

The Herald and News

FRANK JENKINS
Editor
BILL JENKINS
Managing Editor
FLOYD WYNNE
City Editor
MAURICE MILLER
Circulation Mgr
Ph. TU 4-4732

Entered as second class matter at the post office at Klamath Falls, Ore., on August 29, 1936, under act of Congress, March 8, 1879.

SERVICES:
ASSOCIATED PRESS UNITED PRESS
AUDIT BUREAU OF CIRCULATIONS
Serving Southern Oregon And Northern California

Subscription Rates

CARRIER	
1 MONTH	\$ 1.50
6 MONTHS	\$ 9.00
1 YEAR	\$18.00
MAIL	
1 MONTH	\$ 1.50
6 MONTHS	\$ 8.50
1 YEAR	\$15.00

Women

By FLOYD L. WYNNE

This is a little advice directed toward men who have to boss women . . . in their jobs.

No man is safe bossing a woman under any other conditions.

The Associated Press Managing Editors Association, called APME for brevity, has drawn up 10 tips on bossing women that are mighty useful, and may be mighty useful, depending on how you utilize them.

The 10 tips are these: 1. Measure a woman by her success with a job, not by her sex or your prejudice.

2. Avoid impatience with a woman; she needs to have confidence in you.

3. What ego is to a man, security is to a woman; make her feel safe and needed and she'll make you feel 10 feet tall.

4. Never desert a woman in her fear; it is not circumstances a woman fears so much as the prospect of facing them alone.

5. Never lose your temper with a woman; every woman knows the smaller the pot, the quicker it boils.

6. A woman's anger can be atomic in power; when there's a blast-off, direct the force to useful ends.

7. Never forget that a woman never forgets; her memory, compared to a man's, is as a cable to a thread.

8. As a man, provide the reason, the authority and the security to guide a woman in the use of her constant emotional drive.

9. Praise a woman on every possible occasion; her appreciation is fourfold that of man. So is her sensitivity; she requires one-fourth the criticism.

10. Treat each woman as an individual in ways suitable to the time, the place and the woman.

Strangely, those 10 tips sound as though they were written by a woman.

But, one correction. No man ever "bosses" women, he merely directs them in the way that he hopes they will go.

The irony of the entire thing is apparent but pointless, I fear.

When a man is born, his mother gets the credit.

When a man is married, his bride gets the praises, the parties and the gifts, and all he gets is congratulations for having been chosen as a husband by such a beautiful bride.

If and when he becomes a business success, people give his wife the credit.

And even when he dies, the sympathy goes to his widow, and the mourners speculate as to whether or not he left her in good financial condition, or perhaps how much better off she is . . . now that he isn't.

I suppose when I get home tonight, my wife will have cut out these 10 rules and have them prominently posted for my benefit.

Oh well, such are the vicissitudes of life.

Unemployment

By FLORENCE JENKINS

The Oregon State Employment Service, a division of the Unemployment Compensation Commission, was depression-born and supposed at that time to have been an emergency stop-gap.

The last Legislature made some radical changes in the unemployment laws of the state and took a first step toward halting the runaway progress of state unemployment compensation.

The first unemployment benefits were paid in 1933. Up to the end of the year 1957, the unemployment commission had paid out more than \$230 million for an average of \$11.5 million per year. Post-war benefits (and we quote the Oregon Blue Book) "have been running much higher, however, reaching \$31.7 million in 1957."

And 1957 was a "good" year.

The new law proposed to reduce by 10,000 to 12,000 the total claims paid by requiring that claimants must have received a minimum of \$20 a week for 20 weeks under covered employment to be eligible. This eliminates many persons, particularly women, whose only paid work was on crop harvest. These persons could make the old minimum of \$700 previously required during the calendar base period, but the harvest work can't be stretched to 20 weeks.

Claims could be made for unemployment benefits in 26 regularly established local offices and at 64 itinerant points in Oregon. With only 36 counties in the state, 90 offices accepting claims for unemployment compensation would seem to be quite a lot, particularly when every office has to be staffed by personnel paid for by the taxpayers of Oregon.

The State Unemployment Compensation Commission of three

members has been eliminated and a Department of Employment set up with a single commissioner. Now, however, employers hiring just one employee must pay unemployment tax despite the fact that a business operating with just one employee wouldn't be having any unemployment.

