

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE

Published Daily except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO. 33 North First St., Ph. 8-1541

Subscription Rates: By Mail - In Advance, Copy 100 Daily and Sunday - 1 year \$15.00

Official Paper of City of Medford, Official Paper of Jackson County, United Press International

Member of Audit Bureau of Circulation, Newspaper 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: Feb. 10, 1951 (Saturday) Costly government requirements for the pay, care and feeding of imported farm labor may result in one of the most acute farm labor shortages in years in the Rogue valley, according to the Jackson County Fruitgrowers' league.

20 YEARS AGO: Feb. 10, 1941 (Monday) The Works Projects Administration today issued a call for bids for the paving of the main and cross runways at Medford's municipal airport.

30 YEARS AGO: Feb. 10, 1931 (Tuesday) The confessed slayer of an Ashland city policeman has been sentenced to hang in the state prison next April 3.

40 YEARS AGO: Feb. 10, 1921 (Thursday) A bill to raise the pay of Jackson county officials has passed in the state legislature.

50 YEARS AGO: Feb. 10, 1911 (Friday) Governor Oswald West said today he will veto a bill permitting net fishing in the Rogue river; the bill, passed last week, overrides a people's initiative measure to close the Rogue to commercial fishing.

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

1. In the Bible, is a "Sabbath day's journey" a long or short journey?

2. During W W II where was the Pacific Fleet Headquarters?

3. On Centigrade thermometers, what is the boiling point of water?

4. Correct the following sentence, "He cannot go without he gets permission."

5. Is the carotid artery in the arm, neck or thigh?

6. Saccharin is a coal-tar product; true or false?

7. The League of Nations had its headquarters in which city in Switzerland?

8. Which State is called "Seward's Icebox"?

9. Name the Baltimore lawyer who was inspired to write our National Anthem, while detained aboard a British ship near Ft. Mifflin.

10. Cleopatra was born before or after Christ?

Answers: 1. A very short journey. 2. Pearl Harbor. 3. 100 degrees. 4. "He cannot go unless he gets permission."

5. Neck. 6. True. 7. Geneva. 8. Alaska. 9. Francis Scott Key. 10. Before (63 B.C.)

How About It?

We haven't taken sides, editorially, in the pro and con discussions concerning a proposed multi-purpose stadium, which would be located at the fairgrounds as part of an eventual activity center which ultimately would include an auditorium.

We haven't taken sides simply because we don't know whether or not the idea is feasible. To find out, to get a good idea of whether it would be used, and to determine whether the expenditure of public money would be justified, will take considerable time and effort.

IT'S easy to say, "If the promoters want it so badly, let them build it themselves."

But as Sports Editor Dick Jewett pointed out yesterday, there are other things involved than just the question of whether it would pay for itself or not.

The new extension service offices at the fairgrounds, for instance, will not "pay for themselves," but the county court is willing to pay an estimated \$135,000 to build them.

"Entertainment, cultural and community spirit, enthusiasm and pride values" are listed by Jewett as some of the intangibles that can't be measured in dollars and cents.

WE DO not blame the county court for believing that only a vote of the people should decide whether or not a stadium should be built (although no vote of the people was needed for the extension buildings, which are for a far more restricted purpose, and which will cost almost as much as the "basic" stadium plan).

But we do rather blame them for saying, in effect, "This whole job is up to somebody else. A lot of study is needed. But we won't even advance funds to make a study possible."

Those who have proposed the stadium have done so simply because they think it would be a good thing for the community to have, not because they have anything to gain personally. And they can no longer afford the costs of continuing an investigation.

Thus the court's decision virtually closes the door on any possibility of a stadium being built.

AT THE same time, it has been proposed that the need for an auditorium in this community is greater than the need for a stadium.

This may well be true. Certainly, as Olive Starcher declared in her column a few weeks ago, there isn't any really good place in Medford now for concerts, plays, and so on, except the privately-owned theaters.

(One suggestion making the rounds last year was that the city buy the Craterian theater, and remake it into a civic building, with a variety of accommodations for a variety of attractions. But nothing ever came of it.)

WITH all this talk of "the need" for this and that, we still don't know what we need, except insofar as each individual has his own idea.

Why wouldn't it be a good idea for the city and county planning commissions to set up a joint sub-committee to explore the various ideas, their feasibility, the degree of support which might be expected, methods of financing, the experience with such facilities in other communities of like size, population projections, and so on, and then make public their report?

A city-county civic center, including ample parking, a multi-purpose stadium, a civic auditorium, and perhaps even other facilities, sounds good, but up to now it has had a sort of dream-like aspect.

A definitive study could crystallize a lot of thinking, change claims into documented facts, and provide a basis for realistic appraisal, rather than the rather ill-tempered discussions we have heard up to this point.

