

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 initials for publication is permissible. The Mail Tribune reserves the right to edit all letters with a view to clarification and condensation. Letters submitted for publication must not exceed 400 words. The letters printed in this column do not necessarily represent the views of the paper; in fact the contrary is often the case.

Wondering

To the Editor: I am wondering just what Mr. Deatherage's interest is, in his campaign to defeat Home Rule. From his tactics as reported in the paper it does not seem he is increasing his standing in the community, and one wonders if he has some valuable asset he feels he is protecting that makes him willing to pass out misinformation.

Or perhaps he is just trying to see how far he can make the public believe any statement if repeated often enough.

Anyway, I am just wondering.

Mrs. George B. Dean,
265 Janney Lane,
Medford

Medford's Growth

To the Editor: It seems funny to me "You All" want to make Medford a friendly-promising place. Yet when conscientious people want to make this their home, you don't seem to want to help them.

Yes, we came from Portland nearly eight months ago. My husband was in White City for over two months. I came in October to be near him.

He got out of White City in January. Since then he has tried to get work here. He has gone to the State Employment Office every day. We are both fry cooks and apartment managers. He is a steel fabricator and burner. He can wash dishes and do janitor work or general farm work. I've clerked in stores also. We are only middle aged, sober and dependable, but it seems you don't want people to come here and build and make their homes.

We prefer managing an apartment house or resort, or anything for a living.

This is a nice beautiful place and we really would like to make our home here. So why not help us and make Medford grow?

Mrs. Wilbur Funderburg
525 North Riverside ave.
Medford

Election Comments

To the Editor: Voting in the primary election, where we only vote for the candidate of our own party, should be easy, but where there are two or more candidates for the same office, it causes one to do some searching to decide which one is the better qualified.

With some there is no question. With us one of these is Sen. Wayne Morse, whom we have known for several years, and as a man who really puts

No Simple Solution

To the Editor: Much has been said about our tax problems and their solutions. This is as it should be. However, the first thing we should understand is that taxes are the result of SPENDING.

The ONLY way to reduce, or to hold taxes down, is to reduce, or hold down spending. . . there is no other way.

Since the cost of education accounts for most of our property tax problem, the method whereby we CAN reduce our property tax load is to increase the State of Oregon's share in school support. Presently the State only contributes 30 per cent. If the legislature can be made to raise the State's share to 50 per cent of the total cost, then property taxpayers would get a 20 per cent reduction. Once the Legislature is committed to this program then will be the time to consider how this money will be raised.

To push for the method of taxation without FIRST bringing about methods for relief is a dangerous thing . . . because it opens the door to MORE spending.

Remember, more spending means more taxes. To earmark a sales tax for any specific purpose relieves the Legislature of any further responsibility in this field . . . and this can be a serious error. For example, if a sales tax was earmarked for education, the Legislature, hard pressed for money for other purposes, might discontinue basic school support . . . this would result in severe property tax increases.

The sales tax has been proposed many times in recent years . . . and the voters have always turned it down.

A sales tax has also been proposed in the Legislature, as a matter of fact, in the last session of the Legislature. Sen. Walter Pearson, presently a candidate for Governor, introduced a sales tax bill which was signed by Republicans and Democrats alike, and they couldn't even get such a bill passed.

Please remember this: a sales tax will only be brought into law by the people of Oregon . . . voting for it as a ballot measure.

I think it is unfortunate to imply that such a tax is a simple solution to our tax problems, or that such a tax is easy to adopt into law.

I sincerely hope the above information will prove helpful.

L. W. (Lynn) Newberry,
State Senator, Jackson County,
P. O. Box 106,
Ashland, Ore.

R. E. Nealon
Route 2, Box 275

To the Editor: Much has been said about our tax problems and their solutions. This is as it should be. However, the first thing we should understand is that taxes are the result of SPENDING.

The ONLY way to reduce, or to hold taxes down, is to reduce, or hold down spending. . . there is no other way.