In addition to processing claims for unemployment benefits, the branch offices around the state provide job counseling, give proficiency employment tests and maintain specialized service programs for veterans, handicapped, mature youth and minority group applicants.

Today there is only one privately operated employment agency advertising in Klamath Falls.

The state of Colorado, where the Colorado State Employment Service has announced that it handles 60 per cent of the job placement business (and hopes to handle 90 per cent within five years), is becoming concerned over the government agency's monopoly.

"If any company bottled up 60 per cent of the market and announced it was trying for 90 per cent, the Department of Justice lawyers would be swarming the premises and waving copies of the Sherman Act at the proprietors," states a release from Denver.

The Colorado institution has a new \$1.5 million headquarters and 32 field offices and "openly competes with private employment agencies and advertises for clients," the release continues.

It speaks well for Colorado's private employment agencies that they have been able to hang onto 40 per cent of the business while the state government gives away the services they sell.

A free service which can't attract more customers than that must have some serious faults.

Maybe Oregon's Legislature had better take another look at the next session.

Supreme Court

By JAMES MARLOW

Associated Press News Analyst WASHINGTON (AP)—Don't buy the idea the Supreme Court is backing down under criticism. The facts don't bear it out.

The attacks on the court in the 1958-59 term were bitter although less widespread than in the past. But this was a fairly mild term.

There's a good explanation for that. The nine justices didn't have to cope with issues as explosive as some of those in recent years.

The court continued to plod along steadily in its role as guardian of individual rights and freedoms. Its most publicized decisions were in that field.

As usual, they didn't please everyone, not even some of the justices themselves. The harshness of some of their criticism of one another's opinions might indicate some conflict within the court itself. That's only a guess.

Justice Black, always voting on what is called the liberal side, complained in a moment of exasperation that the court is in retreat. Any impartial study of the court's work would have a hard time proving it. One example: In decision after decision the court never budged an inch from its 1954 ruling outlawing racial segregation in public schools.

Ever since that 1954 opinion—and subsequent ones protecting fair-treatment rights of Communists and non-Communists—the court has been battered with denunciations.

Those opinions cut across many fields: states rights, the federal employ security program, the sedition laws of the states, and congressional investigations of communism.

As a result the justices have been told they were going too far, that they were usurping power that belonged to the legislative and executive branches of government, and that they were a menace. Some Southern Democrats talked of impeaching them.

This year even the American Bar Assn. at its February convention was split between those who wanted to chastise the court in an ABA resolution and those who didn't. In the end the ABA avoided direct criticism.

In one grand congressional outburst this summer House Republicans, defying the wishes of the Eisenhower administration, joined Southern Democrats in ramming through a bill to offset at least one court decision.

The court had ruled in 1956 that when it comes to trying subversives, federal law supersedes state sedition laws. The House-passed bill would give state laws equal weight with federal laws in the same field unless Congress specifically says otherwise or unless there are direct conflicts between them.

Opponents charged—and supporters of the bill denied—that its real target was not sedition laws at all but civil rights and labor laws. Its chance of becoming law looks thin, for the Senate is unlikely to approve it.

The court irritated Congress no end in 1957 with a decision throwing out the contempt conviction of a man who refused to answer certain questions of the House Committee on Un-American Activities investigating communism in labor.

The court ruled that if a congressional committee wants to force a witness to answer it must show that its questions are pertinent to the investigation being made. In this case, the court said, the committee didn't.

This opinion forced the committee to be lots more precise in asking questions.

This year the court upheld the contempt conviction of another man who refused to answer the same committee's questions. In this case, the court said, the questions asked were shown to be pertinent.

This is the case where Black said the court was in retreat. But, whereas in the first case the witness asked to be shown how the questions were pertinent, the second didn't, and the committee explained its purposes beforehand.

In still another case which brought criticism the court in 1957 threw out the conviction of a man for falsely swearing he was not a Communist.

The court said the trial judge refused to let him see statements made to the FBI by witnesses testifying against him. The court said a witness has a right to see such statements to try, if he can, to discredit the witness.

