

U. S. WEATHER BUREAU
Tucson and vicinity show cloud-
less, temperature steady.
Yesterday: High: 75 Low: 38
Today: High: 79 Low: 40

VOL. 110 NO. 66

EDITOR ANSWERS CITIZEN CHARGE OVER FRANCHISE

Mathews Pleads 'Guilty' to Insisting Utility Pay Its Fair Share

By WILLIAM E. MATHEWS
As a matter of presenting
both sides of a critically im-
portant question, the Star re-
prints in adjoining columns an
editorial with exactly the same
prominence on page one as it
was given in the Tucson Daily
Citizen. Since it makes personal
charges about me, I am an-
swering them.

To the charges the Citizen makes
I plead "guilty."
It is the same old story of an
other vested interest trying to
dodge its fair share of the cost of
running our government. I don't
dodge to insinuate that this dodg-
ing is stopped.

Citizen Defends Citizens
The cattle growers made the same
case, and the Citizen defended
them. When I insisted that grazing
laws on state land be raised
I was charged with "running the
livestock industry." Two years
later the cattle industry and the
livestock industry are both de-
claring to be innocent.

In recent weeks the oil industry
attempted to sidestep the legisla-
ture a revised oil lease bill sit-
ting the rental on exploration lease
to 10 cents an acre. It went
through the house with little op-
position. The senate leaders in-
sisted on an open hearing as they
joined the organized educators in
opposing it.

Telegrams Published
At the open hearing a telegram
from me was published suggesting
that the rental be raised to 20
cents an acre and that Arizona law
to Texas for the same purpose.
The evening of that day two mem-
bers of the senate committee
went to Texas to investigate. When
they returned they recommended
more than what I suggested. Any
legislation will carry not less than
20 cents and probably 25 cents a
year. A prima facie case of the
house I was accused of suggesting
"Socialist school teachers" whose
Arizona Education Association led
the fight.

My objective is more revenue
from tax dodgers.
I helped to get the taxation of
airlines put before the legislature.
Senator Myers' bill is expected to
bring in \$100,000 a year. Other
states get such money, why not
Arizona?

It will still make money
I own stock in Arizona Air-
lines. I'll bet anybody I'll make
it will help to pay.
Have I done wrong?
Reading of the Citizen editorial
would lead readers to think that
I oppose just by opposing.
Other folks have had their rent
cut and taxes raised, why not
me? I am a taxpayer and I have
a few favored interests to op-
pose special privilege.

The local utility has had its tax
assessment reduced by more than
\$300,000 from the year 1949 to the
year 1950.
Who else has had their assess-
ment reduced?

The main reason for this is that
the utility is in the business of
generating plant outside of Tucson
and its corporate income tax is
paid in the state where the plant
is located. Neither Tucson nor
the Tucson school district col-
lects on it.

Contrary to Franchise
This was done in spite of the
fact that its present franchise
specifically reads that the company
agrees "to increase the capacity
of its present gas and electric
plants from time to time to meet
the requirements of the city of
Tucson..." and at all times to
maintain a first class, modern electric
plant and power plant in the city
of Tucson...

When, as a member of the citi-
zens' committee, I saw these facts,
I suggested that this line of revenue
be made up by a charge for the
use of the city's streets.
Scores of cities do this, San Diego,
San Francisco, Alhambra, and
Tucson are a few.

Albuquerque's Revenue
Albuquerque received \$90,000 last
year from such a charge, and will
get \$100,000 this year. Most of the
Albuquerque community is within
its city limits. A two per cent
charge brings this revenue. Albu-
querque has slightly more than
100,000 people, because its city
limits are extensive.

A two per cent charge in Tucson
will bring \$40,000, because Tucson
has only 50,000 people within its
corporate limits, but 75,000 beyond.
Tucson's city limits are restricted.
The two per cent charge will be
made only on what business the
company does within the city limits.

Income Taxes
The local utility has offered to
guarantee a minimum of \$20,000
year, or two per cent of the city's
income, whichever is greater. As a
member of the citizens' committee, I
refused to agree, and thereby have
the wrath of the company and the
Tucson Citizen.

My objectives are purely city
revenue. That the voters of Tucson
means that when the company's
revenue within the city limits is
less than \$20,000, the city will
pay the difference. The company
will not be increased in revenue for
the city.

