

MEDFORD BUSINESS

Published Daily Except Saturdays and Sundays... MEDFORD BUSINESS... MEDFORD BUSINESS... MEDFORD BUSINESS...

NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION... MEDFORD BUSINESS... MEDFORD BUSINESS... MEDFORD BUSINESS...

Flight of Time

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

10 YEARS AGO

March 14, 1947 (Friday) Two stock associations formed at Star ranger to promote and protect grazing on national forest lands.

20 YEARS AGO

March 14, 1927 (Sunday) Lithia Springs hotel in Ashland purchased by Walter H. Leverette, Medford financier.

30 YEARS AGO

March 14, 1927 (Monday) Secretary C. T. Baker of Medford Chamber of Commerce denies report that chamber may move to a location on Riverside ave.

40 YEARS AGO

Former Gov. Oswald West spends day in Medford on business concerning a O and C land grant case.

What's Your I.Q.?

- 1. Was the first theater in the U. S. expressly for operatic performances opened in New York or Boston?
2. Wolves drink water in the manner as dogs; true or false?
3. Bible: Jesus' two miracles, "Healing of the Deaf Man" and "Feeding the Four - Thousand" occurred at D - ?

Court Says Wife Can't Be Forced To Testify

Salem - (U.P.) - The State Supreme Court held yesterday that a wife cannot be compelled against her will to testify against her husband who had indicted for an attempted assault upon his minor daughter.

The Portland "Mess"

Some years ago we visited Hollywood and after a tour of some of the "lots" were given the low-down on movie-morals.

There was some sort of scandal hitting the front pages in "L.A." at the time, and we opined, in our innocence, that it must be hard on the principals, particularly the popular feminine star who was involved.

"Shucks," remarked our newspaper guide, "that front page stuff is great box office, the more of it the merrier."

"In other words it is publicity they want, whether it is good or bad?" we asked.

"You got the idea," was the reply, "this place is publicity-mad and it pays off!"

WHICH only goes to show that Portland, Ore., is a long distance from Hollywood, Calif., not only geographically but regarding morals and mores.

For they don't like "scandal" in Portland. And they like even less any publicity about it.

For example, here is an extract from a letter we recently received from the "Rose City," quote:

"Portland is on the map all right thanks to these Senate hearings in Washington. But what a map—and what a spot! To listen to all that dirt one would think this wasn't a city of nice homes and nice people, but a community of burglars, bawdy houses and bums."

Probably the hearing in Washington has politics in it—everything in Washington, including the dome, is slanted by it.

NATURALLY, however, our Portland friend doesn't like it. He has lived all his life in the beautiful, complacent and somewhat provincial metropolis.

BUT all that, of course, is "water over the dam." What interests the Mail Tribune at the present time is how to clean up the mess, not only for the well being and betterment of Portland, but organized labor as well.

THE FUNDAMENTAL problem we have decided bears a certain resemblance to the Russian problem. In both cases we doubt if there will be REAL improvement until the high command—the leadership—is changed.

Such attacks "stir up the animals" at home, but we fear they only tend to close the ranks and stimulate the opposition at home and abroad.

IN OTHER words we doubt if there will be permanent improvement in either case, until the people of Russia somehow, somehow, put their own house in order and organized labor in this country does the same.

THERE is some evidence that such a reformation is possible EVENTUALLY in Soviet Russia, and even more evidence that the job can be done by union labor here at home.

That telegram to the McClellan senate committee, for example, signed by 333 members of the Teamsters union in Portland, was particularly heartening. This is the way it read in part:

"We wish the removal from office of any Teamsters officials found guilty of racketeering or misuse of union funds. We favor legislation to prevent the occurrence of such a situation as now exists."

Equally encouraging was the stand taken by George Meany, president of "AFL and CIO." Said he:

"I welcome the senate effort where and when it is directed toward cleaning up the Teamsters or any other union, and punishing crime or wrong doing wherever found. But I am opposed where the motive fundamentally is NOT to reform and purify the unions, but to destroy them."

We believe the people of this state, and country, would give their general approval to both declarations.

AS FAR as this paper is concerned, we would go back to a statement made to the undersigned by

Mollet Faces Double Question In Vote of Confidence Test

By CHARLES M. McCANN United Press Correspondent Guy Mollet France's most durable premier since the end of World War II, is about to face his biggest test.