This brought cries that the court was stripping government files of all secrecy in the future. The court actually did no such thing but, to avoid future confusion, Congress passed a law which said a defendant in a federal trial has a right—this upheld the court—to see written or recorded statements made to the government by witnesses against him, but only statements bearing on their testimony.

This year the Supreme Court, faced with a test case of this law, upheld it. It turned into law what the court had ruled, with a clarification. This was hardly a retreat from the 1957 opinion.

SHORT RIBS

By Frank O'Neal

WHEEL!

LOOK! NO HANDS!

THIS IS GREAT!

WILMINGTON, N.C. — Pinkie Miller, 35, mother of newly born triplet girls, following a decision by her and her husband not to put them out for adoption: "I don't think I could ever forgive myself if I did part with them."

MANILA — Columnist Alejandro Roces, denouncing bashing beauty contests: "What is not for sale should not be paraded or exhibited."

WASHINGTON — Sen. Mike Mansfield (D-Mont.), commenting on our negotiations with the Russians: "This is not a game of marbles. It is time the American people realized we face years of tension in dealing with the Soviet Union."

ment, and that they were a menace. Some Southern Democrats talked of impeaching them.

This year even the American Bar Assn. at its February convention was split between those who wanted to chastise the court in an ABA resolution and those who didn't. In the end the ABA avoided direct criticism.

In one grand congressional outburst this summer House Republicans, defying the wishes of the Eisenhower administration, joined Southern Democrats in ramming through a bill to offset at least one court decision.

The court had ruled in 1956 that when it comes to trying subversives, federal law supersedes state sedition laws. The House-passed bill would give state laws equal weight with federal laws in the same field unless Congress specifically says otherwise or unless there are direct conflicts between them.

Opponents charged—and supporters of the bill denied—that its real target was not sedition laws at all but civil rights and labor laws. Its chance of becoming law looks thin, for the Senate is unlikely to approve it.

The court irritated Congress no end in 1957 with a decision throwing out the contempt conviction of a man who refused to answer certain questions of the House Committee on Un-American Activities investigating communism in labor.

The court ruled that if a congressional committee wants to force a witness to answer it must show that its questions are pertinent to the investigation being made. In this case, the court said, the committee didn't.

This opinion forced the committee to be lots more precise in asking questions.

This year the court upheld the contempt conviction of another man who refused to answer the same committee's questions. In this case, the court said, the questions asked were shown to be pertinent.

This is the case where Black said the court was in retreat. But, whereas in the first case the witness asked to be shown how the questions were pertinent, the second didn't, and the committee explained its purposes beforehand.

In still another case which brought criticism the court in 1957 threw out the conviction of a man for falsely swearing he was not a Communist.

The court said the trial judge refused to let him see statements made to the FBI by witnesses testifying against him. The court said a witness has a right to see such statements to try, if he can, to discredit the witness.

This brought cries that the court was stripping government files of all secrecy in the future. The court actually did no such thing but, to avoid future confusion, Congress passed a law which said a defendant in a federal trial has a right—this upheld the court—to see written or recorded statements made to the government by witnesses against him, but only statements bearing on their testimony.

This year the Supreme Court, faced with a test case of this law, upheld it. It turned into law what the court had ruled, with a clarification. This was hardly a retreat from the 1957 opinion.

ment, and that they were a menace. Some Southern Democrats talked of impeaching them.

This year even the American Bar Assn. at its February convention was split between those who wanted to chastise the court in an ABA resolution and those who didn't. In the end the ABA avoided direct criticism.

In one grand congressional outburst this summer House Republicans, defying the wishes of the Eisenhower administration, joined Southern Democrats in ramming through a bill to offset at least one court decision.

The court had ruled in 1956 that when it comes to trying subversives, federal law supersedes state sedition laws. The House-passed bill would give state laws equal weight with federal laws in the same field unless Congress specifically says otherwise or unless there are direct conflicts between them.

Opponents charged—and supporters of the bill denied—that its real target was not sedition laws at all but civil rights and labor laws. Its chance of becoming law looks thin, for the Senate is unlikely to approve it.

The court irritated Congress no end in 1957 with a decision throwing out the contempt conviction of a man who refused to answer certain questions of the House Committee on Un-American Activities investigating communism in labor.