If three per cent is charged the
Tucson utility will be \$60,000
more than the \$40,000 which two
percent would bring. That is a differ-
ence in favor of the utility of

An Editorial

(Reprinted from the Tucson Daily Citizen of March 5, 1951)

There has developed in the past few weeks a single
source of objection to the proposed franchise for the local
utility company—William R. Mathews, editor of the Arizona
Daily Star.

A citizens' committee appointed by the late Mayor
Houston worked for many months to prepare the proposed
franchise, then presented it to officials of both the city
and the utility for further joint study. The franchise
recommended by the citizens' committee is to be acted upon
by the city council tonight.

In all fairness, the council should make no change in
it is in the interest of the city and its future. That, after
all, is the sole criterion of judgment. We believe, therefore,
that it should be submitted for the people's vote as it is
recommended by the committee.

Mr. Mathews, protesting the new 25-year franchise,
declares the utility should pay three, rather than two, per
cent of its gross income for use of city streets.

But recent trends in this country indicate the people
are growing increasingly opposed to government confisca-
tion by taxation. The Citizens always has opposed this policy,
branding it as an underhanded socialist scheme. We still
are opposed to it and always will be opposed to it.

The utility has conceded to a two per cent franchise
payment. Beyond that—which Mr. Mathews neglects to
mention—the same will, and the Citizens defend it. The
utility will add immeasurably to the appearance of our city.

Granted, the utility would be hard put to operate
without the use of city streets. But so would many other
businesses—newspapers, for instance, Mr. Mathews. The
daily papers derive revenue from sale of papers on streets,
yet they pay no extraordinary tribute to municipal govern-
ment for that privilege.

The utility's concession to pay two per cent of its gross
revenue is a source of new and equitable income to the
city, since the present franchise produces no income what-
soever to the city of Tucson. To browbeat the company for
not paying a tax it is entitled to from a public
enterprise. And the people of this city determined that
issue when they voted against municipal ownership of the
utility.

Electricity and gas are strong determinants in the growth
of a city. Much as our city has grown in the past decade,
recent developments indicate that past growth is nothing
compared to what lies ahead in our immediate future.

Tucson, Pima county and state taxpayers benefit from
an expanding industrial economy. The utility of this city
has been of vast assistance in making past and future
growth possible.

If Tucson wants to shrink back to cow-town status,
it will reduce the service potential of the Tucson Gas
and Electric Light & Power Company. If it wants to advance
and expand to its fullest capacity, it will co-operate with busi-
ness—not club it to submission and death.

Tonight the city council should approve the new fran-
chise as it is submitted, and pass it on to the people for
their vote.

Butter Battles Looming Today Over Controversial Measures

House Rules Committee Advances Relative's Clause For Welfare Bill, Pushes Proposal for General Vote on Recall of Arizona Retirement Act

By LESTER E. INSKIP
The House Rules Committee today
of the current welfare bill may be the most explosive day
of legislation now pending.

One bill is a measure which
will give welfare recipients the right to sue for the children of
children are well able to care for
them, thus leaving more money for
those in actual need.

Lobby Fighting
The provision, which is the
subject of a bill, is being fought
by the welfare recipients. The bill
is being fought by the welfare
recipients. The bill is being
fought by the welfare recipients.

The bill is being fought by the
welfare recipients. The bill is
being fought by the welfare
recipients. The bill is being
fought by the welfare recipients.

The bill is being fought by the
welfare recipients. The bill is
being fought by the welfare
recipients. The bill is being
fought by the welfare recipients.

The bill is being fought by the
welfare recipients. The bill is
being fought by the welfare
recipients. The bill is being
fought by the welfare recipients.

The bill is being fought by the
welfare recipients. The bill is
being fought by the welfare
recipients. The bill is being
fought by the welfare recipients.

The bill is being fought by the
welfare recipients. The bill is
being fought by the welfare
recipients. The bill is being
fought by the welfare recipients.

The bill is being fought by the
welfare recipients. The bill is
being fought by the welfare
recipients. The bill is being
fought by the welfare recipients.

Arizona Daily Star

(Reprinted from the Tucson Daily Citizen of March 5, 1951)

There has developed in the past few weeks a single
source of objection to the proposed franchise for the local
utility company—William R. Mathews, editor of the Arizona
Daily Star.

A citizens' committee appointed by the late Mayor
Houston worked for many months to prepare the proposed
franchise, then presented it to officials of both the city
and the utility for further joint study. The franchise
recommended by the citizens' committee is to be acted upon
by the city council tonight.