Since the cost of education accounts for most of our property tax problem, the method whereby we CAN reduce our property tax load is to increase the State of Oregon's share in school support. Presently the State only contributes 30 per cent. If the legislature can be made to raise the State's share to 50 per cent of the total cost, then property taxpayers would get a 20 per cent reduction. Once the Legislature is committed to this program then will be the time to consider how this money will be raised.

To push for the method of taxation without FIRST bringing about methods for relief is a dangerous thing . . . because it opens the door to MORE spending.

Remember, more spending means more taxes. To earmark a sales tax for any specific purpose relieves the Legislature of any further responsibility in this field . . . and this can be a serious error. For example, if a sales tax was earmarked for education, the Legislature, hard pressed for money for other purposes, might discontinue basic school support . . . this would result in severe property tax increases.

The sales tax has been proposed many times in recent years . . . and the voters have always turned it down.

A sales tax has also been proposed in the Legislature, as a matter of fact, in the last session of the Legislature. Sen. Walter Pearson, presently a candidate for Governor, introduced a sales tax bill which was signed by Republicans and Democrats alike, and they couldn't even get such a bill passed.

Please remember this: a sales tax will only be brought into law by the people of Oregon . . . voting for it as a ballot measure.

I think it is unfortunate to imply that such a tax is a simple solution to our tax problems, or that such a tax is easy to adopt into law.

I sincerely hope the above information will prove helpful.

L. W. (Lynn) Newberry,
State Senator, Jackson County,
P. O. Box 106,
Ashland, Ore.

R. E. Nealon
Route 2, Box 275

To the Editor: Much has been said about our tax problems and their solutions. This is as it should be. However, the first thing we should understand is that taxes are the result of SPENDING.

The ONLY way to reduce, or to hold taxes down, is to reduce, or hold down spending. . . there is no other way.

Since the cost of education accounts for most of our property tax problem, the method whereby we CAN reduce our property tax load is to increase the State of Oregon's share in school support. Presently the State only contributes 30 per cent. If the legislature can be made to raise the State's share to 50 per cent of the total cost, then property taxpayers would get a 20 per cent reduction. Once the Legislature is committed to this program then will be the time to consider how this money will be raised.

To push for the method of taxation without FIRST bringing about methods for relief is a dangerous thing . . . because it opens the door to MORE spending.

Remember, more spending means more taxes. To earmark a sales tax for any specific purpose relieves the Legislature of any further responsibility in this field . . . and this can be a serious error. For example, if a sales tax was earmarked for education, the Legislature, hard pressed for money for other purposes, might discontinue basic school support . . . this would result in severe property tax increases.

The sales tax has been proposed many times in recent years . . . and the voters have always turned it down.

A sales tax has also been proposed in the Legislature, as a matter of fact, in the last session of the Legislature. Sen. Walter Pearson, presently a candidate for Governor, introduced a sales tax bill which was signed by Republicans and Democrats alike, and they couldn't even get such a bill passed.

Please remember this: a sales tax will only be brought into law by the people of Oregon . . . voting for it as a ballot measure.

I think it is unfortunate to imply that such a tax is a simple solution to our tax problems, or that such a tax is easy to adopt into law.

I sincerely hope the above information will prove helpful.

Unfair Tax Bill

To the Editor, and readers of the Medford Mail Tribune: There is a tax bill proposing a withholding tax on dividends and interest payments received by investors, designated as HR 10650, Section 19, which has passed the House of Representatives and is now before the Senate. It is not a new tax, but is a complicated, costly, and unfair method of over-collection of existing taxes.

If you have studied this bill, you must know it will affect the average investor and taxpayer. There would be a flat rate of 20 per cent on all dividends and interest, even though there is not that much tax owed. Millions would overpay their taxes and then would have to go through the complicated procedure of claiming refunds, which would be costly. In addition, the tax-reporting would be more complicated and expensive.

The average taxpayer would have twice as much withheld as would ultimately be owed in taxes. Meanwhile, he would be deprived of the earning power of his money until by his own efforts he could obtain a refund, as the government will not pay interest on overpayments.

If he is reinvesting his dividends, \$20 out of every \$100 of dividends will be taken by the government as withholding and will not be automatically reinvested. To this extent, the amount available for compounding will be cut down, even though he may be overpaying the tax initially by a substantial amount.