Charles M. McCann The debate will continue until March 22 when Mollet will put his program to a vote of confidence.

It is pretty certain that the deceivably scholarly-looking Socialist premier will win the test.

If he does, it will be the 33rd time since he took office on Feb. 1, 1956, that Mollet has put the life of his government on the line and has kept his job.

Two Policy Issues The National Assembly debate centers on two policy issues. One is Algeria, the 851,299-square mile area of French Africa which has been torn by a bloody, costly revolt since Nov. 1, 1954.

Mollet is determined that France shall keep Algeria at any cost. He offers Algeria free elections and a great measure of home rule. But he insists that first the nationalist rebels must lay down their arms.

The other issue concerns Mollet's fight against inflation in France. It is being pinned on the demand of powerful agricultural interests for a rise of about one-half cent a quart in the price of milk, which is government controlled like many other prices.

Raise Price Index The difficulty is that if the increase is approved, it will raise the price index. That would mean an increase of 5 per cent in the minimum wage scale for all of France.

Actually, not a great many French workers would get the increase, because few of them get only the minimum wage prescribed by law.

Mollet knows, however, from past experience that if the minimum wage is increased, the labor unions will at once open a fight—and wage it with mass strikes—for general wage increases.

Mollet has decided to stand or fall on his refusal to raise the milk price.

Matter of Fact By Stewart Alsop

THE DULLES PROMISSORY NOTES Washington—One thing at least is obvious. Despite all the hopeful hints and bright forecasts since the withdrawal of the Israelis, the Middle Eastern crisis is far from over.



Stewart Alsop up or shut up.

For the United States, under the policy of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, has given the British, the French, and the Israelis certain large promissory notes, in return for their withdrawal from Egypt. And it is quite likely that these promissory notes will fall due in the near future.

The French and British invasion of Egypt was no doubt an act of folly, but it was not an act of simple insanity. They had rational reasons for doing what they did. Above all, they believed that it was better to risk force than to tolerate a situation which would see the violently hostile Abdel Gama Nasser, with Soviet backing, in unchallenged control of their economic jugular vein, the Suez Canal.

They agreed to withdraw, without commitment from Nasser, largely because they believe they did have a commitment from the United States that Nasser would not achieve total control of the canal. When they withdrew, Vice-President Nixon, in a speech approved by Dulles and the President, gave them their promissory note. He said, in effect, that the United States had a moral obligation to make certain that Britain and France did not suffer as a result of their compliance with the American-sponsored U.N. resolution.

THIS promissory note could fall due in a matter of days. The canal is to be opened shortly to ships of 10,000 tons. Suppose, one day soon, a ship flying the British flag enters the canal and the Egyptians demand the toll. The British captain, on instruction from London, offers a receipt on the Egyptian blocked sterling account in London. The Egyptians refuse to supply a pilot unless cash on the barrel head is forthcoming, without conditions.

If the British (and/or the French) agree to put cash on the barrel head in such circumstances, Nasser will have won the ball game. Even after Nasser took the canal, 60 per cent of the canal tolls were paid into blocked accounts in Paris and London, pending a settlement. If the tolls are now instead paid to Nasser in cash, without conditions, there will have been a settlement—on Nasser's terms.

For all practical purposes, the canal will be the British and French to do if Nasser refuses them passage except on his terms? After what has passed, they are not at all likely to use force unilaterally again, as Nasser is well aware. Instead, they will turn to the United States, and ask payment on their promissory note. And—aside from appealing again to the United Nations, a weak reed indeed in such a situation—how is the United States to pay off on the note? The United States, after all, is not likely to start shooting either, as Nasser is also aware.

Perhaps, in the end, Nasser will be reasonable. Egyptian Foreign Minister Mahmoud Fawzi continues to make reasonable noises to U.N. Secretary Dag Hammarskjold. It is in Nasser's rational self-interest to achieve a settlement, in order to unblock Egyptian funds and start rebuilding Egypt's wrecked economy. But is a risky business to suppose that Middle Eastern nationalists fanatics can be relied upon to act in their own rational self-interest, and recent portents are hardly encouraging.