In all fairness, the council should make no change in
it is in the interest of the city and its future. That, after
all, is the sole criterion of judgment. We believe, therefore,
that it should be submitted for the people's vote as it is
recommended by the committee.

Mr. Mathews, protesting the new 25-year franchise,
declares the utility should pay three, rather than two, per
cent of its gross income for use of city streets.

But recent trends in this country indicate the people
are growing increasingly opposed to government confisca-
tion by taxation. The Citizens always has opposed this policy,
branding it as an underhanded socialist scheme. We still
are opposed to it and always will be opposed to it.

The utility has conceded to a two per cent franchise
payment. Beyond that—which Mr. Mathews neglects to
mention—the same will, and the Citizens defend it. The
utility will add immeasurably to the appearance of our city.

Granted, the utility would be hard put to operate
without the use of city streets. But so would many other
businesses—newspapers, for instance, Mr. Mathews. The
daily papers derive revenue from sale of papers on streets,
yet they pay no extraordinary tribute to municipal govern-
ment for that privilege.

The utility's concession to pay two per cent of its gross
revenue is a source of new and equitable income to the
city, since the present franchise produces no income what-
soever to the city of Tucson. To browbeat the company for
not paying a tax it is entitled to from a public
enterprise. And the people of this city determined that
issue when they voted against municipal ownership of the
utility.

Electricity and gas are strong determinants in the growth
of a city. Much as our city has grown in the past decade,
recent developments indicate that past growth is nothing
compared to what lies ahead in our immediate future.

Tucson, Pima county and state taxpayers benefit from
an expanding industrial economy. The utility of this city
has been of vast assistance in making past and future
growth possible.

If Tucson wants to shrink back to cow-town status,
it will reduce the service potential of the Tucson Gas
and Electric Light & Power Company. If it wants to advance
and expand to its fullest capacity, it will co-operate with busi-
ness—not club it to submission and death.

Tonight the city council should approve the new fran-
chise as it is submitted, and pass it on to the people for
their vote.

Butter Battles Looming Today Over Controversial Measures

House Rules Committee Advances Relative's Clause For Welfare Bill, Pushes Proposal for General Vote on Recall of Arizona Retirement Act

By LESTER E. INSKIP
The House Rules Committee today
of the current welfare bill may be the most explosive day
of legislation now pending.

One bill is a measure which
will give welfare recipients the right to sue for the children of
children are well able to care for
them, thus leaving more money for
those in actual need.

Lobby Fighting
The provision, which is the
subject of a bill, is being fought
by the welfare recipients. The bill
is being fought by the welfare
recipients. The bill is being
fought by the welfare recipients.

The bill is being fought by the
welfare recipients. The bill is
being fought by the welfare
recipients. The bill is being
fought by the welfare recipients.

The bill is being fought by the
welfare recipients. The bill is
being fought by the welfare
recipients. The bill is being
fought by the welfare recipients.

The bill is being fought by the
welfare recipients. The bill is
being fought by the welfare
recipients. The bill is being
fought by the welfare recipients.

The bill is being fought by the
welfare recipients. The bill is
being fought by the welfare
recipients. The bill is being
fought by the welfare recipients.

The bill is being fought by the
welfare recipients. The bill is
being fought by the welfare
recipients. The bill is being
fought by the welfare recipients.

The bill is being fought by the
welfare recipients. The bill is
being fought by the welfare
recipients. The bill is being
fought by the welfare recipients.

Arizona Daily Star

(Reprinted from the Tucson Daily Citizen of March 5, 1951)

There has developed in the past few weeks a single
source of objection to the proposed franchise for the local
utility company—William R. Mathews, editor of the Arizona
Daily Star.

A citizens' committee appointed by the late Mayor
Houston worked for many months to prepare the proposed
franchise, then presented it to officials of both the city
and the utility for further joint study. The franchise
recommended by the citizens' committee is to be acted upon
by the city council tonight.

In all fairness, the council should make no change in
it is in the interest of the city and its future. That, after
all, is the sole criterion of judgment. We believe, therefore,
that it should be submitted for the people's vote as it is
recommended by the committee.

Mr. Mathews, protesting the new 25-year franchise,
declares the utility should pay three, rather than two, per
cent of its gross income for use of city streets.

But recent trends in this country indicate the people
are growing increasingly opposed to government confisca-
tion by taxation. The Citizens always has opposed this policy,
branding it as an underhanded socialist scheme. We still
are opposed to it and always will be opposed to it.

