

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE
"Everyone in Southern Oregon Reads The Mail Tribune"
Published Daily except Saturday by MEDFORD PUBLISHING CO.
33 North 7th St., Ph. 772-8143

NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION
AFFILIATE MEMBER

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
Dec. 23, 1952 (Monday)
About 400 children in Medford will receive toys for Christmas as a result of a joint drive by the city firemen and Lady Lions.

20 YEARS AGO
Dec. 23, 1942 (Tuesday)
Medford merchants report Christmas trade is biggest in history and almost double that of 1941.

30 YEARS AGO
Dec. 23, 1932 (Thursday)
False rumor circulated that marriages made in Jackson county are invalid cuts issuance of marriage licenses here by 50 per cent during December.

40 YEARS AGO
Dec. 23, 1922 (Friday)
Large amount of livestock and farm equipment destroyed when fire burns barn owned by George B. Young in Orchard Home district.

50 YEARS AGO
Dec. 23, 1912 (Sunday)
Epidemic of scarletina causes cancellation of numerous Christmas parties planned for Christmas eve in Medford area.

Oregon Agricultural college hand schedules concert at Medford high school auditorium.

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

1. What was the name of the woman who was called Princess Alice?
2. Name the American woman who was known as "Angel of the Battlefield"?
3. Who wrote of an episode in her life, concerning alcoholism, entitled "I'll Cry Tomorrow"?
4. Name the famous woman salon wrecker of prohibition days?
5. It is a quarter of ten o'clock; if the minute and hour hands were reversed, what time would it be according to the clock?
6. What relation is a daughter of my mother's niece to me?
7. How many states begin with the letter "E"?
8. In what continent are the highest mountains of the world?
9. What is the source of the Mississippi River?
10. Unscramble these pieces of common furniture: TAP, RODREV and NIDSROW IRACHE.

Answers: 1. Alice Longworth Roosevelt. 2. Clara Barton. 3. Lillian Roth. 4. Carrie Nation. 5. Eighty-five. 6. Second cousin. 7. None. 8. Asia. 9. Lake Itasca in Minnesota. 10. Davenport and Windsor Chair.

Legislative Pay

Elsewhere on this page Frank Jenkins comes to the conclusion that the pay rates proposed for the legislature by a joint committee thereof are "reasonable."
We would not disagree, but would put it a bit more negatively. We think they are "not unreasonable."

Why the double negative? Because, while we agree the proposed salary-expense items are within the bounds of reason, we believe at the same time they are too high, taking all things into consideration.
THE committee proposal is for \$3,000 per year, plus \$20 per day expenses when the legislature is in session. This would work out to \$5,000 for legislative years (assuming a 100-day session) and \$3,000 for non-legislative years, or \$8,000 per biennium.

This does not sound unreasonable when compared to legislative salaries in other states. But it is a considerable jump from the \$600 per year and strictly limited expenses at present—which practically everyone agreed was inadequate.

WE approve more of the proposal made by a non-legislative committee appointed some months ago by Senate President Harry Boivin. They based their recommendation on two premises:
1. Salaries must be large enough to permit able people to serve, who could not otherwise.
2. Salaries should be low enough so they would not attract simple job-seekers and opportunists.

This committee proposed \$150 per month (or \$1,800 per year) plus \$20 per day expenses during a legislative session, limited to 100 days. This works out to \$3,800 per year for legislative years, or \$5,600 per biennium.
It seems to us this is (a) adequate to permit legislators to serve without undue financial sacrifice, and (b) small enough so it would not attract free-loaders.

IN our view, additionally, the per diem expense should not be limited to any specific number of days. That would put too much pressure on members for a quick adjournment, which often can, and does, make for hurried, unconsidered and bad legislation.
Regarding the proposed expenses, Former Gov. Charles A. Sprague, editor of the Oregon Statesman in Salem, has this to say:
"... The present (expense) allowance to state employees for in-state travel is \$5 a day for meals and \$6.50 for lodging, or \$11.50. In going from zero it would be better to stop at \$15 a day for legislative expenses."

He has a point, but it must be remembered that the legislative session lasts three months or longer, not just for a night or two; legislators must, in effect, maintain two homes, and often feel they must bring their families with them.
ALL in all, we feel that the recommendations of the Boivin committee, with the single exception of limiting the number of days of per diem to 100, is the better course of action.
In voting the Constitutional amendment which permits them to set their own salaries, the voters reversed a long-standing stinginess in the matter of legislative pay. It would not set too well with many voters if they now go overboard and set a pay scale for themselves at startling variance with both that at present and that proposed by a disinterested committee.
It is true that legislative pay is a small item in the overall budget, but too much of an increase, coming at a time when pressure for other expenditures, and for new taxes to pay for them, will be at an all time high, is uncalled for.—E.A.