In a number of instances this injustice will undermine to a dangerous extent investment objectives established for the education of children, retirement, and other similar goals.

I, along with most other average investors and taxpayers, believe there is no need for this drastic withholding procedure. Our taxes are already so high that it is extremely difficult for the average taxpayer to meet his obligation to the government, especially those of us on a fixed income.

If you agree with me that this is unfair legislation, and that it will work a hardship on you as an investor, I urge you to write a letter in your own words to your senator and state your opinion. This is our last chance to protect our investment income from the unfair hardship of such a withholding tax.

You may address your senators as follows: Hon. . . . United States Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington 25, D.C.

Marian E. Fisher,
32 Black Oak dr.,
Medford.

To the Editor: Much has been said about our tax problems and their solutions. This is as it should be. However, the first thing we should understand is that taxes are the result of SPENDING.

The ONLY way to reduce, or to hold taxes down, is to reduce, or hold down spending. . . there is no other way.

Since the cost of education accounts for most of our property tax problem, the method whereby we CAN reduce our property tax load is to increase the State of Oregon's share in school support. Presently the State only contributes 30 per cent. If the legislature can be made to raise the State's share to 50 per cent of the total cost, then property taxpayers would get a 20 per cent reduction. Once the Legislature is committed to this program then will be the time to consider how this money will be raised.

To push for the method of taxation without FIRST bringing about methods for relief is a dangerous thing . . . because it opens the door to MORE spending.

Remember, more spending means more taxes. To earmark a sales tax for any specific purpose relieves the Legislature of any further responsibility in this field . . . and this can be a serious error. For example, if a sales tax was earmarked for education, the Legislature, hard pressed for money for other purposes, might discontinue basic school support . . . this would result in severe property tax increases.

The sales tax has been proposed many times in recent years . . . and the voters have always turned it down.

A sales tax has also been proposed in the Legislature, as a matter of fact, in the last session of the Legislature. Sen. Walter Pearson, presently a candidate for Governor, introduced a sales tax bill which was signed by Republicans and Democrats alike, and they couldn't even get such a bill passed.

Please remember this: a sales tax will only be brought into law by the people of Oregon . . . voting for it as a ballot measure.

I think it is unfortunate to imply that such a tax is a simple solution to our tax problems, or that such a tax is easy to adopt into law.

I sincerely hope the above information will prove helpful.

L. W. (Lynn) Newberry,
State Senator, Jackson County,
P. O. Box 106,
Ashland, Ore.

R. E. Nealon
Route 2, Box 275

To the Editor: Much has been said about our tax problems and their solutions. This is as it should be. However, the first thing we should understand is that taxes are the result of SPENDING.

The ONLY way to reduce, or to hold taxes down, is to reduce, or hold down spending. . . there is no other way.

Since the cost of education accounts for most of our property tax problem, the method whereby we CAN reduce our property tax load is to increase the State of Oregon's share in school support. Presently the State only contributes 30 per cent. If the legislature can be made to raise the State's share to 50 per cent of the total cost, then property taxpayers would get a 20 per cent reduction. Once the Legislature is committed to this program then will be the time to consider how this money will be raised.

To push for the method of taxation without FIRST bringing about methods for relief is a dangerous thing . . . because it opens the door to MORE spending.

Remember, more spending means more taxes. To earmark a sales tax for any specific purpose relieves the Legislature of any further responsibility in this field . . . and this can be a serious error. For example, if a sales tax was earmarked for education, the Legislature, hard pressed for money for other purposes, might discontinue basic school support . . . this would result in severe property tax increases.

The sales tax has been proposed many times in recent years . . . and the voters have always turned it down.

A sales tax has also been proposed in the Legislature, as a matter of fact, in the last session of the Legislature. Sen. Walter Pearson, presently a candidate for Governor, introduced a sales tax bill which was signed by Republicans and Democrats alike, and they couldn't even get such a bill passed.

Please remember this: a sales tax will only be brought into law by the people of Oregon . . . voting for it as a ballot measure.

