

Medford Mail Tribune

Published Daily except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO. 33 North Fir St. Ph. 772-8141

Subscription Rates: By Mail - In Advance, Copy 10c Daily and Sunday - 1 year \$15.00

Advertising Representative: NELSON ROBERTS & ASSOCIATES, Inc. 1100 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

1962 PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION NATIONAL EDITORIAL 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: May 29, 1952 (Thursday) Medford City Superintendent Robert Duff today requested that Medford residents observe regulations which will conserve water.

20 YEARS AGO: May 29, 1942 (Friday) State civil defense head warns of Japanese raid on Dutch Harbor, Alaska.

30 YEARS AGO: May 29, 1932 (Sunday) Plans discussed to discontinue Oregon state fair "in the interest of economy."

40 YEARS AGO: May 29, 1922 (Monday) Plans announced for three pear packing plants to be erected in Medford.

50 YEARS AGO: May 29, 1912 (Tuesday) Medford baseball team defeats Grants Pass 20 to 15.

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

1. The U.S. recently assigned a number of what "weapons" to N.A.T.O.?

2. During the administration of which President was the pay-as-you-go income tax law enacted?

3. How do the constitutional qualifications for vice president and president differ?

4. What Viennese writer popularized such terms as libido, repression and sublimation?

5. Complete the following: "A soft answer..."

6. Is an astute person dull, shrewd, or lazy?

7. A bivalve is an intake of a submarine, true or false?

8. Who was President of the U.S. during the "Era of good feeling"?

9. Does the Hudson River have its source in Hudson Bay?

10. Could a naturalized American citizen hold the office of Secretary of State?

Answers: 1. Five Polaris missile subs. 2. F. D. Roosevelt, 1943. 3. Qualifications are the same. 4. Sigmund Freud. 5. "...turneth away wrath." 6. Shrewd. 7. False. 8. James Monroe. 9. No. 10. Yes.

Coastal Trip

A business trip to Eugene Friday, plus a day of vacation still unused on Saturday, provided the opportunity. An out-of-state visitor provided the excuse. And thus it was that early Saturday morning we were driving along Route F in Lane county, headed for the coast.

Too often, in jaunts to that magnificent stretch of country and coastline, we have been in a hurry to get somewhere. This time we had no agenda, no plans, no timetable.

So, arriving at Florence, we took the little road that runs to a park overlooking the mouth of the Siuslaw river, something we'd never seen.

THE mouth of the Siuslaw river isn't terribly exciting, but the drive to it was superb, for the rhododendrons were in full flower. So was the scotch broom. And the two of them—the bright yellow and dark green of the latter and the varying shades of pink and light green of the former, alternating along the side of the road—provided a seldom-seen feast for the eyes.

Traffic was fairly heavy both Saturday and Sunday, all the way down the coast. Motel and service station people told us that many of the travelers are en route to or from the fair in Seattle, as expected.

The highway, however, is constantly being improved, and only in a few spots does it leave convenience and safety factors to be desired. And these are being corrected.

THE best part of the trip, from our viewpoint, is from Port Orford south. It is here that the sandy beaches and dunes give way to massive headlands, sharp cliffs, and rocks studding the offshore waters; to tiny sand-beach coves; to rolling open grassy uplands, and to forests, tall and green and occasionally scarred by logging or fires.

We spent the late afternoon and evening in Gold Beach—hiking along the beach in a brisk and chilly wind, and driving for a distance up the Rogue River from its mouth.

The number of homes—some small and shabby, others quite comfortable and neat-looking—that are tucked into crannies in the nearby hills was amazing. Many of them, we guessed, belong to employees of a big lumber mill on the south side of the river, and the number of boats drawn up on the bank by it suggested that many of the workers "commute" to work by boat.

THE most spectacular part of the whole trip is from Gold Beach to Brookings, and the best part of that is the magnificent brand-new section, open only a few months, north of Brookings.

The old road ran inland, so the new road, slicing along the crests and slopes of the hills on the seaward side, opens up coastal vistas seen by very few in the past.

Superlatives fail in attempting to express the beauties of that portion of the coast. To our mind it is far and away the most beautiful of any coastline we have ever seen, personally or in picture, and we do not exempt either the Riviera or the Big Sur country in California. Our companion compared it favorably to the coast of Maine.

THE highway department has put its best foot forward here. The engineering work on the highway is a splendid achievement, from the massive cuts and fills to the Thomas Creek bridge, highest in the state, which spans a gorge more than 300 feet deep.

We felt that in locating and constructing some of the "viewpoint" turn-outs, the department was a little less than imaginative and helpful to travelers, and we deplored some of the great bare spots sliced into the scenery by the engineering necessities.

