

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 2-6141

ROBERT W. RUIHL, Editor

HERB GREY, Advertising Manager

GERALD LATHAM, Business Manager

ERIC ALLEN, Jr., Managing Editor

KARI 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 months \$4.25

Sunday Only—One year \$4.25

By Carrier—In Advance—Medford

Ashland Central Point Eagle Point

Jacksonville Gold Hill Phoenix

Shady Cove Rose 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

Portland San Francisco Los Angeles

Vancouver Seattle St. Louis Atlanta

San Francisco B.C.

NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION

AFFILIATE MEMBER

NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION

1957

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

March 26, 1947 (Wednesday)

Otto Ewaldsen of Medford

Toastmasters club wins southern

Oregon district speaking contest

at Klamath Falls.

From Arthur Perry's Ye

Smudge Pot column: Food prices

during February increased 0.8

per cent. This is like finding a

haystack with a needle in it.

20 YEARS AGO

March 26, 1937 (Friday)

Carl Y. Tengwald elected

president of the Medford Realty

board.

The new 4-cent stamps of the

army's series go on sale at the

Medford post office and sub-

station.

30 YEARS AGO

March 26, 1927 (Saturday)

The Salvation Army of Med-

ford is putting on its annual self-

denial appeal.

Recent chilly weather proves

beneficial to pear industry here,

it is reported.

40 YEARS AGO

March 26, 1917 (Monday)

Patriotic moving pictures in

support of Red Cross and army

and navy are on the program at

the Page theater today.

Hardy W. Campbell, soil spe-

cialist with Southern Pacific

company, lectures at armory.

What's Your I.Q.?

Nine or ten correct is superior; seven

or eight is excellent; five or

six is good.

1. The modern Tel al Muquay-

yar is held to be the site of the

How About a One-Party Press?

This is a strange time for the Republicans to deny that Oregon has a one-party press.

In the first place the election is over and there won't be another for nearly two years.

So there would seem to be no excuse for playing the ostrich act from a party standpoint.

More important it was so clearly demonstrated five months ago that except below the Mason and Dixon line, Oregon is journalistically the most 100 per cent partisan commonwealth in the nation.

THERE were only two newspapers in the entire state for example, that last year supported Wayne Morse for the U. S. Senate. There were not many more who supported Bob Holmes for Governor.

Moreover the metropolitan press in the state, went all-out for the Republican ticket right down the line as has been the case now for several years.

Our guess is there are more Republican dailies south of the Mason and Dixon line than there are Democratic papers, above it.

So why deny what is so apparent?

Yet one of our up-state contemporaries hopes to hear no more of that "phony Democratic charge" that Oregon is a one-party state. For proof it cites the recent election returns, which added up to a Democratic "sweep."

That is true—the "sweep" we mean.

BUT not due to any newspaper support, but in spite of newspaper opposition. The claim made in this department, moreover, was not that there were no Democrats in Oregon,—they at present have a registered majority—but that there were practically speaking no Democratic newspapers. And there aren't.

AS BEFORE remarked this is a one-party state from a newspaper standpoint. And in view of the facts it is surprising that any newspaper, regardless of party would dispute it.

THIS FACT was brought into sharp relief recently, when the Dominican Republic "incident" came up in the U.S. Congress.

The only member of the congress to take any note of this miscarriage of justice and demonstration of the murderous tyranny that exists in this southern dictatorship was the newly elected Democratic congressman from Oregon, Charles O. Porter.

He insisted that the state department register a vigorous protest and insist upon an investigation of the strange disappearance of one of his constituents in Eugene, Oregon,—Aviator Gerald Murphy.

As remarked in this column at the time it was a statesmanlike and courageous action to take. But did Congressman Porter receive any praise in the Republican press of his home state?

Not a word! The Republican papers in Oregon as a whole, either followed the lead of the Republicans in the Congress, and condemned Mr. Porter for his impetuous and ill-considered action, or completely ignored it.