The utility has conceded to a two per cent franchise
payment. Beyond that—which Mr. Mathews neglects to
mention—the same will, and the Citizens defend it. The
utility will add immeasurably to the appearance of our city.

Granted, the utility would be hard put to operate
without the use of city streets. But so would many other
businesses—newspapers, for instance, Mr. Mathews. The
daily papers derive revenue from sale of papers on streets,
yet they pay no extraordinary tribute to municipal govern-
ment for that privilege.

The utility's concession to pay two per cent of its gross
revenue is a source of new and equitable income to the
city, since the present franchise produces no income what-
soever to the city of Tucson. To browbeat the company for
not paying a tax it is entitled to from a public
enterprise. And the people of this city determined that
issue when they voted against municipal ownership of the
utility.

Electricity and gas are strong determinants in the growth
of a city. Much as our city has grown in the past decade,
recent developments indicate that past growth is nothing
compared to what lies ahead in our immediate future.

Tucson, Pima county and state taxpayers benefit from
an expanding industrial economy. The utility of this city
has been of vast assistance in making past and future
growth possible.

If Tucson wants to shrink back to cow-town status,
it will reduce the service potential of the Tucson Gas
and Electric Light & Power Company. If it wants to advance
and expand to its fullest capacity, it will co-operate with busi-
ness—not club it to submission and death.

Tonight the city council should approve the new fran-
chise as it is submitted, and pass it on to the people for
their vote.

Butter Battles Looming Today Over Controversial Measures

House Rules Committee Advances Relative's Clause For Welfare Bill, Pushes Proposal for General Vote on Recall of Arizona Retirement Act

By LESTER E. INSKIP
The House Rules Committee today
of the current welfare bill may be the most explosive day
of legislation now pending.

One bill is a measure which
will give welfare recipients the right to sue for the children of
children are well able to care for
them, thus leaving more money for
those in actual need.

Lobby Fighting
The provision, which is the
subject of a bill, is being fought
by the welfare recipients. The bill
is being fought by the welfare
recipients. The bill is being
fought by the welfare recipients.

The bill is being fought by the
welfare recipients. The bill is
being fought by the welfare
recipients. The bill is being
fought by the welfare recipients.

The bill is being fought by the
welfare recipients. The bill is
being fought by the welfare
recipients. The bill is being
fought by the welfare recipients.

The bill is being fought by the
welfare recipients. The bill is
being fought by the welfare
recipients. The bill is being
fought by the welfare recipients.

The bill is being fought by the
welfare recipients. The bill is
being fought by the welfare
recipients. The bill is being
fought by the welfare recipients.

The bill is being fought by the
welfare recipients. The bill is
being fought by the welfare
recipients. The bill is being
fought by the welfare recipients.

The bill is being fought by the
welfare recipients. The bill is
being fought by the welfare
recipients. The bill is being
fought by the welfare recipients.

Arizona Daily Star

(Reprinted from the Tucson Daily Citizen of March 5, 1951)

There has developed in the past few weeks a single
source of objection to the proposed franchise for the local
utility company—William R. Mathews, editor of the Arizona
Daily Star.

A citizens' committee appointed by the late Mayor
Houston worked for many months to prepare the proposed
franchise, then presented it to officials of both the city
and the utility for further joint study. The franchise
recommended by the citizens' committee is to be acted upon
by the city council tonight.

In all fairness, the council should make no change in
it is in the interest of the city and its future. That, after
all, is the sole criterion of judgment. We believe, therefore,
that it should be submitted for the people's vote as it is
recommended by the committee.

Mr. Mathews, protesting the new 25-year franchise,
declares the utility should pay three, rather than two, per
cent of its gross income for use of city streets.

But recent trends in this country indicate the people
are growing increasingly opposed to government confisca-
tion by taxation. The Citizens always has opposed this policy,
branding it as an underhanded socialist scheme. We still
are opposed to it and always will be opposed to it.

The utility has conceded to a two per cent franchise
payment. Beyond that—which Mr. Mathews neglects to
mention—the same will, and the Citizens defend it. The
utility will add immeasurably to the appearance of our city.

Granted, the utility would be hard put to operate
without the use of city streets. But so would many other
businesses—newspapers, for instance, Mr. Mathews. The
daily papers derive revenue from sale of papers on streets,
yet they pay no extraordinary tribute to municipal govern-
ment for that privilege.