I think it is unfortunate to imply that such a tax is a simple solution to our tax problems, or that such a tax is easy to adopt into law.

I sincerely hope the above information will prove helpful.

L. W. (Lynn) Newberry,
State Senator, Jackson County,
P. O. Box 106,
Ashland, Ore.

R. E. Nealon
Route 2, Box 275

To the Editor: Much has been said about our tax problems and their solutions. This is as it should be. However, the first thing we should understand is that taxes are the result of SPENDING.

The ONLY way to reduce, or to hold taxes down, is to reduce, or hold down spending. . . there is no other way.

Since the cost of education accounts for most of our property tax problem, the method whereby we CAN reduce our property tax load is to increase the State of Oregon's share in school support. Presently the State only contributes 30 per cent. If the legislature can be made to raise the State's share to 50 per cent of the total cost, then property taxpayers would get a 20 per cent reduction. Once the Legislature is committed to this program then will be the time to consider how this money will be raised.

To push for the method of taxation without FIRST bringing about methods for relief is a dangerous thing . . . because it opens the door to MORE spending.

Charter Views

Editor's note: Floyd McCabe, candidate for the Republican nomination for county commissioner, recently wrote a letter setting forth his views on the Home Rule charter proposal, and submitted it to the Mail Tribune as a clarification of his views. Portions of the letter follow:

To the Editor: . . . I have NOT said anything FOR or AGAINST the proposed Home Rule charter, since I feel that we who are candidates SHOULD NOT seek to influence the voters on a matter which would so directly affect us. It is only natural that a candidate would oppose a proposal to abolish the position for which he is a candidate. I consider that those who are thus affected, are biased and possibly unethical, to be for or against, publicly, a proposal which may adversely affect THEM but perhaps MAY benefit the people as a whole!

Far too many of our county residents have formed their opinion based on hearsay evidence. Would you, if you were a member of a jury, want to form your opinion and verdict after listening to people on the witness stand (give hearsay testimony)? Yet many of those who have flatly stated they are against the charter have acquired their information in just this manner.

There are some things I do not like in the charter, but on the other hand there are some things I do like, very definitely.

The charter provides the Board of County Commissioners shall regularly meet at least twice each month in the county court house. It is obvious that when the Board of County Commissioners holds a regular meeting at a specified time and place, open to the public, there should be no reason whatsoever that the public should not be fully informed as to what the Board of County Commissioners is doing, is considering doing or intends to do!

I do object, also, to the provision for a full time chairman of the Board of Commissioners.

Remember, too, that if you, or any other resident of Jackson County felt that a change should be made in the charter, you can start the ball rolling toward the making of the change.

One man I was talking to the day the charter was printed in the Medford Mail Tribune said, "I don't know what is in it, but I'm going to vote against it." Now that did not sound to me as if he were a reasonable or thinking man.

This charter is nothing more, nothing less, than a Constitution of the County of Jackson, and like the constitution of the various states and the Constitution of the United States, are continually in need of being revised to fit the constantly changing conditions.

Floyd R. McCabe
Mt. Pitt Star Rt.
Butte Falls, Ore.

To the Editor: Since the publication of a letter in your paper criticizing the present "stop" of the Evergreen Bus Lines in downtown Medford, I have received numerous comments both pro and con. I am soliciting neither. The action was taken by the Legion as a unit and I was acting strictly on orders.

I would like to make it very clear that the contents of that letter are very definitely not my own. I, personally, have absolutely no objection to the present bus stop or the Evergreen Bus Lines stops or service.

M. E. Prevost
Commander, Post 192
The American Legion
White City, Ore.

To the Editor: Much has been said about our tax problems and their solutions. This is as it should be. However, the first thing we should understand is that taxes are the result of SPENDING.

The ONLY way to reduce, or to hold taxes down, is to reduce, or hold down spending. . . there is no other way.

Since the cost of education accounts for most of our property tax problem, the method whereby we CAN reduce our property tax load is to increase the State of Oregon's share in school support. Presently the State only contributes 30 per cent. If the legislature can be made to raise the State's share to 50 per cent of the total cost, then property taxpayers would get a 20 per cent reduction. Once the Legislature is committed to this program then will be the time to consider how this money will be raised.