THAT the stand taken by Congressman Porter WAS both praiseworthy and newsworthy from any non-partisan standpoint was quickly attested by editorial comment made by the New York Times, one of the few genuinely "independent" newspapers in the country and a very great one.

Here is a brief extract from the Times editorial regarding Porter, quote:

It certainly looks as if credit for the State Department's move must go to Representative Charles O. Porter of Oregon, who spoke up boldly and well in the House for his constituents, the parents of Gerald Murphy. On that day no Congressman came to Mr. Porter's support. On the contrary, he was abused in unworthy fashion. His justification has now come.

It is to be hoped that the State Department will insist on a satisfactory answer from the Dominican Republic and its dictator, Generalissimo Trujillo.

Thanks to Congressman Porter's prompt and courageous action the Dominican Republic while characteristically, refusing to date to make any explanation or investigation has promised the parents of Aviator Murphy an indemnity payment of \$50,000.

Small recompense for the loss of a son, presumably murdered in cold-blood, but better than nothing, and but for Oregon's Congressman from the Fourth District there would have been just that—NOTHING!

IT IS perhaps excusable to wonder, what action would have been taken by the Oregon GOP press if instead of Congressman Porter, Democrat, a good Republican like Congressman Norblad, or former Congressman Ellsworth had taken similar action? It is not difficult to guess . . . !!!

AS indicated above the matter is not of any great importance particularly in the dead political calm "between-elections."

But this Porter incident does emphasize how overwhelmingly Republican the press of Oregon is and for so many recent years has been, and what a handicap any office-holder bearing the Democratic label suffers, as far as a fair break in newspaper support is concerned, not only during but between elections.

The one bright spot in the prejudicial and partisan picture is the fact that has been so often demonstrated, particularly in the last national election, namely—that while newspaper support is a helpful factor to a candidate, it is not, when the voters become really aroused, a determining one.—R.W.R.

Bermuda Conference Assists Amity; Difficulties Remain

By CHARLES M. McCANN, United Press Correspondent

The Bermuda conference undoubtedly has strengthened the alliance between the United States and Great Britain.

President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Harold Macmillan met as old friends. Reports of the conference reflected an atmosphere of cordiality. The two leaders announced agreement on a number of big issues.

But it is likely that Britain under Macmillan's leadership will show a considerable degree of independence in its relations with the United States. The breach in the alliance which resulted from the British-French invasion of the Suez Canal Zone was a serious one.

Breach Influenced Eden It certainly had a great deal to do with the resignation of Sir Anthony Eden. Eden pleaded ill health when he stepped down. He really is in bad health. But his condition was aggravated by strain.

Eden's resignation, and Macmillan's succession to the prime ministry, constituted an important turning point in British politics.

Eden had succeeded Sir Winston Churchill after having been his political heir for many years. He carried on where Churchill left off.

But Macmillan's succession to the prime ministry last Jan. 10 marked a distinct break in the continuity of British policy toward the United States.

Resentment is still strong in Britain over the attitude President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles took toward the Suez invasion.

Aimed at Ike, Dulles There seems to be feeling among many Britons that the President and Dulles went out of their way to humiliate Eden, aside from the fact that they made no attempt to conceal their anger over the British-French action.

Britons seem to feel also that for a long time their country had acted as a sort of junior partner in the Anglo-American alliance.

The immediate effect of the Suez dispute was to take Britain closer to France. Another was to weaken the reluctance of Britain to tie its economy more closely to continental Europe.

It will be necessary for Macmillan to make sure that nothing he does can be criticized either inside his own Conservative Party or outside of it, as permitting Britain to be a tail

dragged along by an American political kite.

The Bermuda conference issued after the Eisenhower-Macmillan talks spoke of agreements on Middle Eastern policy. But there remains wide divergence on some aspects of it.

Britain still feels that the right course in the Suez dispute is to get tough with President Gamal Abdel Nasser of Egypt. It would be surprising if Macmillan did not feel that the United States let Britain down on that issue.

It is unlikely that President Eisenhower approves of Macmillan's determination to reduce the strength of British forces assigned to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as an economy measure.