Then, with something definite to go on, the people could decide.

How about it?—E. A.

No Money

The stadium-auditorium discussion here has had its counterpart at the University of Oregon in Eugene, where recently-announced plans for a stadium have had much the same sort of repercussions they have had here.

Need, feasibility, cost, relative advantages—all of these are being debated there, sometimes heatedly.

The only trouble, of course, is the same old one. No money.—E. A.

Art and Utility

The reactions to Sculptor Charles Forrester's model for a new war memorial-play structure sound a little bit like some of the reactions to the proposed Franklin D. Roosevelt memorial in Washington, D. C.

The FDR proposal consisted of a number of irregularly placed slabs, and won from the Washington Post the dubious title of "Instant Stonehenge."

Whether or not one likes a particular work of art is an entirely individual affair. But the idea of incorporating both attractive, imaginative and abstract design and the utility of play apparatus in the same thing has strong appeal.

We commend the parks and recreation commission, the donor organizations, and Sculptor Forrester for their part in this forward-looking project.—E. A.

Dennis the Menace



"PEACHES ARE BIG, SEE? BUT APERECOTS ARE LITTLE, SEE? SO ALWAYS ASK FOR PEACHES!"

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 initial for publication is permissible.

The Weight-Mile Tax: To the Editor: Your recent editorial regarding the PUC weight-mile fees needs answering. If only to clear up some popular misconceptions regarding this tax.

Tax on Cigarettes?: To the Editor: While I have no way of knowing whether you are a tobacco user, my husband and I both smoke cigarettes, as do most of our friends.

Secrecy and Weapons: To the Editor: I, for one, object to secrecy on the part of public officials, whether city, county, state or federal.

Pear Tree Exemption: To the Editor: For several years our county assessor has conducted a campaign to rectify what he considers an injustice in the tax laws, the exemption of fruit trees in the property tax field.

On Shortening Letters: To the Editor: You edited the very heart out of my letter. I am ashamed of you. I would rather you hadn't printed it at all than leave out any except possibly the names of Jesus.

Art and Utility: The reactions to Sculptor Charles Forrester's model for a new war memorial-play structure sound a little bit like some of the reactions to the proposed Franklin D. Roosevelt memorial in Washington, D. C.

No Money: The stadium-auditorium discussion here has had its counterpart at the University of Oregon in Eugene, where recently-announced plans for a stadium have had much the same sort of repercussions they have had here.

How About It?: We haven't taken sides, editorially, in the pro and con discussions concerning a proposed multi-purpose stadium, which would be located at the fairgrounds as part of an eventual activity center which ultimately would include an auditorium.

Equity To States in Taxation Levels Discussed by Wilson: Washington—UPI—The most easily remembered and likely the most quickly forgotten line in President Kennedy's inaugural address was this: "Fellow Americans, ask not what your country will do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

President Cleveland expressed the same idea many years before President Kennedy was born. Cleveland told the voters that it was not for government to support the people but for people to support the government.

The most striking acceleration in federal spending since Korea (1951-53) has been in benefits considered as governmental services flowing to the public under the functions of commerce, housing and space, agriculture, labor and welfare, natural resources and veterans' services and benefits.

Since fiscal year 1954, budget outlays for benefits have climbed 78 per cent, twice as fast as the gross national product. Over these years, benefits have expanded from 17 per cent of the total budget to 28 per cent at present.

The New Jersey Taxpayers Association comes up with some figures related to the foregoing but more specifically intended to answer two questions about federal aid to state and local governments.

There are 14 others among those classified by the association as "aiding" states. Delaware, for example, pays \$2.99 in federal taxes for each \$1 of federal aid received.

The association reports that New Jersey taxpayers put up \$2.47 in federal taxes for every \$1 returned in federal aid, a loss of \$1.47 on each dollar's worth of assistance.

There are 14 others among those classified by the association as "aiding" states. Delaware, for example, pays \$2.99 in federal taxes for each \$1 of federal aid received.

The association reports that New Jersey taxpayers put up \$2.47 in federal taxes for every \$1 returned in federal aid, a loss of \$1.47 on each dollar's worth of assistance.

There are 14 others among those classified by the association as "aiding" states. Delaware, for example, pays \$2.99 in federal taxes for each \$1 of federal aid received.

The association reports that New Jersey taxpayers put up \$2.47 in federal taxes for every \$1 returned in federal aid, a loss of \$1.47 on each dollar's worth of assistance.

There are 14 others among those classified by the association as "aiding" states. Delaware, for example, pays \$2.99 in federal taxes for each \$1 of federal aid received.