However, it makes up for these in the location and planning of other viewpoints—one of which has a road leading to a parking area near the top of a hill, right above the ocean, with a sweeping view in both directions.

TWO new state parks, for picnickers only, have been laid out and equipped in delightful spots. And, we understand, most of the land between the highway and the ocean has been acquired by purchase or gift, thus creating a mile-long state park, always to be protected from commercial "development."

The principal camping parks in the area have been here for some time, one of them tucked down in the little valley just north of Humbug mountain, the other at Harris beach just north of Brookings. Only one camping party was in evidence at Humbug, but Harris Beach park appeared to be almost full on Sunday.

Perhaps half the cars on the road bore California licenses. We also spotted them from Alberta, Connecticut, Minnesota, New York, Illinois and Florida.

THE trip home, by way of Jedediah Smith Redwoods State Park and up the Smith river, over Oregon mountain, through the Illinois Valley and Grants Pass, is always pleasant.

Major changes noted this time included a several-mile stretch of new four-lane highway between Wilderville and Grants Pass, and, of course, the freeway from Grants Pass to the already-open section at Rogue River.

Intending to go to Rogue River via the river road, we saw an open access road leading to the freeway, with no barrier, and with a sign pointing to Medford, so we got onto the Freeway and whizzed home in 15 or 20 minutes less time than any prior trip. The freeway will be opened "officially" on Friday.—E.A.

Berlin Wall



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 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.

Connally Amendment

To the Editor: "Tiger In The Senate" (Editorial 5/24/62) fits Senator Wayne Morse in more ways than one. The tiger is one of the most dangerous animals in the jungle, and Mr. Morse has proven himself exceedingly dangerous, in my estimation, ever since 1945. For in that year he introduced to the Senate a resolution which would put our nation under complete and compulsory jurisdiction of the UN World Court.

This "Supreme Court" of the United Nations, answerable only to the UN, consists of one American and 14 Communist and foreign justices, all appointed by the UN, without approval by the U.S. The UN Charter states that this court is to have jurisdiction over international affairs only. But it also states that the World Court, itself, shall decide which is international and which is domestic. And there shall be NO appeal from its decision!

Can't you just see Khrushchev and his wolf pack of Communist and "neutral" judges slobbering to get a crack at us with that kind of unlimited power? Senator Tom Connally saw it. He took time to study the UN Charter and Morse's resolution and saw in them the complete surrender of the U.S. to the UN via the future "decisions" of the UN's World Court. And we can thank our lucky stars that he bowed his neck and went in slugging till he convinced the Senate, and they added to the Morse "resolution" the Connally Amendment, which specifically stipulates that it is the United States of America which shall decide what disputes are "domestic" and which are "international." God bless Tom Connally's heart.

I am told that Senator Morse fought like a wounded tiger to keep the Connally Amendment out of his resolution; and that he has been licking his wounds ever since, biding his time. Letters I've received from him in recent years bear this out, showing that after over 15 years he is more determined than ever to repeal the Connally Amendment. And make no mistake about it. If this Amendment is repealed or bypassed, it will mean the end of our Constitution, our Bill of Rights, and our Declaration of Independence—the end of a free United States and a free American people.

For this reason we should give Senator Wayne Morse all the respect we would give a Bengal Tiger crouching in our midst with tail twitching. Don't ever underestimate him, or foolishly class him as a "braying jackass." Oppose him, vote against him, if you feel you should. But respect him.

L. C. Powell, 316 S.E. Eighth St., Grants Pass, Ore.

Defeat Socialism

To the Editor: Before Congress is the largest single piece of welfare legislation in history—the King-Anderson Bill. The first year's cost alone has been estimated to be from one to four billion dollars. Two things are sure: (1) the cost will be enormous; (2) the money will come from our pocketbooks.

Let us examine this gigantic piece of legislation. First, is there a need for a bill of this size? Fifty-three per cent of the people over 65 have some kind of health insurance, and by 1965, 75 per cent will. The elderly are buying health insurance faster than any other age group. We see, then, that the need is not great. Now let us examine the plan. First we can see that it is woefully inadequate. It is, of course, the self-sufficient people who participate in the

Social Security system. Therefore, under the King-Anderson bill, it would be those people, not the less fortunate who need it most, receiving the services!

Let me also note that this is not insurance, although the advocates of the bill would have it so. Social Security is not insurance.

This bill will cost too much and is financially unsound. If the bill is passed and goes as planned, by 1968, a person with a \$4000 income would pay \$380 Social Security tax and at least \$245 income tax.