Events in the next few months probably will show though the Anglo-American alliance has been strengthened it has not been restored fully.

The immediate effect of the Suez dispute was to take Britain closer to France. Another was to weaken the reluctance of Britain to tie its economy more closely to continental Europe.

It will be necessary for Macmillan to make sure that nothing he does can be criticized either inside his own Conservative Party or outside of it, as permitting Britain to be a tail

dragged along by an American political kite.

The Bermuda conference issued after the Eisenhower-Macmillan talks spoke of agreements on Middle Eastern policy. But there remains wide divergence on some aspects of it.

Britain still feels that the right course in the Suez dispute is to get tough with President Gamal Abdel Nasser of Egypt. It would be surprising if Macmillan did not feel that the United States let Britain down on that issue.

It is unlikely that President Eisenhower approves of Macmillan's determination to reduce the strength of British forces assigned to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as an economy measure.

Events in the next few months probably will show though the Anglo-American alliance has been strengthened it has not been restored fully.

The immediate effect of the Suez dispute was to take Britain closer to France. Another was to weaken the reluctance of Britain to tie its economy more closely to continental Europe.

It will be necessary for Macmillan to make sure that nothing he does can be criticized either inside his own Conservative Party or outside of it, as permitting Britain to be a tail

Cost-Price Squeeze May Check Production At Costly Properties

Boston — (U.P.) — The recent sharp decline in copper prices has made an important segment of the nation's copper production uneconomical, a top industry spokesman said today.

Roy H. Glover, chairman of the Anaconda Co., warned that the present cost-price squeeze may result in drying up production at high cost properties.

Copper prices have tumbled from 46 cents to around 32 cents a pound over the past year.

Glover told the Boston Security Analysts Society that a recent analysis of 1956 production showed that 150,965 tons, or 13.9 per cent of domestic production, cost 30 cents a pound or more to produce.

He said 245,484 tons, or 22.6 per cent of last year's output, had costs of 28 cents a pound or more and 359,451 tons, or 33.1 per cent, had costs of 25 cents per pound and higher.

"The production with costs at 29 cents per pound and higher and representing 22.6 per cent of our domestic production is indispensable to our economy," he said.

"Nevertheless, on the basis of present prices there is not a sufficient margin of profit in this production to justify mining risks. Unless we head into a period of greatly slackened industrial activity, the inevitable result of the relationship between present costs and prices will be to dry up production at the high cost properties until there is again a period of scarcity with the resulting increased prices."

Substantial Period Required He warned that copper production cannot be turned on and off like a water faucet. He said once production is suspended "it requires a substantial period of time to bring it back."

The Anaconda chairman attributed the decline in copper prices over the past year principally to inventory reduction by customers.

Glover said consumers have looked to their inventories for approximately 25 per cent of their monthly requirements since last September. He said it now appears that "in many places inventories are becoming dangerously low."

In the Day's News

By FRANK JENKINS

In the last few days, we've been hearing quite a lot about the Richter scale for measuring the forces of earthquakes. On the theory that it's always interesting to know more about something that everybody is talking about, let's take a closer look at this Richter thing while earthquakes are still hot news.

BASICALLY, the Richter scale is a jigger for measuring just how bad an earthquake has been. To that extent, it is something like a recording thermometer, which tells us just how hot it was yesterday—or how cold.

After we've been through a terrifically hot day, or a frightfully cold one, we like to know just how uncomfortable we were—and how near we came to dying of heat prostration or freezing to death.

It's much the same with earthquakes. After people have been through them they like to know how close a call they had.

THE Richter scale is MUCH more complicated than a thermometer. It operates on a logarithmic basis. It starts with one and goes up from there. A reading of three is ten times as strong as two and 100 times as strong as one. Four is ten times as strong as three. And so on.

I hope you understand all this. Frankly, I don't. It's beyond my mathematical horizon. But it's what Dr. Charles Richter says, and he's the man who invented the thing. He's one of the greatest living experts on upheavals of the earth's crust, which is what earthquakes amount to.

