driver managed to get off to the side of the road, and watched as the wheel rolled on, finally coming to rest up the highway.

As our driver waited for traffic to clear so he could hike forward and get the wheel, another truck, this one a pick-up, pulled off the side of the road by the wheel, the driver jumped out, grabbed the wheel, tossed it in the pick-up, and drove off. The first driver was so flabbergasted all he could do was sit there and watch. Didn't even get the other guy's license number.

The Jackson school publication, Jackson Hickory Chips, reports that "March came in like a lamb. That means it will go out like the sixth grade at lunch time."

Good deeds are not always appreciated. Just ask Cliff Cordy, the horticultural agent here, who last week started off to demonstrate to a photographer how to prune rose bushes. He was looking for a house with bushes needing the work, which he'd perform, skillfully and expertly, free.

At the first house where he stopped, the lady declined because she wanted unpruned roses to keep the kids out of the garden. At the next, the skeptical householder declined because, she said, they were renting and maybe the landlord didn't want the roses pruned.

This same story showed up at another some distance away. At another two or three houses no one answered the door.

Finally, about an hour and 20 minutes after he started, Cordy found a lady at home who said she'd be delighted to have the roses pruned, and that her husband had been planning to do it that afternoon.

State Sen. Howard Belton of Canby, "dean" of the senate, says that some of the new legislators remind him of the bottom half of a double boiler—"they put out a lot of steam, but they never seem to know what's cooking."

Amos Walker saw a "Flight 'O' Time" item in Mail Tribune the other day, in the 40 years ago column, which recorded that Mrs. Myrtle Day of Gold Hill had been in town to buy a Saxon Six car. Walker, who then operated the Walker Auto Company on Main street, tells us that other Saxon Sixes were delivered to other valley residents from the same shipment. He delivered one to Johnny Reed, then mayor of Gold Hill, after Mrs. Day, Reed's sister-in-law, made the arrangements, and others went to Richard Antle, cashier of the Farmers and Fruitgrowers bank, and Herman Offenbacher, of the Applegate.

Mrs. H. H. Chapman, our Hornbrook correspondent, swears that she heard a radio announcer the other day, in giving a weather forecast, say there was "a shouance of chattered skewers." She thinks he probably meant a chance of scattered showers.

Last week our sports editor traded in his desk for another one, considerably larger, due to a general rearrangement of furniture now going on in connection with our remodeling.

After the big desk was delivered, someone made reference to the sports desk, whereupon the sports editor drew himself up and announced that, with the changeover, "This isn't the sports desk anymore; it's the sports department."

McLaughlin Junior High school's paper, the Junior Quill, records a conversation in which Jim asks Tim if he knows how to get rid of "that run-down feeling." Tim says, "No. How?" Jim replies, "Look both ways before you cross the street."

The general fire alarm sounded last week in the midst of a downpour of rain, and our photographer was dispatched post haste to the Pinnacle plant where smoke had been reported. No fire ensued, however, and he came back without a picture.

Someone said they were sorry he'd had a "dry run." "Well," commented the photographer, shaking water from his hair and clothes, "it wasn't exactly dry."

decisively support the President's conduct of foreign policy. If this support holds and the Republicans conclusively back the President, then the Republican party may be putting itself in an exceedingly advantageous position for the election next year.

But it remains to be seen whether this Republican support will hold. Sen. Knowland has already indicated that he will try to cut Mr. Eisenhower's foreign aid program.

Copyright, New York Herald Tribune Inc.

From Washington

By Roscoe Drummond

RESISTANCE TO THE PRESIDENT Washington—The trend of recent events shows that President Eisenhower is going to have recurring trouble with Congress.

What is immediately visible is that Mr. Eisenhower faces a more critical Congress—a Congress more resistant to his proposals for the conduct of foreign policy—than at any time since his first election.

The decisive Senate approval, 72 to 19, of the Eisenhower Doctrine in the Middle East is profoundly welcome to the White House, but it would be misleading to look upon this vote as much of a Presidential victory. It was a Presidential defeat at several points—and casts its shadow ahead.

It would be premature to say that anything like stalemate between the White House and Congress is in the making. It isn't. Neither side wants stalemate. What is happening is this:

The Democratic leaders are not pliantly going to say yes to the President every time he asks for something. This is not unexpected. There will be no massive opposition. There will be selective opposition and now that Mr. Eisenhower can't run again, there is going to be a little more "politics as usual."

There is some compensation for the President. As Democratic opposition increases, there is a tendency among the Republicans to close ranks and increase their support. This has been evident throughout the voting on the Middle East resolution.

FIFTY-EIGHT days from presentation to passage cannot be considered very responsive on the part of Congress to the "urgent" appeal Mr. Eisenhower made for "prompt" concurrence in his plan to give economic aid and military protection to the Middle East nations. A Republican Congress did better than that in approving the "Truman Doctrine" for military and economic aid to Greece and Turkey in 1947.

There are other manifestations of Congressional independence of and resistance to the President. For reasons which were completely arguable, the Senate Democratic leaders re-wrote the Eisenhower resolution to put the full responsibility upon the President for use of force in the Middle East if he deems it necessary.

At another point a Democratically sponsored amendment to empty the Middle East resolution of the economic aid provision got 28 votes, which cannot fail to give the White House grave concern about what may happen to the economic aid appropriations which lie ahead.

Finally, there was the overwhelming upsurge of Congressional opposition to the prospect that President Eisenhower would support U.N. sanctions against Israel. Here both parties were united against the White House. Senate Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson wrote Secretary Dulles a strong letter saying that Congress would never accept such a course and Republican Senate Leader William Knowland threatened to resign from the American delegation to the United Nations if sanctions were approved by the Administration.

Most correspondents doubted that the Administration would in the end ever have gone along with sanctions, but the vigorous attitude of the Senate had the effect of striking from the President's hands an instrument of pressure which he was seeking to use on Premier Ben-Gurion.

THE unusually solid Republican support for the President on the Middle East resolution is the only encouraging development which the President can find in this whole sequence of events. Only five Republicans joined the 23 Democrats who voted for the amendment deleting flexibility in economic aid. Only three Republicans voted with the 16 Democrats against the resolution itself.

All the public opinion polls continue to show that the voters