In 1961, President Kennedy asked the Social Security Administration to examine the financial aspects of the program. The committee came forth with a startling conclusion: It won't work. Still, the president has tried to push the bill. He says that he will raise the tax, yet Secretary Ribicoff has said when the Social Security tax approaches the 10 per cent level, which it will under the bill, it reaches the saturation level.

The bill will cost more than expected. The insurance companies of the United States recently took a survey. They found it will cost 150 per cent more than expected. This bill will overcrowd hospitals; they will become hospitals; they will become jumping-off place for nursing homes. Under the bill, a committee of non-medical men will be running the hospitals. And, under the King-Anderson bill, the patient may not have free choice of hospital!

Anyone can see the handwriting on the wall. The King-Anderson bill is a long stride toward socialized medicine. I do not believe the U.S. wants to take such a radical step, when there are other means to solve the need. We can extend federal loans to hospitals, use the Kerr-Mills bill to its fullest extent, and have greater income tax deduction for the care of our elderly people. Socialized medicine is not the answer.

This will lead us to socialism. First socialized hospital care for the aged, next socialized medicine, then full socialism. I don't think any of us want socialism—I know I don't. Let's defeat the King-Anderson bill and what it stands for. Write your U.S. Senators and Congressman. Let's defeat socialism in the U.S.

John Castlerline, Ninth Grade, Hedrick Junior High School, Medford

Appreciation

To the Editor: I would appreciate very much the opportunity through your columns of thanking my constituents and the people of the State of Oregon who worked for me and who expressed their confidence in me at the polls. I trust that I have in a small way alerted the people of the state to their problems as they exist in the Nation's Capitol.

To the newspapers I appreciate the news coverage of my activities and philosophies of government.

Edwin R. Durno, M.C. Washington, D. C.

Members of Division Sought for Reunion

The 3rd Infantry division, the famed Thunderbolt division of World War II, is conducting an extensive search for 30,000 former members. The persons are wanted in connection with the 16th annual reunion of the division to be held Aug. 16 through 18 in Atlantic City, N. J.

Secretary General's Term Will Expire Next April; That May Be Named Again

By PHIL NEWSOM UPI Foreign News Analyst

U Thant soon must make up his mind whether he wants to be secretary general of the United Nations for a full term. Some friends of the mild-spoken, cheery, foot-smoking diplomat express doubts that he wants the job beyond next April 10—the end of the late Dag Hammarskjold's term to which the General Assembly appointed him last November.

Despite the lame-duck nature of his appointment, U Thant's six month conduct in the office has not looked like that of a man treading carefully to avoid anything that could wreck his election to a full term.

He has been sharp, in a quiet diplomatic way, with East and West alike on occasion. British Prime Minister Harold MacMillan, visiting here last month, was reported to have given U Thant his government's backing for a five-year term in his own right. Washington has been careful to steer clear of official endorsement lest it prove a cold war kiss of death that could bring Russia's veto if only because he was supported by the United States.

But last Sunday, U.S. Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson, in a nationwide television interview, waxed enthusiastic about U Thant.

The answer to whether the "acting" will be removed from U Thant's secretary general title probably will come late this summer, when he visits Moscow.

The Russians are not likely to announce any endorsement. But the reception of the slightly-built Burmese gets in the Soviet capital will signal the Kremlin's attitude.

The United Nations was fortunate, I think, to find such a distinguished diplomat to fill this demanding post. Stevenson said, "His ability and his equanimity are universal, recognized and he has served well in his first months of office."

Washington Report

By William S. White (c) United Feature Syndicate

THE ISSUES CHOICE

Washington - Increasingly it looks that this year's true congressional election campaign will be fought far more on the floors of the senate and house than in the states and congressional districts. Traditionally, congress quits about July in such years so members may go home and mount the electioneering stumps. This time because of a heavy workload, there is no real prospect of any final adjournment either in July or August, and probably not in September, either. The probability is that the best that can be managed will be a fairly short recess, so that for all practical purposes the senate and house themselves will be and remain the electioneering stumps.

INCREASINGLY, too, it looks as if the great questions of our time—the cold war, the state of Western alliance, and our national policy toward neutral nations—will be far less talked about than will be two or three homely and relatively minor domestic issues.

We are unlikely to have anything like a great debate between the Democratic and Republican parties on the state of the world. We are likely, instead, to have a series of small debates on such matters as the administration's relationship to business and what sort of medical care we should provide for the aged. No doubt, too, we shall hear a deal about the scandals raised by that big-time operator in the farm subsidy program, Billie Sol Estes.