Merry Christmas

PRITHEE, why so grim and sad? Listen, things aren't all that bad! Sure, the world is in a mess. But isn't it always, more or less?
Things were plenty tense, it's true. In nineteen-hundred-sixty-two. Life was full of jolts and shocks. Riots, storms and falling stocks.
Trouble bubbled everywhere. In Cuba, Guam and Belgrave Square. In Mississippi and Manila. And Elizabeth Taylor's Roman villa.
Everything from sin to sex. Seemed to grow ever more complex; Critics deplored our moral decay. But hasn't it always been that way?
The twentieth century's not the first To rate itself the very worst. Every era's had its share. Of jangled nerves and bleak despair.
And Status Quo has always been A fancy term for the mesa we're in. Mankind, since the world began, Has jumped from fire to frying pan.
Paleolithic man, no doubt, Found plenty to complain about. The Middle Ages were grim and dark. And even the Renaissance was no lark.
Man, throughout the centuries, Has roiled at life's anomalies. And groaned into the midnight blue, "Oh, what is this world coming to?"
Earth's a risky habitat. There isn't any doubt of that. But tell the truth now, honestly. Is there anywhere you'd rather be?
No? Well, in that case, let's cheer up. And pass around the wassail cup. And, taking a chin-up attitude, Shift to a merry Christmas mood.
Let's toast ourselves in Yuletide cheer To joy throughout the coming year. And, unafraid but cautiously, Let's welcome nineteen-sixty-three!
—Jane Goodsell, in the Oregon Labor Press.

"Let 'Em Vote For Congressmen—Long As We Can Keep The Congressmen From Voting For Them"



Today & Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann
(c) New York Herald Tribune Syndicate

THE AGITATED ALLIANCE
The American monopoly of nuclear weapons has become a hot issue in Britain and France because of the Cuban affair, and it has become an immediate issue because of the proposal to abandon Skybolt. In Cuba American nuclear power was wielded without consulting our European allies. To have nothing to say while Washington and Moscow go to the brink of nuclear war reduces the Europeans, says M. Raymond Aron of the newspaper Figaro, "to the status of protectorate nations." This, he has said in the New Republic, is on the way to being intolerable provocation and humiliation.

Coming on top of this, the decision about Skybolt looks—however little this is in fact the President's intention—like an American action to abolish the British nuclear deterrent. Thus, while the Western Alliance is by no means disrupted, it is severely shaken up.

AFTER hearing the matter argued back and forth and sideways in the capitals of Western Europe, my general feeling is that while in theory the problem is insoluble, actual experience will nevertheless prevent the theoretical conflict from producing dangerous practical consequences.
Let us look at the theory. It is impossible within the same alliance to have one or two nuclear forces which are in truth independent of the main nuclear force. In the foreseeable future the American nuclear power will comprise well over 90 per cent of the whole nuclear power of the Western Alliance.

All that an "independent" French force could do is to make a first strike against a few Soviet cities. I have heard it said on high authority that they might kill 20 million Russians. After that, not even the American nuclear force might be able to deter the Soviet Union from a devastating retaliation against France.

IN THE American view, therefore, it is impossible to concede to France the right to initiate a nuclear war. We have to insist that being allies requires that the French force should not be used independently but only as part of a unified force of the alliance.
This American view is regarded as self-serving and is not acceptable to the French. They say, first, that the United States wants a veto on France although, as was shown in Cuba, France has no veto on the United States. They say, second, that our policy means that we will use nuclear weapons when we regard the issue as vital to us whereas we will not use them when the issue is thought vital only to France.

ANYONE who has had the patience to follow all this argumentation will perhaps agree that theoretically the problem posed by our nuclear monopoly is insoluble. Nor is the problem likely to be made soluble by some international device such as an "independent" European nuclear force or an "independent" NATO force. They would pose the same problems for us that the

Matter of Fact

By Joseph Alsop
(c) New York Herald Tribune Syndicate
BIGGER THAN A MAN'S HAND
Paris—On the Far Eastern horizon, a cloud considerably bigger than a man's hand has now appeared, as a direct consequence of the deepening split between the Soviets and the Chinese Communists North Korea is the only Communist satellite which as yet deserves to be called the satellite of Peking. Albania, tiny and isolated, is more a pretext than a satellite. North Viet Nam is quite probably becoming a Chinese satellite; but thus far Hanoi has rather desperately tried to keep two lines open, to Moscow as well as to Peking.