If Nasser is not ready to negotiate seriously, if he demands a settlement on his own terms in the canal, in the Straits of Tiran, and in the Gaza Strip, Secretary Dulles' promissory notes will fall due. The United States may then find itself going very publicly into receivership, an unhappy prospect for the world's greatest power.

Copyright New York Herald Tribune Inc.

Nixon's Airplane Forced To Return By Engine Trouble

Tripoli, Libya - (U.P.) - A plane carrying Vice President Richard M. Nixon from Khartoum to Tobruk was forced to return to Khartoum today when trouble developed in one of the engines.

A radio message said the plane returned to Khartoum 90 minutes after takeoff from Khartoum because of "partial failure" of the No. 2 engine.

An announcement said the vice president's brief visit to Tobruk would be cancelled and that Nixon would fly direct to Tripoli after engine repairs are made or a new one is flown in for him.

Second Difficulty It was the second time Nixon's plane had developed engine trouble on his tour of Africa. A new engine was flown into Monrovia, Liberia, from Prestwick, Scotland, when trouble developed.

A second plane carrying American correspondents also was plagued with mechanical difficulties and their flight from Casablanca to Accra, capital of the new Ghana, was delayed.

Nixon had been expected to confer in Tobruk with King Idriiss, ruler of one and a quarter million people of this desert country, before going to Tripoli for a three-day visit.

Plans call for him to fly to Rome Saturday for a week end audience with Pope Pius XII.

former Governor Martin, some 20 years ago, which was approximately as follows:

"They claim I am a foe of organized labor. I am not. I am no more a foe of organized labor than I am of organized capital. I believe organization is needed in both. But I also believe there are inescapable obligations in both fields, and among the first I would place obedience to the law. When labor breaks the law I am against labor, when capital does I am against capital. That is all there is to my so-called anti-labor stand. When labor is in the right I am all for it, when it is wrong I am all against it. The same with organized capital. Big Business, Little Business or what have you. Let them all obey the law, morally and legally, and there will be no quarrel as far as I am concerned."

It is possible that had Governor Martin lived and held office for another term, the "mess" our Portland friend now complains of would never have reached the stage it has. The great hope is there will be a new leadership in the Teamsters union, brought about by the union rank and file themselves, and the job that "Tommy Martin" started will be finished by them.—R.W.R.

From Washington

By Roscoe Drummond

WHERE SOVIET POLICY STANDS Washington—Is any real headway being made toward easing the tensions between the Soviet Union and the West, and, if not, what are the prospects?

That is the over-riding question in Washington. The answers to this question requires an answer to other questions: where does "de-Stalinization" begin and where does it stop? What effect is it having on Soviet policy within its borders, in its policy toward the satellites and toward the free world?

In light of the record since the Khrushchev anti-Stalin speech, in light of the Polish and Hungarian revolution and Soviet maneuvers in the Middle East, U.S. officials have reached pretty firm conclusions as to the shape of Kremlin policy as far ahead as anyone dare foresee. There is nothing on the horizon justifying any optimism. The consensus on the main points is this:

ON INTERNAL DE-STALINIZATION — De-Stalinization was never intended for export. Bear in mind that the text of the Khrushchev speech was not disclosed by the Kremlin, but by the U.S. government. De-Stalinization—which began with the death of Stalin, not with the Khrushchev speech—was designed to reduce the danger of mutual blood-letting at the top of the Soviet hierarchy and to permit a little more initiative, a little more intellectual elbow room to the new Soviet managerial class. Khrushchev began his speech with the assumption of Stalin's "great contributions" to Communism and criticized him only for his "excessive" repressions against the wrong people—that is, against other Communists. De-Stalinization was not intended to go far; it has not gone far but is not being withdrawn. The dictatorship is wholly in control.

ON RELATIONS WITH THE SATELLITES—Khrushchev and Co. misjudged the effect of de-Stalinization on the satellites, especially those with a long history of pre-Communist Russian domination. Today Kremlin policy toward the satellites is as tough, tough and unbending as it ever was under Stalin.

The force and fury of the Polish and Hungarian revolts took the Kremlin by surprise. Poland and Hungary have gone farther in reducing Kremlin control than the Soviets relish and they are determined it won't happen again. The judgment of those closest to the facts is that the Soviets will use massive force against Poland or Hungary or any other satellite which goes beyond these two limits: If it fails to maintain a "Communist system."