To push for the method of taxation without FIRST bringing about methods for relief is a dangerous thing . . . because it opens the door to MORE spending.

Remember, more spending means more taxes. To earmark a sales tax for any specific purpose relieves the Legislature of any further responsibility in this field . . . and this can be a serious error. For example, if a sales tax was earmarked for education, the Legislature, hard pressed for money for other purposes, might discontinue basic school support . . . this would result in severe property tax increases.

The sales tax has been proposed many times in recent years . . . and the voters have always turned it down.

A sales tax has also been proposed in the Legislature, as a matter of fact, in the last session of the Legislature. Sen. Walter Pearson, presently a candidate for Governor, introduced a sales tax bill which was signed by Republicans and Democrats alike, and they couldn't even get such a bill passed.

Please remember this: a sales tax will only be brought into law by the people of Oregon . . . voting for it as a ballot measure.

I think it is unfortunate to imply that such a tax is a simple solution to our tax problems, or that such a tax is easy to adopt into law.

I sincerely hope the above information will prove helpful.

L. W. (Lynn) Newberry,
State Senator, Jackson County,
P. O. Box 106,
Ashland, Ore.

R. E. Nealon
Route 2, Box 275

To the Editor: Much has been said about our tax problems and their solutions. This is as it should be. However, the first thing we should understand is that taxes are the result of SPENDING.

The ONLY way to reduce, or to hold taxes down, is to reduce, or hold down spending. . . there is no other way.

Since the cost of education accounts for most of our property tax problem, the method whereby we CAN reduce our property tax load is to increase the State of Oregon's share in school support. Presently the State only contributes 30 per cent. If the legislature can be made to raise the State's share to 50 per cent of the total cost, then property taxpayers would get a 20 per cent reduction. Once the Legislature is committed to this program then will be the time to consider how this money will be raised.

To push for the method of taxation without FIRST bringing about methods for relief is a dangerous thing . . . because it opens the door to MORE spending.

Remember, more spending means more taxes. To earmark a sales tax for any specific purpose relieves the Legislature of any further responsibility in this field . . . and this can be a serious error. For example, if a sales tax was earmarked for education, the Legislature, hard pressed for money for other purposes, might discontinue basic school support . . . this would result in severe property tax increases.

The sales tax has been proposed many times in recent years . . . and the voters have always turned it down.

A sales tax has also been proposed in the Legislature, as a matter of fact, in the last session of the Legislature. Sen. Walter Pearson, presently a candidate for Governor, introduced a sales tax bill which was signed by Republicans and Democrats alike, and they couldn't even get such a bill passed.

Please remember this: a sales tax will only be brought into law by the people of Oregon . . . voting for it as a ballot measure.

I think it is unfortunate to imply that such a tax is a simple solution to our tax problems, or that such a tax is easy to adopt into law.

I sincerely hope the above information will prove helpful.

L. W. (Lynn) Newberry,
State Senator, Jackson County,
P. O. Box 106,
Ashland, Ore.

R. E. Nealon
Route 2, Box 275

Charter Discussion

To the Editor: Without desiring to disparage the party system nor good party workers, who know on which side their politics are buttered, history would seem to indicate that no label is a sacred guarantee of the people's getting an informed, intelligent, honest and sincere candidate of integrity who will not misuse power.

Power misused is that regardless of label. In view of schisms within as well as between parties, the ideal candidate seems to rest within the conscience of the individual chosen, AND the well-informed, reasoned choice of those electing him. A non-partisan label merely allows commissioners loyal to all electors, rather than party.

The Charter contains, as must all democratic processes which admit man's fallibility, the means for change under due process of law if the public so desires.

No review of facts seems to dispel fear or prejudice as such, but here also, a reasoned, unemotional approach to the issues must rest with the conscience of the individual. There are good and valid reasons on both sides, and the frightening thing is not what would happen if the Charter would pass, OR if it didn't; it is the manner in which the subject has been fought!