Hence what the North Koreans say at this juncture is particularly meaningful, since it is said, one may be certain, under orders from the Chinese Communists. Needless to say, the Chinese position in the Sino-Soviet row received enthusiastic support in the just-published communiqué of the Fifth Plenum of the North Korean "Workers Party." But the significant passage runs as follows:
"Only when our defense capacity is fortified and steel-like and we are always in a posture of mobilization, will the enemy not dare to pounce upon us and if he launches a reckless adventure, can we decisively smash it and win the victory..." (To this end) our military potential must be reinforced at all costs, even if this slows down the growth of the national economy."

ONE reason for this bleak warning of harder times ahead for the Korean people may well be the abrupt interruption of Soviet arms deliveries. The Koreans, like the Chinese, have always got the bulk of their heavier and more complex military equipment from the Soviet Union. If the source of supply has been cut off, they may well embark on an attempt to provide at least a part of their own heavier arms.
If this interpretation is correct, the consequences for China will be vastly more grave than for North Korea. Some things the Koreans cannot conceivably attempt—such as the construction of a serious aircraft industry. The Chinese, on the other hand, will have to do all these things, and on a scale to supply their Asian satellite as well as themselves.

If arms deliveries from the Soviets have indeed been stopped, as seems highly likely, and oil deliveries have been halted at the same time, as also seems likely, Nikita S. Khrushchev is really hitting Mao Tse-tung where it will hurt the most. In the present desperate condition of the economy, it is hard to see how the Chinese system can withstand the enormous increase of strain that must result from increased fuel stringency plus an immensely increased armament effort.

Confirmation by intelligence must be awaited, for there are no solid proofs as yet that Khrushchev is using this kind of sanction against Mao. The North Korean communique is the first piece of important evidence seeming to point in that direction.

THE \$3,000-a-year will be \$6,000 per biennium, plus \$20 per day while the legislature is in session. Washington legislators get \$2400 a biennium (a biennium is two years), plus \$25 a day expenses during regular sessions and an additional \$10 a day during special sessions.

California legislators get \$12,000 a biennium, plus \$19 a day while in session. The California legislature meets every year, and normally remains in session during a rather long period. In Oregon and Washington, the legislatures meet every two years.

QUESTION: Assuming that the bill is passed as agreed upon by the committee, how will the salaries (including expense accounts) of Oregon legislators compare with those of neighboring states?
ANSWER: The \$3,000-a-year will be \$6,000 per biennium, plus \$20 per day while the legislature is in session. Washington legislators get \$2400 a biennium (a biennium is two years), plus \$25 a day expenses during regular sessions and an additional \$10 a day during special sessions.

After a Jump, a Double Check Is Needed

By ERIC SEVAREID
Americans rush in where angels fear to tread, an occasionally endearing trait which has probably done more good than harm in a long career. But we are also the people who invented the phrase, "check and double check," although we require an astonishingly long time to practice what we preach.
After a dozen years of fabulous expenditure of money, efforts and reputations, we are finally to have a severe double-check of our foreign aid programs by disinterested inspectors, presided over by the sharp if not lofty mind of Lorenz Clay, whose instincts as well as his face bear resemblance to the hawk that sees and pounces quickly and never lets go unless dragged from his quarry. As a caretree gesture, I would predict that his major exercise in blame-laying will not question the competence of administrators or field workers so much as the capacity of many societies to be developed in our time and by our methods.

To say that the initial enthusiasm over foreign aid has gone yellow in the leaf is the understatement of the policy season. But while this massive double-check is put in motion, we remain in the stage of "initial enthusiasm" about foreign aid's eager helper, the Peace Corps. Here again, the cycle will repeat itself, though we shall all, ourselves, be much yellower in the leaf before a realistic appraisal of the Corps' output, let alone reappraisal. There is nothing so irresistible as pure intentions backed by pure publicity, and I am aware that in the current atmosphere of euphoric reverence an expressed doubt about the Peace Corps will receive the same treatment as a doubt expressed about virginity.