Informally, the figure 10 is used as the top, but that is just a stake to sight on. Theoretically, quakes with a magnitude of 100 could be recorded on the Richter scale. The point is that there haven't been any that bad since man started recording them. So 10 is high enough for the purposes of the scale.

THAT raises a question: How bad was this latest San Francisco quake? It was reasonably rugged. The worst tremor, the one that came just before noon, was measured at 5.5. The one that came early Saturday morning registered 4.25. The 1906 quake, which started the disastrous fire, was 8.25 in intensity. The most powerful quakes ever recorded ANYWHERE have been about 8.6, according to Dr. Perry Byerly, University of California seismologist.

SO, YOU see, it was quite a shake. People down in the city were justified in being scared half out of their boots. But were they?

You can draw your own conclusions from this incident that has just been reported on the teletype.

FRIDAY'S severe earthquake in San Francisco caught Gene Hoffman (of the American President Lines) dictating in his office. He was in mid-stride of an important sentence when the big one came. He was thrown in to his secretary's lap and then rolled onto the floor.

Just then the telephone rang. Somebody wanted to talk to him. He heard his secretary say: "Will you talk a little louder, please? We are having an earthquake and the line is a little fuzzy." Then she added: "Oh, yes. Will you wait a minute, please, until Mr. Hoffman gets up off the floor?"

He got up off the floor and answered the call, and that was that.

THE Top 'o' the Mark, as you must have read in the papers, swayed like a bird's nest in a tall tree, but only two people left the room. The rest stayed and had another one and talked the situation over.

WHY this casual insouciance? It must have been because people have confidence in modern "earthquake-proof" construction. Their confidence seems to have been justified. No buildings were shaken down.

Modern progress REALLY IS PROGRESS. It saved San Francisco from another disaster.

Matter of Fact

By Stewart Alsop

NASSER AND BERMUHA

Washington—President Eisenhower and British Prime Minister Macmillan no doubt accomplished many useful things in Bermuda. But as far as their central problem in the Middle East is concerned, they came face to face with a stubborn fact, which has been summed up in the sady facetious remarks of a British diplomat and an American official.

The British diplomat: "The only thing Nasser really has to worry about is that maybe we shan't remember him in our prayers." The American official: "There's no short hair growing around the Suez Canal."

The great powers of the West, in other words, are left without truly effective means of threatening or rewarding Egypt's President Gamal Abdel Nasser, and thus without effective bargaining power.

The use of direct force—the last resort—was ruled out when the British and French invaded Suez and the United States pressed them to withdraw with no commitments whatsoever from Nasser. Any worry on Nasser's part that the United States might ultimately resort to force was dissolved when the President said that the United States had no intention of "shooting its way through the Suez Canal."

NASSER, to be sure, might fear that the Western powers may cause the United Nations forces in Gaza to be withdrawn, and thereafter in effect give the Israelis a green light to attack again. But an incident which occurred while the Bermuda conference was in progress should also reassure him on this point.

Information reached Washington, just after Secretary of State John Foster Dulles had left for Bermuda, that French Defense Minister Bourges-Manouary had encouraged Israeli Foreign Minister Golda Meir to believe that French support would be forthcoming in case of a second round. On instructions from Dulles and the President, Under Secretary of State Christian Herter called in French Ambassador Herve Alphand and politely read him the riot act. Since then, the French have hastily backed away from Bourges-Manouary's offer, amidst a spate of diplomatic denials.

Before the Bermuda conference, the British were toying rather half-heartedly with the idea of reverting to a boycott of the canal and other measures short of force, as proposed by Dulles before the invasion. But the idea has now in effect been dropped as impractical. A poll of the major shipping nations has indicated that none of them—except possibly Denmark, and conspicuously not including the United States—would join the British in a boycott.

In these circumstances, it is hardly surprising that Nasser should be tempted to go for broke—to demand total control of the Suez Canal traffic on his own terms. If Nasser demands, and gets, total control of the canal he will have won the ball game. After all, the British joined the Israelis and the French in attacking Egypt just because the prospect of control of the canal line by the intensely hostile Nasser seemed to them intolerable.