The court ruled that if a congressional committee wants to force a witness to answer it must show that its questions are pertinent to the investigation being made. In this case, the court said, the committee didn't.

This opinion forced the committee to be lots more precise in asking questions.

This year the court upheld the contempt conviction of another man who refused to answer the same committee's questions. In this case, the court said, the questions asked were shown to be pertinent.

This is the case where Black said the court was in retreat. But, whereas in the first case the witness asked to be shown how the questions were pertinent, the second didn't, and the committee explained its purposes beforehand.

In still another case which brought criticism the court in 1957 threw out the conviction of a man for falsely swearing he was not a Communist.

The court said the trial judge refused to let him see statements made to the FBI by witnesses testifying against him. The court said a witness has a right to see such statements to try, if he can, to discredit the witness.

This brought cries that the court was stripping government files of all secrecy in the future. The court actually did no such thing but, to avoid future confusion, Congress passed a law which said a defendant in a federal trial has a right—this upheld the court—to see written or recorded statements made to the government by witnesses against him, but only statements bearing on their testimony.

This year the Supreme Court, faced with a test case of this law, upheld it. It turned into law what the court had ruled, with a clarification. This was hardly a retreat from the 1957 opinion.

ment, and that they were a menace. Some Southern Democrats talked of impeaching them.

This year even the American Bar Assn. at its February convention was split between those who wanted to chastise the court in an ABA resolution and those who didn't. In the end the ABA avoided direct criticism.

In one grand congressional outburst this summer House Republicans, defying the wishes of the Eisenhower administration, joined Southern Democrats in ramming through a bill to offset at least one court decision.

The court had ruled in 1956 that when it comes to trying subversives, federal law supersedes state sedition laws. The House-passed bill would give state laws equal weight with federal laws in the same field unless Congress specifically says otherwise or unless there are direct conflicts between them.

Opponents charged—and supporters of the bill denied—that its real target was not sedition laws at all but civil rights and labor laws. Its chance of becoming law looks thin, for the Senate is unlikely to approve it.

The court irritated Congress no end in 1957 with a decision throwing out the contempt conviction of a man who refused to answer certain questions of the House Committee on Un-American Activities investigating communism in labor.

The court ruled that if a congressional committee wants to force a witness to answer it must show that its questions are pertinent to the investigation being made. In this case, the court said, the committee didn't.

This opinion forced the committee to be lots more precise in asking questions.

This year the court upheld the contempt conviction of another man who refused to answer the same committee's questions. In this case, the court said, the questions asked were shown to be pertinent.

This is the case where Black said the court was in retreat. But, whereas in the first case the witness asked to be shown how the questions were pertinent, the second didn't, and the committee explained its purposes beforehand.

In still another case which brought criticism the court in 1957 threw out the conviction of a man for falsely swearing he was not a Communist.

The court said the trial judge refused to let him see statements made to the FBI by witnesses testifying against him. The court said a witness has a right to see such statements to try, if he can, to discredit the witness.

This brought cries that the court was stripping government files of all secrecy in the future. The court actually did no such thing but, to avoid future confusion, Congress passed a law which said a defendant in a federal trial has a right—this upheld the court—to see written or recorded statements made to the government by witnesses against him, but only statements bearing on their testimony.

This year the Supreme Court, faced with a test case of this law, upheld it. It turned into law what the court had ruled, with a clarification. This was hardly a retreat from the 1957 opinion.

ment, and that they were a menace. Some Southern Democrats talked of impeaching them.

This year even the American Bar Assn. at its February convention was split between those who wanted to chastise the court in an ABA resolution and those who didn't. In the end the ABA avoided direct criticism.

In one grand congressional outburst this summer House Republicans, defying the wishes of the Eisenhower administration, joined Southern Democrats in ramming through a bill to offset at least one court decision.

The court had ruled in 1956 that when it comes to trying subversives, federal law supersedes state sedition laws. The House-passed bill would give state laws equal weight with federal laws in the same field unless Congress specifically says otherwise or unless there are direct conflicts between them.

Opponents charged—and supporters of the bill denied—that its real target was not sedition laws at all but civil rights and labor laws. Its chance of becoming law looks thin, for the Senate is unlikely to approve it.

The court irritated Congress no end in 1957 with a decision throwing out the contempt conviction of a man who refused to answer certain questions of the House Committee on Un-American Activities investigating communism in labor.