The association reports that New Jersey taxpayers put up \$2.47 in federal taxes for every \$1 returned in federal aid, a loss of \$1.47 on each dollar's worth of assistance.

There are 14 others among those classified by the association as "aiding" states. Delaware, for example, pays \$2.99 in federal taxes for each \$1 of federal aid received.

The association reports that New Jersey taxpayers put up \$2.47 in federal taxes for every \$1 returned in federal aid, a loss of \$1.47 on each dollar's worth of assistance.

There are 14 others among those classified by the association as "aiding" states. Delaware, for example, pays \$2.99 in federal taxes for each \$1 of federal aid received.

The association reports that New Jersey taxpayers put up \$2.47 in federal taxes for every \$1 returned in federal aid, a loss of \$1.47 on each dollar's worth of assistance.

There are 14 others among those classified by the association as "aiding" states. Delaware, for example, pays \$2.99 in federal taxes for each \$1 of federal aid received.

The association reports that New Jersey taxpayers put up \$2.47 in federal taxes for every \$1 returned in federal aid, a loss of \$1.47 on each dollar's worth of assistance.

There are 14 others among those classified by the association as "aiding" states. Delaware, for example, pays \$2.99 in federal taxes for each \$1 of federal aid received.

Washington Report

By William S. White

DEMOCRATIC SPLITS: Washington—The political situation in the country's most politically powerful states, New York and California, is deeply worrying the Democrats, just returned to national power though they are.

The source of anxiety lies in the presence in both states, in large and righteous numbers, of the good, good, good Democrat. This is a fellow so terribly "liberal" and infallibly right on every question that it hurts-hurts all others, that is.

President Kennedy himself is trying to stay out of what in each state is a prolonged hissing match set off by the good, good, good Democrats against nearly all other Democrats who happen to be in elected office or in positions of party leadership.

It seems clear, however, that he must shortly dip into these rancorous pools with a brisk exercise of his own authority. If he doesn't, the loss of one or both states to the Republicans in 1962—and maybe even in 1964, when he seeks a second term—is most plainly probable.

FOR in both the Democrats are showing a bickering ineffectuality. The public gets the impression they are hardly competent to carry on any enterprise beyond clashing at each other and shouting shrill and weird epithets.

Frustration is the word for the national Democratic politicians as they gaze sadly at what ought to be two great state strong points and are instead both wide open to Republican capture.

California, where Democrats vastly outnumber Republicans, nevertheless went last November to G.O.P. Presidential candidate Richard M. Nixon. True, New York was carried by Mr. Kennedy, but the future is dark for the Democrats there, too.

Republican Gov. Nelson Rockefeller seems practically certain of re-election next year. The Democratic mayor of New York City, Robert Wagner, goes for re-election this fall as the alleged head of an alleged Democratic party which is really in broken fragments.

In California, Gov. Edmund (Pat) Brown, also up for re-election next year, is in the same fix. There, according to sound private estimates among Democrats themselves, Brown can hardly hope to survive if Nixon challenges him.

WHY all this, in both New York and California? Answer: These two presumably sophisticated states have developed a back-biting campaign by the good, good, good Democrats which must be heard to be believed.

In New York, "reformers" headed by former Sen. Herbert Lehman and Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt endlessly denounce the ablest professional leader their party has, Tammany Leader Carmine DeSapio. In their eyes, DeSapio's crimes are manifold. The outsider has some trouble to determine what they are—except for the capital crime of disagreeing with the "reformers."

If in New York there are now several Democratic parties, in California there are several more. Governor Brown, if not the ablest man ever to breathe the California air, did reclaim the state for the Democrats in 1959. But other Democrats gave him far more trouble than did the Republicans.

THEY are still giving it to him. To hear what is really wrong with Brown, you need only meet one of the good, good, good California Democrats. These fellows, as in New York, are in the happy position of having no responsibility. So, their situation permits them to operate what they would call a hit-and-run politics; that is, it were being practiced by conservatives.

All men having some human feeling should have a bit of sympathy for the poor chaps who have had the misfortune to have some real power and responsibility in both states.

President Kennedy himself—though not yet taking sides—is bound to feel some sympathy himself. For there was a time when the good, good, good Liberals, especially in New York, did not well love John F. Kennedy himself.

(Copyright, 1961, by United Feature Syndicate, Inc.)

to a string of Republican successes on the Atlantic coast, the Democratic problem in 1964 can become fairly formidable. In these quite likely circumstances, in fact, the Democrats can only hope for salvation by one man, President Kennedy.

(c) 1961 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

Imagine a straight Republican victory in the Mayoralty race. Yet if Wagner is successfully re-elected in the end, the New York City vipers will still be rising, hissing, and striking at one another all over the place.