THE canal will be open on April 10 or thereabouts. The moment thereafter when a British ship arrives at the canal may be a historic moment. For if there has been no prior agreed settlement, and the British ship pays its canal tolls, cash on the barrelhead, on Nasser's terms, Nasser will have won his ball game.

Matter of Fact

By Stewart Alsop

NASSER AND BERMUHA

Washington—President Eisenhower and British Prime Minister Macmillan no doubt accomplished many useful things in Bermuda. But as far as their central problem in the Middle East is concerned, they came face to face with a stubborn fact, which has been summed up in the sady facetious remarks of a British diplomat and an American official.

The British diplomat: "The only thing Nasser really has to worry about is that maybe we shan't remember him in our prayers." The American official: "There's no short hair growing around the Suez Canal."

The great powers of the West, in other words, are left without truly effective means of threatening or rewarding Egypt's President Gamal Abdel Nasser, and thus without effective bargaining power.

The use of direct force—the last resort—was ruled out when the British and French invaded Suez and the United States pressed them to withdraw with no commitments whatsoever from Nasser. Any worry on Nasser's part that the United States might ultimately resort to force was dissolved when the President said that the United States had no intention of "shooting its way through the Suez Canal."

NASSER, to be sure, might fear that the Western powers may cause the United Nations forces in Gaza to be withdrawn, and thereafter in effect give the Israelis a green light to attack again. But an incident which occurred while the Bermuda conference was in progress should also reassure him on this point.

Information reached Washington, just after Secretary of State John Foster Dulles had left for Bermuda, that French Defense Minister Bourges-Manouary had encouraged Israeli Foreign Minister Golda Meir to believe that French support would be forthcoming in case of a second round. On instructions from Dulles and the President, Under Secretary of State Christian Herter called in French Ambassador Herve Alphand and politely read him the riot act. Since then, the French have hastily backed away from Bourges-Manouary's offer, amidst a spate of diplomatic denials.

Before the Bermuda conference, the British were toying rather half-heartedly with the idea of reverting to a boycott of the canal and other measures short of force, as proposed by Dulles before the invasion. But the idea has now in effect been dropped as impractical. A poll of the major shipping nations has indicated that none of them—except possibly Denmark, and conspicuously not including the United States—would join the British in a boycott.

In these circumstances, it is hardly surprising that Nasser should be tempted to go for broke—to demand total control of the Suez Canal traffic on his own terms. If Nasser demands, and gets, total control of the canal he will have won the ball game. After all, the British joined the Israelis and the French in attacking Egypt just because the prospect of control of the canal line by the intensely hostile Nasser seemed to them intolerable.

THE canal will be open on April 10 or thereabouts. The moment thereafter when a British ship arrives at the canal may be a historic moment. For if there has been no prior agreed settlement, and the British ship pays its canal tolls, cash on the barrelhead, on Nasser's terms, Nasser will have won his ball game.

From Washington

By Roscoe Drummond

RESOLVING PRESIDENTIAL DISABILITY

Washington—President Eisenhower intends to present to Congress a detailed plan for a statute and, probably, a Constitutional amendment on Presidential disability.

Mr. Eisenhower's proposal will go to the Capitol at this session unless it appears that it would hold up urgent legislation.

It shouldn't have that effect. The President's concern is not to press for hasty action, but, rather, to give Congress and the country all the time needed to examine, debate and determine what should be done.

The reason something needs to be done comes from this sentence in the Constitution: "In case of . . . the President's inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said office, the same shall devolve upon the Vice President."

These two provisions would admittedly not meet all emergencies but they would meet most of them.

The great gain would be that it would make certain that a Vice President could not seize the "office" of President even while temporarily discharging its powers. This would reduce, perhaps entirely overcome, the disinclination of a disabled President to free himself of his duties lest he never get them back.

This is no theoretical problem. After being seriously wounded by an assassin, President Garfield was unable to perform his duties for 2½ months, but his staff was unwilling to allow him to delegate them to Vice President Arthur for fear the latter would