If this forecast turns out to be correct, then the whole attention of the country will be turned from what is infinitely urgent and incomparably vital—foreign policy—to what is reasonably important but by no means historically urgent—domestic politics.

ALL this is well within the American tradition and no one should question the country's right so to preoccupy itself, if it chooses.

Still, the probable choice of priorities seems a great pity. It is as though we were deciding to yawp our way through those questions which could mean life or death in favor of spirited national discussion on such things as these: how many hospital bills the government should pay and for whom; how right or wrong business is in its view of John F. Kennedy; and the exact character and associations of Billie Sol Estes.

This is not to imply that these three things are only trifling. Obviously, all three are meaningful; and the matter of business confidence in the present American government is meaningful, indeed. Still, the republic will survive even if "medicare" is not enacted in any form. It will go on even if the ideal partnership between business, labor and government eludes us all. And assuredly the temple will not fall no matter how many curious transactions Billie Sol Estes may be found to have made and no matter how many politicians, of whatever party, may be discovered to have been involved.

ALL these are not urgent subjects in point of time, have been built up under it are fantastic. We can't even give the surpluses away as rapidly as they build up. So the feeling in Washington is that something drastic has to be done about it.

That raises this question: Why is it regarded as politically safe to propose a drastic cure for the evils that have arisen under a farm program that has subsidized overproduction to the point where we no longer know what to do with the immense surplus that have resulted from the subsidies?

The answer is simple. In these days when the BIG CITY vote decides our elections, it is regarded as politically safe to tell the farmers WHAT THEY MUST DO OR ELSE for the good of the country as a whole.

Strictly Personal

By Sydney J. Harris (c) Field Enterprises, Inc.

SHRINKING WORLD We speak glibly of the "shrinking" world of today—but do we actually realize how much the world has shrunk since our nation was founded? When the original 13 colonies decided to federate, they were much "larger" than the whole world is today. In 1776, the fastest courier required 24 days to take a copy of the Declaration of Independence from Philadelphia to South Carolina.

This was about 575 hours to travel a distance of 350 miles as the crow flies; an average rate of about 61 miles an hour. A commercial jet today can easily go 610 miles an hour, or 1,000 as fast.

Since the world is about 24,000 miles around, if we divide it by 1,000 (the number of times greater than our speed of travel is now), this represents a world only 24 miles in circumference compared to the world of 1776.

Consider a world that is only 24 miles around—the distance from the north end of Chicago to the south end. And, of course, if we computed the same way for wire or telephone communication, the whole world would shrink to the size of a pea.

But this is the world we live in. Vietnam is no further than a drive out to the picnic grounds. Paris is a brief spin to a drive-in movie. Moscow is less than half a length of the city away. With a globe only 24 miles in circumference, compared to 1776, what validity is there in Washington's words warning us to beware of "entangling alliances."

We are entangled right up to our eyeballs, like it or not. The world has become one city, in time and space. We cannot avoid being entangled with our neighbors, because the whole concept of distance has been so radically changed that a global war can now be declared, waged and lost in 15 minutes.

Psychologically—much less politically and socially—we have not been able to catch up to these facts. We are not prepared for such proximity; we can barely endure our neighbors across the street, and now we are asked to cope with those across the world.

It is almost too much to bear in too short a time. Technology has plunged us into a tiny goldfish bowl together, and we are all swimming around furiously, wondering what happened to the spacious pond we used to live in. It is the most severe test of humanity that one can imagine. If the world goes to war, it may be more out of frustration than out of hostility.

Matter of Fact

By Joseph Alsop (c) New York Herald Tribune Syndicate

THE SLEEPER AWAKES

Washington - The agriculture bill, which has always been the sleeper in the Kennedy legislative program, had an impressive awakening in the Senate last week. As the result of a single vote cast against the Administration by Sen. William Proxmire of Wisconsin, the bill had been gutted in committee—which is usually the end of any bill's story. But the Senate put back the bill's guts by a substantial majority on Thursday, and passed the bill itself by a majority of 42-10-38 on Friday.

The guts of the provision is designed to put limits on the formerly limitless expansion of farm surpluses. This part of the bill extends to wheat and feed grains the same system of strict production controls—plus solid price supports—which is already working well for other crops like cotton, tobacco, and peanuts. Wheat and feed grains now account for two-thirds of \$9 billion surplus of farm products currently held by the U. S. government.

The deficit area in feed grains, and therefore have a strong interest in low feed grain prices. Hence the Southern votes were the ones to watch. All the bellwethers—Sens. Harry F. Byrd of Virginia and Richard Russell and Herman Talmadge of Georgia—supported the administration. This is a good augury for the House of Representatives, which is expected to pass the bill by a better majority than the Senate, but only after a rough fight.