Amid all the false starts and semi-failures of our manifold world missions, the Peace Corps, at least, is a solid success so we tell ourselves in vast relief. Senator Humphrey, one of its sponsors, has set in judgment on his own handiwork and finds that the Corps has done "an outstanding job" even though its first wave of recruits have barely had time to get the feel and grip of their various tasks abroad.
Of course, it is a success by the criteria so far employed: young men and women flock to join it, foreign governments welcome it (they should, it comes postpaid) and Communists attack it. I would go further and say that giving frustrated American youth a sense of mission and adding to our supply of comprehension of other societies (at the credit side of the ledger).
Important as are these returns on our investment (\$60 million this fiscal year) they cannot bring benefits in the

Washington Report

By William S. White
(c) United Feature Syndicate
YEMEN AND NASSER
Washington—it is hard to put down the troubling suspicion that much of the State Department is operating on the shinning-eyed conviction that all traditional governments are necessarily bad guys. Sometimes it seems that one sure way to assure official American sympathy is for the rebels solemnly to tell Washington straightaway that they are the liberal reformers and their opponents the evil "reactionaries."

The latest instance in this melancholy tale is this government's decision to grant official recognition to the insurgent regime in Yemen, in the Middle East.
THIS "revolution" is not really comparable to that conducted by George Washington and others in colonial United States. Though it was indeed begun by a local leader called Abdullah Al-Sallal, it was in fact very quickly taken over by Colonel Nasser's Egypt. Nasser sent in 12,000 Soviet-trained Egyptian troops, supplied with So-

viet-made bombers and tanks, against the barefoot tribesmen who remained loyal to the royal Yemenite government of the tribal king, Mohammad Al-Badr.
In the meantime, Saudi Arabia and Jordan gave some assistance—but of a far more ragged scale and kind—to the old regime of Al-Badr.
In State Department definition, of course, a king is more or less automatically a "reactionary," even in a remote area like this which is living in roughly the 16th century and where any serious talk of "democracy" is an absurd jest.

THE American action in giving recognition to the Egyptian-led insurgents puts us in the company of, among others, the Soviet bloc. But it does not put us in the company of, say, Britain, which is in no great hurry to celebrate this supposed great movement toward liberal reform.
Our motives are quite correct. We wish to see an end of fighting in the Middle East and the disengagement of all hostile forces, in fear that otherwise the thing might blow up into major war and give the Russians some opportunity to intervene.

It is easy to go along with the objective. But it is not easy to see why—since the disengagement of the contending forces is our central aim—we did not at least withhold recognition until Nasser had actually withdrawn his troops and Soviet-made weapons. We have had only a somewhat vague "indication" that he will do so.

WHAT, therefore, is really left? We have given the great boon of American recognition to a "revolution" which was only nominally homemade and actually results in a victory for Nasser Egypt. If Colonel Nasser can rush into Yemen upon the "invitation" of some force seeking to overthrow the existing authority, why cannot he rush into other Arab countries on other "invitations"—or other pretexts?
The United States is rightly trying to bring about its total detachment from the Soviet Union, which in the past was close to him and which, indeed, built up his present military force. But is the pattern of Yemen a good way to do that? Surely not.

For Nasser in Yemen showed an alarming capacity for military amphibious operations on a considerable scale. After all, he hurled what amounts to a full division across the Red Sea.
To encourage him in such an adventure until we know, and do not merely hope, that he has really turned away from the Soviet Union and toward the West, as he has sometimes seemed to do.

Distinguished Service
To the Editor:
Are you thinking 'bout giving Santa his annual reward? Then, let's all chip in and hand him a big smile-trimmed credit card.
George Distell
156 Vashli Way
Medford

So far, any taxpayer is entitled to wonder how much, if at all, a country like Brazil, for example, can be changed for the better by the presence of a handful of American youngsters, in the face of an advancing sea of inflation, population tides and hunger among its tens of millions of people. The corporan now run about 85 or 90 to a country, across the vast, unmeasurable human swamps of Asia and Latin America. Some awareness of the world's size might aid our assessments.
On the argument that the Peace Corps has proved a success, the government now approaches the idea of a domestic corps for service in our own slums and blighted regions. I won't argue that we should have started there in the first place; this would not have happened, given the absence of glamor. But here at home, in the Harlem, South Chicago and Kentucky coal regions, momentum will not be maintained by publicity, every constituency concerned will soon teach its congressman the difference between fringe and measurable returns, and the double check will run from the beginning concurrently with the check.
It won't require a dozen years and a General Clay to show the stockholders exactly what has happened to their investment. So maybe it should be tried.
(Distributed 1962, by The Hall Syndicate, Inc.)
(All Rights Reserved)