If it denounces the Warsaw Pact—which justifies the presence of Soviet troops.

ON THE CONDUCT OF THE COLD WAR — De-Stalinization has little bearing on the methods and goals of Soviet foreign policy. The goals remain the same, the methods, if anything, more venturesome, as in the Middle East.

Moscow's diplomatic objectives are: To liquidate NATO entirely, to see its organization dismantled and American forces drawn back to the shores of the continental United States. To neutralize Germany entirely.

To keep things so stirred up in the Middle East that peace between the Arab nations and Israel will be impossible to attain. Its ultimate end is to cut off Europe's indispensable oil supply which, to Moscow, would be better than taking western Europe by arms.

THERE is no evidence that the Kremlin is open to productive negotiation on a single point. Could there, for example, be a mutual draw-back of East-West forces where they now confront each other in Germany?

The answer here is that the Soviet Union does not dare, in light of the Polish and Hungarian revolutions, withdraw its forces from a single eastern European nation it now occupies, including East Germany. If it did, the "peoples' democracy," Communist-style, would be overthrown and as the leader of international Communism, Moscow cannot sacrifice a Communist regime to popular will. That would start toppling the satellite dominoes.

This means that there can be no unification of Germany on the basis of Bonn's acceptance of the East German Communist government.

On balance the prospect of any useful negotiation with the Kremlin is less promising today than it has been for a long time. (c) New York Herald Tribune Inc.

In the Day's News

By FRANK JENKINS

In our nation's capital this morning the house of representatives starts debate on a resolution asking President Eisenhower for advice as to how his nearly 72 billion dollar budget can be "cut substantially."

What's cooking? WELL, it appears that public demands for economy and tax reduction are reaching the point where something may have to be done about it. The Democrats are alleged to be sponsoring the resolution as a move to take the offensive in an ECONOMIC drive.

The Republicans are attacking it as a buck-passing maneuver designed to take the congress (which the Democrats control) OFF the spot and put the Republican administration ON the spot.

At any rate, it is interesting to learn that the public is beginning to demand more economy in government—which is the only feasible road to lower taxes.

Suppose we do a little analyzing of this proposal on the part of the congress to ASK IKE how to go about cutting the budget that Ike made.

These are the fundamentals: 1. It is the job of the President to suggest to the congress how much he thinks ought to be spent for this and that.

2. It is the job of congress to appropriate the amount of money the President asks or to REFUSE TO APPROPRIATE IT.

THAT is to say: Under our system of government, the congress holds the purse strings.

If the congress thinks the President is somewhat extravagant in his spending ideas, it is the DUTY of the congress to refuse to appropriate as much money as he asks.

That is about the size of it. LET'S take another look at this proposal on the part of the congress to go to the President and ask his advice as to how the congress can go about CUTTING the budget the President has proposed.

If the congress was doing it out of deep affection for the President—

If it loved him, and was genuinely concerned with saving him from the consequences of spending too much—

This proposal to talk things over with him with the idea of bringing about a reduction in spending would be a WONDERFUL thing. It would be a shining example of the way things OUGHT to be done.

BUT everyone with an ounce of political savvy knows that isn't the situation. The purpose of the Democratically controlled house of representatives is to make it appear that the Democratic congress is saving the country from the reckless extravagance of a Republican President.

That's the politics of it.

Seismograph Notes 'Major' Earthquake

Pasadena, Calif. - (U.P.) - An earthquake with a magnitude of over 7 was recorded at 6:45.04 a.m. (PST) today on seismographs at the California Institute of Technology.

Dr. Charles Richter said that with limited information it appears the new tremor is in the general vicinity of the Aleutian Islands where a quake with a magnitude of 8 was recorded last Saturday.

WHAT IS INCLUDED IN FUNERAL EXPENSE? When you call on a funeral director for his services in time of need, he makes available to you up to 88 different items of "services rendered", each of them affecting your comfort and peace of mind. At the Chapel Mortuary all of these services are included in whichever price funeral service YOU select... whether it is the minimum or the more elaborate. DAY OR NIGHT - PHONE 2-8030 Chapel Mortuary Across from the Courthouse Frank Morgan - Harold Snodgrass FUNERAL DIRECTORS