One reason the fight will be rough in the House can be discerned in the famous Billie Sol Estes case. The endlessly increasing farm surpluses have created a requirement for more and more crop storage space, such as Estes rented to the Federal government for large sums.

In many parts of the country, building storage space for Federally-held farm surpluses has in fact become a favorite speculative investment. The companies and individuals who entered the business in the era of endlessly increasing surpluses are already bawling House members with cries of protest, because they fear the surpluses, and therefore their incomes, may begin to shrink.

The fact that no one really expected anything to be done about the surplus problem—the general acceptance of the problem as a kind of costly but wholly incurable disease—can also be read in the

Storage Space Story

Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman announced his intention to get the surplus problem under control at all costs, as soon as he took office. But Freeman's announcement was dismissed as nonsensical, and large investments were made in additional storage space during last year.

It is ironical that almost everyone should be astonished, and a good many hard-headed businessmen should be caught short, because the passage of this serious farm bill suddenly seems likely. It is even more ironical that conservative persons are not at all pleased by this prospect.

Evidently continued reckless spending is widely thought to be less dangerous than extending government controls. For the point in the farm story, heavily underlined by the hapless record of former Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, is that the choice lies squarely between extending controls or wasting more and more monstrous sums of public money.

BENSON's theoretical third choice was a bolshoi price supports for farm products. But this was never politically feasible, as was proven by the Eisenhower administration's flat failure to carry Benson's programs, even in the first Republican-controlled Eisenhower Congress. High price supports combined with inadequate production controls inevitably lead to increasing Federal costs and increasing stored surpluses.

For this reason, the cost of the Federal farm program rose from about \$2.5 billion a year at the end of the Truman administration to the staggering total of \$9 billion a year at the end of the Eisenhower administration, with no less than \$1 billion a year going for mere storage costs of surplus crops. Such was the situation that Secretary of Agriculture Freeman tackled head-on, with remarkably industry and considerably political courage.

It has been touch-and-go all the way. The most arduous work by Freeman and the astute Chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, Rep. Harold D. Cooley, was needed to secure a one-vote margin to report the bill to the House. The Senate Committee vote, as noted, went against the Administration, but by one vote. Curiously enough, the farm bill has lately gained support from the Estes case, which has highlighted the scandal of the unreformed farm program. In such strange ways, with hardly anyone paying the smallest attention, one of the most intractable, long-established national problems seems to be on the way to solution.

In the Day's News

By FRANK JENKINS

Political note: The Morse campaign committee reports that it spent \$18,843 in the Oregon primary election campaign. The committee adds in its report that it received \$20,367. The committee for Representative Edith Green, of Portland, who won renomination, reports that it spent \$310 in the primary election campaign.

TWO thoughts about campaign contributions: 1. It doesn't matter so much HOW MUCH IS SPENT AS WHERE IT COMES FROM. 2. Candidates should be required to disclose their spending, including where the money came from, BEFORE THE ELECTION so that before voting the voters may have the opportunity to know where the money came from and whether in their opinion it was TOO MUCH.

THE senate passes a complex and controversial farm bill carving many of the stiff production controls

and penalties asked by President Kennedy. The senate vote was 42-38. The measure now goes to the house, where a similar bill is already awaiting floor action.

The principal features of the bill are HIGHER PRICE SUPPORTS and substantially reduced PRODUCTION (not acreage) quotas for wheat, corn, grain sorghum and barley. If approved by both houses of the congress and signed by the President, it will be put to a vote of the farmers, with a two-thirds majority needed for adoption.

If the bill, when submitted to the farmers, is rejected, production would be unlimited, but price quotas would be substantially lower and the secretary of agriculture would be authorized to DUMP SOME OF THE PRESENT SURPLUS STOCKS ON THE MARKET for what they would bring, thus further depressing prices.

THE bill is a decidedly drastic one. But the farm program is a mess. The surpluses that

have been built up under it are fantastic. We can't even give the surpluses away as rapidly as they build up. So the feeling in Washington is that something drastic has to be done about it.

That raises this question: Why is it regarded as politically safe to propose a drastic cure for the evils that have arisen under a farm program that has subsidized overproduction to the point where we no longer know what to do with the immense surplus that have resulted from the subsidies?

The answer is simple. In these days when the BIG CITY vote decides our elections, it is regarded as politically safe to tell the farmers WHAT THEY MUST DO OR ELSE for the good of the country as a whole.

THE answer is simple. In these days when the BIG CITY vote decides our elections, it is regarded as politically safe to tell the farmers WHAT THEY MUST DO OR ELSE for the good of the country as a whole.