Thus both Governor Rockefeller and his ally, Sen. Jacob Javits, can reasonably count on winning new terms with generous state-wide majorities, sweetened by impressively good showings in New York City.

This is just the kind of result that Governor Rockefeller needs, of course, in order to achieve a more commanding position at the Republican convention in 1964. But this Rockefeller-Republican story by no means ends at the borders of New York state.

IN NEW JERSEY, particularly Sen. Clifford Case and most of the other Republican members of the state's Congressional delegation have got together to back former Secretary of Labor James Mitchell for the Governorship. And here again there is no obviously saleable Democratic candidate, since Rep. Frank Thompson Jr. has decided not to seek the place now held by the fading Democratic Gov. Robert Meyner.

If the liberal-minded Mitchell is nominated and elected, it will be another gain for the Rockefeller brand of Republicanism. Mitchell is not only close to Rockefeller in viewpoint. He is also on bad terms, since the last Presidential election, with former Vice President Richard M. Nixon; and he is one of the pet targets of the Barry Goldwater Republicans. The question really is whether Mitchell can win nomination against the Bergen County leader, State Sen. Walter Jones, who has powerful support from the local New Jersey organizations.

In Connecticut, again, the removal from the scene of former Gov. Abraham Ribicoff gives the Republicans a greatly improved chance to recapture the State Capitol. In Massachusetts, they already hold the Capitol, since John A. Volpe won the Governorship despite the Kennedy tide. And they have a chance to pick up the Massachusetts Democratic Senate seat now held on an interim basis by President Kennedy's old friend, Benjamin A. Smith Jr.

IN THE vote-heavy industrial Northeast, in short, the Republican prospects for the immediate future are very good indeed, providing the other state parties can only imitate the New York state Republicans' defiance of the iron law of Republicanism. This is the law that the Republican candidates most likely to be appealing to the voters are also the candidates most likely to repel and alarm the party fat cats.

If Rockefeller wins as easily as now seems likely, and the iron law is successfully overcome in two or three of the other states in this corner of the U.S., the national Republican outlook will be unavoidably and quite sharply affected. This is the reason, of course, why former Vice President Nixon is already moving away from his earlier plan to remain far above the battle for a while. Nixon's alternative is to run for the Governorship of California in 1962 against the hapless Pat Brown.

Nixon will need a local victory, in order to balance the effect of victories by Rockefeller and other men of his stripe in this part of the country. And if Nixon adds a Republican success in California

to a string of Republican successes on the Atlantic coast, the Democratic problem in 1964 can become fairly formidable. In these quite likely circumstances, in fact, the Democrats can only hope for salvation by one man, President Kennedy.

(c) 1961 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

Imagine a straight Republican victory in the Mayoralty race. Yet if Wagner is successfully re-elected in the end, the New York City vipers will still be rising, hissing, and striking at one another all over the place.

Thus both Governor Rockefeller and his ally, Sen. Jacob Javits, can reasonably count on winning new terms with generous state-wide majorities, sweetened by impressively good showings in New York City.

This is just the kind of result that Governor Rockefeller needs, of course, in order to achieve a more commanding position at the Republican convention in 1964. But this Rockefeller-Republican story by no means ends at the borders of New York state.

IN NEW JERSEY, particularly Sen. Clifford Case and most of the other Republican members of the state's Congressional delegation have got together to back former Secretary of Labor James Mitchell for the Governorship. And here again there is no obviously saleable Democratic candidate, since Rep. Frank Thompson Jr. has decided not to seek the place now held by the fading Democratic Gov. Robert Meyner.

If the liberal-minded Mitchell is nominated and elected, it will be another gain for the Rockefeller brand of Republicanism. Mitchell is not only close to Rockefeller in viewpoint. He is also on bad terms, since the last Presidential election, with former Vice President Richard M. Nixon; and he is one of the pet targets of the Barry Goldwater Republicans. The question really is whether Mitchell can win nomination against the Bergen County leader, State Sen. Walter Jones, who has powerful support from the local New Jersey organizations.

In Connecticut, again, the removal from the scene of former Gov. Abraham Ribicoff gives the Republicans a greatly improved chance to recapture the State Capitol. In Massachusetts, they already hold the Capitol, since John A. Volpe won the Governorship despite the Kennedy tide. And they have a chance to pick up the Massachusetts Democratic Senate seat now held on an interim basis by President Kennedy's old friend, Benjamin A. Smith Jr.

IN THE vote-heavy industrial Northeast, in short, the Republican prospects for the immediate future are very good indeed, providing the other state parties can only imitate the New York state Republicans' defiance of the iron law of Republicanism. This is the law that the Republican candidates most likely to be appealing to the voters are also the candidates most likely to repel and alarm the party fat cats.