The court ruled that if a congressional committee wants to force a witness to answer it must show that its questions are pertinent to the investigation being made. In this case, the court said, the committee didn't.

This opinion forced the committee to be lots more precise in asking questions.

This year the court upheld the contempt conviction of another man who refused to answer the same committee's questions. In this case, the court said, the questions asked were shown to be pertinent.

This is the case where Black said the court was in retreat. But, whereas in the first case the witness asked to be shown how the questions were pertinent, the second didn't, and the committee explained its purposes beforehand.

In still another case which brought criticism the court in 1957 threw out the conviction of a man for falsely swearing he was not a Communist.

The court said the trial judge refused to let him see statements made to the FBI by witnesses testifying against him. The court said a witness has a right to see such statements to try, if he can, to discredit the witness.

This brought cries that the court was stripping government files of all secrecy in the future. The court actually did no such thing but, to avoid future confusion, Congress passed a law which said a defendant in a federal trial has a right—this upheld the court—to see written or recorded statements made to the government by witnesses against him, but only statements bearing on their testimony.

This year the Supreme Court, faced with a test case of this law, upheld it. It turned into law what the court had ruled, with a clarification. This was hardly a retreat from the 1957 opinion.

ment, and that they were a menace. Some Southern Democrats talked of impeaching them.

This year even the American Bar Assn. at its February convention was split between those who wanted to chastise the court in an ABA resolution and those who didn't. In the end the ABA avoided direct criticism.

In one grand congressional outburst this summer House Republicans, defying the wishes of the Eisenhower administration, joined Southern Democrats in ramming through a bill to offset at least one court decision.

The court had ruled in 1956 that when it comes to trying subversives, federal law supersedes state sedition laws. The House-passed bill would give state laws equal weight with federal laws in the same field unless Congress specifically says otherwise or unless there are direct conflicts between them.

Opponents charged—and supporters of the bill denied—that its real target was not sedition laws at all but civil rights and labor laws. Its chance of becoming law looks thin, for the Senate is unlikely to approve it.

The court irritated Congress no end in 1957 with a decision throwing out the contempt conviction of a man who refused to answer certain questions of the House Committee on Un-American Activities investigating communism in labor.

The court ruled that if a congressional committee wants to force a witness to answer it must show that its questions are pertinent to the investigation being made. In this case, the court said, the committee didn't.

This opinion forced the committee to be lots more precise in asking questions.

This year the court upheld the contempt conviction of another man who refused to answer the same committee's questions. In this case, the court said, the questions asked were shown to be pertinent.

This is the case where Black said the court was in retreat. But, whereas in the first case the witness asked to be shown how the questions were pertinent, the second didn't, and the committee explained its purposes beforehand.

In still another case which brought criticism the court in 1957 threw out the conviction of a man for falsely swearing he was not a Communist.

The court said the trial judge refused to let him see statements made to the FBI by witnesses testifying against him. The court said a witness has a right to see such statements to try, if he can, to discredit the witness.

This brought cries that the court was stripping government files of all secrecy in the future. The court actually did no such thing but, to avoid future confusion, Congress passed a law which said a defendant in a federal trial has a right—this upheld the court—to see written or recorded statements made to the government by witnesses against him, but only statements bearing on their testimony.

This year the Supreme Court, faced with a test case of this law, upheld it. It turned into law what the court had ruled, with a clarification. This was hardly a retreat from the 1957 opinion.

ment, and that they were a menace. Some Southern Democrats talked of impeaching them.

This year even the American Bar Assn. at its February convention was split between those who wanted to chastise the court in an ABA resolution and those who didn't. In the end the ABA avoided direct criticism.

In one grand congressional outburst this summer House Republicans, defying the wishes of the Eisenhower administration, joined Southern Democrats in ramming through a bill to offset at least one court decision.

The court had ruled in 1956 that when it comes to trying subversives, federal law supersedes state sedition laws. The House-passed bill would give state laws equal weight with federal laws in the same field unless Congress specifically says otherwise or unless there are direct conflicts between them.

Opponents charged—and supporters of the bill denied—that its real target was not sedition laws at all but civil rights and labor laws. Its chance of becoming law looks thin, for the Senate is unlikely to approve it.