One can be for or against an issue on its merits; one does not have to commit moral hari-kari by using character assassination; confusion techniques which bring in all manner of subjects NOT related to the issue, nor pertinent to it; and worst of all, by playing on the fears and ignorance of a number of sincere but ill-informed people.

"I been told that . . . and I ain't gonna stand for no dictator in Jackson County" type of quote indicates that someone is misinforming AND someone is sadly misinformed and/or being used. No sincere citizen likes to see other citizens state blatant ignorance and, in turn, fear that some good folks seem to take a twisted pleasure from being labeled "uninformed."

Eternal vigilance, indeed, is the price of liberty. We do have our right to take our stand on issues on what we believe to be their merits; we do not have a right to use the kind of techniques resorted to by the really undemocratic among us!

Jeane Y. Gang,
1209 Mt. Pitt,
Medford.

To the Editor: Much has been said about our tax problems and their solutions. This is as it should be. However, the first thing we should understand is that taxes are the result of SPENDING.

The ONLY way to reduce, or to hold taxes down, is to reduce, or hold down spending. . . there is no other way.

Since the cost of education accounts for most of our property tax problem, the method whereby we CAN reduce our property tax load is to increase the State of Oregon's share in school support. Presently the State only contributes 30 per cent. If the legislature can be made to raise the State's share to 50 per cent of the total cost, then property taxpayers would get a 20 per cent reduction. Once the Legislature is committed to this program then will be the time to consider how this money will be raised.

To push for the method of taxation without FIRST bringing about methods for relief is a dangerous thing . . . because it opens the door to MORE spending.

Remember, more spending means more taxes. To earmark a sales tax for any specific purpose relieves the Legislature of any further responsibility in this field . . . and this can be a serious error. For example, if a sales tax was earmarked for education, the Legislature, hard pressed for money for other purposes, might discontinue basic school support . . . this would result in severe property tax increases.

The sales tax has been proposed many times in recent years . . . and the voters have always turned it down.

A sales tax has also been proposed in the Legislature, as a matter of fact, in the last session of the Legislature. Sen. Walter Pearson, presently a candidate for Governor, introduced a sales tax bill which was signed by Republicans and Democrats alike, and they couldn't even get such a bill passed.

Please remember this: a sales tax will only be brought into law by the people of Oregon . . . voting for it as a ballot measure.

I think it is unfortunate to imply that such a tax is a simple solution to our tax problems, or that such a tax is easy to adopt into law.

I sincerely hope the above information will prove helpful.

L. W. (Lynn) Newberry,
State Senator, Jackson County,
P. O. Box 106,
Ashland, Ore.

R. E. Nealon
Route 2, Box 275

To the Editor: Much has been said about our tax problems and their solutions. This is as it should be. However, the first thing we should understand is that taxes are the result of SPENDING.

The ONLY way to reduce, or to hold taxes down, is to reduce, or hold down spending. . . there is no other way.

Since the cost of education accounts for most of our property tax problem, the method whereby we CAN reduce our property tax load is to increase the State of Oregon's share in school support. Presently the State only contributes 30 per cent. If the legislature can be made to raise the State's share to 50 per cent of the total cost, then property taxpayers would get a 20 per cent reduction. Once the Legislature is committed to this program then will be the time to consider how this money will be raised.

To push for the method of taxation without FIRST bringing about methods for relief is a dangerous thing . . . because it opens the door to MORE spending.

Remember, more spending means more taxes. To earmark a sales tax for any specific purpose relieves the Legislature of any further responsibility in this field . . . and this can be a serious error. For example, if a sales tax was earmarked for education, the Legislature, hard pressed for money for other purposes, might discontinue basic school support . . . this would result in severe property tax increases.

The sales tax has been proposed many times in recent years . . . and the voters have always turned it down.

A sales tax has also been proposed in the Legislature, as a matter of fact, in the last session of the Legislature. Sen. Walter Pearson, presently a candidate for Governor, introduced a sales tax bill which was signed by Republicans and Democrats alike, and they couldn't even get such a bill passed.

Please remember this: a sales tax will only be brought into law by the people of Oregon . . . voting for it as a ballot measure.