The court irritated Congress no end in 1957 with a decision throwing out the contempt conviction of a man who refused to answer certain questions of the House Committee on Un-American Activities investigating communism in labor.

The court ruled that if a congressional committee wants to force a witness to answer it must show that its questions are pertinent to the investigation being made. In this case, the court said, the committee didn't.

This opinion forced the committee to be lots more precise in asking questions.

This year the court upheld the contempt conviction of another man who refused to answer the same committee's questions. In this case, the court said, the questions asked were shown to be pertinent.

This is the case where Black said the court was in retreat. But, whereas in the first case the witness asked to be shown how the questions were pertinent, the second didn't, and the committee explained its purposes beforehand.

In still another case which brought criticism the court in 1957 threw out the conviction of a man for falsely swearing he was not a Communist.

The court said the trial judge refused to let him see statements made to the FBI by witnesses testifying against him. The court said a witness has a right to see such statements to try, if he can, to discredit the witness.

This brought cries that the court was stripping government files of all secrecy in the future. The court actually did no such thing but, to avoid future confusion, Congress passed a law which said a defendant in a federal trial has a right—this upheld the court—to see written or recorded statements made to the government by witnesses against him, but only statements bearing on their testimony.

This year the Supreme Court, faced with a test case of this law, upheld it. It turned into law what the court had ruled, with a clarification. This was hardly a retreat from the 1957 opinion.

ment, and that they were a menace. Some Southern Democrats talked of impeaching them.

This year even the American Bar Assn. at its February convention was split between those who wanted to chastise the court in an ABA resolution and those who didn't. In the end the ABA avoided direct criticism.

In one grand congressional outburst this summer House Republicans, defying the wishes of the Eisenhower administration, joined Southern Democrats in ramming through a bill to offset at least one court decision.

The court had ruled in 1956 that when it comes to trying subversives, federal law supersedes state sedition laws. The House-passed bill would give state laws equal weight with federal laws in the same field unless Congress specifically says otherwise or unless there are direct conflicts between them.

Opponents charged—and supporters of the bill denied—that its real target was not sedition laws at all but civil rights and labor laws. Its chance of becoming law looks thin, for the Senate is unlikely to approve it.

The court irritated Congress no end in 1957 with a decision throwing out the contempt conviction of a man who refused to answer certain questions of the House Committee on Un-American Activities investigating communism in labor.

The court ruled that if a congressional committee wants to force a witness to answer it must show that its questions are pertinent to the investigation being made. In this case, the court said, the committee didn't.

This opinion forced the committee to be lots more precise in asking questions.

This year the court upheld the contempt conviction of another man who refused to answer the same committee's questions. In this case, the court said, the questions asked were shown to be pertinent.

This is the case where Black said the court was in retreat. But, whereas in the first case the witness asked to be shown how the questions were pertinent, the second didn't, and the committee explained its purposes beforehand.

In still another case which brought criticism the court in 1957 threw out the conviction of a man for falsely swearing he was not a Communist.

The court said the trial judge refused to let him see statements made to the FBI by witnesses testifying against him. The court said a witness has a right to see such statements to try, if he can, to discredit the witness.

This brought cries that the court was stripping government files of all secrecy in the future. The court actually did no such thing but, to avoid future confusion, Congress passed a law which said a defendant in a federal trial has a right—this upheld the court—to see written or recorded statements made to the government by witnesses against him, but only statements bearing on their testimony.

This year the Supreme Court, faced with a test case of this law, upheld it. It turned into law what the court had ruled, with a clarification. This was hardly a retreat from the 1957 opinion.

ment, and that they were a menace. Some Southern Democrats talked of impeaching them.

This year even the American Bar Assn. at its February convention was split between those who wanted to chastise the court in an ABA resolution and those who didn't. In the end the ABA avoided direct criticism.

In one grand congressional outburst this summer House Republicans, defying the wishes of the Eisenhower administration, joined Southern Democrats in ramming through a bill to offset at least one court decision.

The court had ruled in 1956 that when it comes to trying subversives, federal law supersedes state sedition laws. The House-passed bill would give state laws equal weight with federal laws in the same field unless Congress specifically says otherwise or unless there are direct conflicts between them.

Opponents charged—and supporters of the bill denied—that its real target was not sedition laws at all but civil rights and labor laws. Its chance of becoming law looks thin, for the Senate is unlikely to approve it.

The court irritated Congress no end in 1957 with a decision throwing out the contempt conviction of a man who refused to answer certain questions of the House Committee on Un-American Activities investigating communism in labor.

The court ruled that if a congressional committee wants to force a witness to answer it must show that its questions are pertinent to the investigation being made. In this case, the court said, the committee didn't.

This opinion forced the committee to be lots more precise in asking questions.

This year the court upheld the contempt conviction of another man who refused to answer the same committee's questions. In this case, the court said, the questions asked were shown to be pertinent.

This is the case where Black said the court was in retreat. But, whereas in the first case the witness asked to be shown how the questions were pertinent, the second didn't, and the committee explained its purposes beforehand.

In still another case which brought criticism the court in 1957 threw out the conviction of a man for falsely swearing he was not a Communist.

The court said the trial judge refused to let him see statements made to the FBI by witnesses testifying against him. The court said a witness has a right to see such statements to try, if he can, to discredit the witness.

This brought cries that the court was stripping government files of all secrecy in the future. The court actually did no such thing but, to avoid future confusion, Congress passed a law which said a defendant in a federal trial has a right—this upheld the court—to see written or recorded statements made to the government by witnesses against him, but only statements bearing on their testimony.

This year the Supreme Court, faced with a test case of this law, upheld it. It turned into law what the court had ruled, with a clarification. This was hardly a retreat from the 1957 opinion.



Demos Aim Campaign At Foreign Aid

WASHINGTON (AP)— Democrats aimed a budget-cutting drive at President Eisenhower's foreign aid program today.

The immediate target was the \$1,600,000,000 Eisenhower asked for military arms aid abroad. Sen. Allen J. Ellender (D-La.) wants to cut this by 50 million dollars in the first of a series of fund-cutting amendments Democrats have proposed.

Sen. Everett M. Dirksen of Illinois, the GOP leader, told reporters he thought there would be sufficient votes from both Democrats and Republicans to defeat any substantial cuts in the pending \$3,924,820,000 foreign aid authorization bill.

But Sens. John J. Sparkman (D-Ala.) and Mike Mansfield (D-Mont.), who normally support foreign aid programs, said they thought some cuts could be made without causing damage.

Eisenhower calls the foreign aid program a keystone of American foreign policy and says it is vital to the free world's defense against international Communist aggression.

Dirksen, seeking to hold the line for the figures Eisenhower proposed, found himself in the unfamiliar role of opposing Democratic efforts to cut spending.

Last week he led a successful fight against a proposal to provide more than Eisenhower asked for development loans. That proposal, approved by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, was urged particularly by Chairman

Burro Named UF Mascot

A small burro with elephantine ears is going to lead the United Fund drive this year.

The campaign will be called "Ufie's Big Push." Ufie is the name UF officials have tacked on the animal.

The burro, they say, played a major role in early Oregon. Burros, in fact, arrived before the wagon trains. They were accompanied by prospectors. And the trains were able to get to Oregon only because the burro got there first, according to UF historians.

Drive officials say the burro links the present with the pioneering spirit of the past. Ufie dramatizes the concept of neighborly assistance, common in early days. That is the way United Fund works, they say.

SUMMER TRAINING

Larry Bean, 20, Air Force Reserve officer cadet of Klamath Falls, is receiving summer training at Fairchild Air Force Base, Washington. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Harry Mathis of 2140 Gettle Street, Klamath Falls. Bean is a student at Oregon State College. He was graduated from Klamath Union High School in 1956.

FIRST PHASE

Larry C. Heaton of Klamath Falls, a student at Oregon State College, has completed the first six weeks of reserve officer training at ROTC summer camp, Fort Sill, Oklahoma. Heaton is learning marksmanship with the rifle and field artillery.

Quotes

United Press International YOSEMITE NATIONAL PARK, Calif. — Mrs. Maria Lip, 38-year-old mother of three, who was rescued Monday after being lost and alone for five days in the Sierra Nevada wilderness: "I was worried more about the family than myself."

MIAMI — City Manager Ira Willard, after ordering investigation of a riot among Cubans here in which the Cuban consul general was beaten by police and arrested: "This is a serious matter. All the (good) efforts made by this country can be wiped out by the ineptness of handling such an explosive situation."

WILMINGTON, N.C. — Pinkie Miller, 35, mother of newly born triplet girls, following a decision by her and her husband not to put them out for adoption: "I don't think I could ever forgive myself if I did part with them."

MANILA — Columnist Alejandro Roces, denouncing bashing beauty contests: "What is not for sale should not be paraded or exhibited."

WASHINGTON — Sen. Mike Mansfield (D-Mont.), commenting on our negotiations with the Russians: "This is not a game of marbles. It is time the American people realized we face years of tension in dealing with the Soviet Union."

5 Planets Seen In Klamath Sky

Five planets will be visible Tuesday evening if the sky is clear. So concludes A. B. Epperson of Klamath Falls who calls himself a "pseudo-amateur astronomer."

Among the quintet will be Mercury, in a faint appearance. It will be hard to see and observers will have to know exactly where to look. Epperson did not elaborate.

Others observable will be Mars, Venus, Jupiter and Saturn.

Venus is so bright now that it is visible in daytime. The orb will appear due south at 3:15 p.m.

Friendly Helpfulness To Every Creed and Pursue

Ward's Klamath Funeral Home

925 High TU 2-4404
Marguerite M. Ward and Sons

Why drive a "HOT BOX"?

Air Conditioned RAMBLERS

Cost Less than many other best-selling cars Without air conditioning!



Work Sparse In Alaska

Greenhorns planning on going to Alaska had better make sure they have a job first.

Guy Barker, manager of the Klamath Falls Department of Employment, said he has received word from colleagues in the far-north state that agencies such as the Salvation Army are working overtime in an effort to care for the jobless.

While the national unemployment level during March measured five per cent or less of the work force, Alaska's rate was 20 per cent.

The resident Alaskan work force is more than adequate for most fields. But a few shortages in some professions exist—notably medical and X-ray technologies, and secretarial and stenographic areas.

Barker warns that unemployed persons planning to move to Alaska should take money enough for a return passage in case they can't find work.

THERE IS A CAUSE AND RELIEF FOR APPENDICITIS

It is said by some that the appendix serves no useful purpose. Others regard it as a sort of "oil can" for the large intestine. Though man has found no reason for its existence, nature seems to think it quite an important organ—as it is very richly supplied with blood vessels and nerves, and can cause the body no end of trouble when not functioning properly.

Many abdominal conditions exhibit symptoms which are similar to appendicitis, so that it is unwise to consider all pains radiating from the lower right side caused by inflammation of the appendix.

An interesting survey among a group of 245 chiropractors shows that out of 1,908 cases of appendicitis given adjustments, 1,721 recovered completely. The above figures show that a large percentage of appendicitis cases can be successfully taken care of without an operation. If the chiropractor considers the condition beyond relief with his methods, he will not hesitate to recommend surgery.

This is one of a series of Chiropractic educational advertisements appearing in this paper through the courtesy of Dr. C. W. Davis, D.C., N.D., 134 North 3rd St., Klamath Falls, Oregon, TU 4-6033

Makes Old Clothes Look Like New

FIGHTS WRINKLES, SOILING

Sta-Nu PROCESS

Have Your Clothes Cleaned at Cascade—There's No Extra Charge For STA-NU Finishing!

CASCADE and Men's Hand Laundry and DRY CLEANERS

11th and Klamath & Opp. Post Office • Ph. 4-5111 or 2-2531

Give your family all the health and comfort benefits of air conditioning—and save money to boot! Drive in icy-cool comfort when it's blazing hot outside. Enjoy dry, de-humidified air on muggiest days. Breathe filtered air with dust and most pollen removed. Get more when you trade. (Rambler tops all low-priced cars in resale value; and air conditioning adds up to \$200 more!) So why swelter this summer? Get an air conditioned Rambler.

Other Rambler benefits: easier parking, top gas economy, full family room. Try Personalized Comfort, too: individually adjustable front seats. Test-drive Rambler now . . . and save with every air conditioned mile.

ECCLES MOTOR CO., 606 South 6th St., Klamath Falls