The utility's concession to pay two per cent of its gross
revenue is a source of new and equitable income to the
city, since the present franchise produces no income what-
soever to the city of Tucson. To browbeat the company for
not paying a tax it is entitled to from a public
enterprise. And the people of this city determined that
issue when they voted against municipal ownership of the
utility.

Electricity and gas are strong determinants in the growth
of a city. Much as our city has grown in the past decade,
recent developments indicate that past growth is nothing
compared to what lies ahead in our immediate future.

Tucson, Pima county and state taxpayers benefit from
an expanding industrial economy. The utility of this city
has been of vast assistance in making past and future
growth possible.

If Tucson wants to shrink back to cow-town status,
it will reduce the service potential of the Tucson Gas
and Electric Light & Power Company. If it wants to advance
and expand to its fullest capacity, it will co-operate with busi-
ness—not club it to submission and death.

Tonight the city council should approve the new fran-
chise as it is submitted, and pass it on to the people for
their vote.

Butter Battles Looming Today Over Controversial Measures

House Rules Committee Advances Relative's Clause For Welfare Bill, Pushes Proposal for General Vote on Recall of Arizona Retirement Act

By LESTER E. INSKIP
The House Rules Committee today
of the current welfare bill may be the most explosive day
of legislation now pending.

One bill is a measure which
will give welfare recipients the right to sue for the children of
children are well able to care for
them, thus leaving more money for
those in actual need.

Lobby Fighting
The provision, which is the
subject of a bill, is being fought
by the welfare recipients. The bill
is being fought by the welfare
recipients. The bill is being
fought by the welfare recipients.

The bill is being fought by the
welfare recipients. The bill is
being fought by the welfare
recipients. The bill is being
fought by the welfare recipients.

The bill is being fought by the
welfare recipients. The bill is
being fought by the welfare
recipients. The bill is being
fought by the welfare recipients.

The bill is being fought by the
welfare recipients. The bill is
being fought by the welfare
recipients. The bill is being
fought by the welfare recipients.

The bill is being fought by the
welfare recipients. The bill is
being fought by the welfare
recipients. The bill is being
fought by the welfare recipients.

The bill is being fought by the
welfare recipients. The bill is
being fought by the welfare
recipients. The bill is being
fought by the welfare recipients.

The bill is being fought by the
welfare recipients. The bill is
being fought by the welfare
recipients. The bill is being
fought by the welfare recipients.

Arizona Daily Star

(Reprinted from the Tucson Daily Citizen of March 5, 1951)

There has developed in the past few weeks a single
source of objection to the proposed franchise for the local
utility company—William R. Mathews, editor of the Arizona
Daily Star.

A citizens' committee appointed by the late Mayor
Houston worked for many months to prepare the proposed
franchise, then presented it to officials of both the city
and the utility for further joint study. The franchise
recommended by the citizens' committee is to be acted upon
by the city council tonight.

In all fairness, the council should make no change in
it is in the interest of the city and its future. That, after
all, is the sole criterion of judgment. We believe, therefore,
that it should be submitted for the people's vote as it is
recommended by the committee.

Mr. Mathews, protesting the new 25-year franchise,
declares the utility should pay three, rather than two, per
cent of its gross income for use of city streets.

But recent trends in this country indicate the people
are growing increasingly opposed to government confisca-
tion by taxation. The Citizens always has opposed this policy,
branding it as an underhanded socialist scheme. We still
are opposed to it and always will be opposed to it.

The utility has conceded to a two per cent franchise
payment. Beyond that—which Mr. Mathews neglects to
mention—the same will, and the Citizens defend it. The
utility will add immeasurably to the appearance of our city.

Granted, the utility would be hard put to operate
without the use of city streets. But so would many other
businesses—newspapers, for instance, Mr. Mathews. The
daily papers derive revenue from sale of papers on streets,
yet they pay no extraordinary tribute to municipal govern-
ment for that privilege.

The utility's concession to pay two per cent of its gross
revenue is a source of new and equitable income to the
city, since the present franchise produces no income what-
soever to the city of Tucson. To browbeat the company for
not paying a tax it is entitled to from a public
enterprise. And the people of this city determined that
issue when they voted against municipal ownership of the
utility.

Electricity and gas are strong determinants in the growth
of a city. Much as our city has grown in the past decade,
recent developments indicate that past growth is nothing
compared to what lies ahead in our immediate future.

Tucson, Pima county and state taxpayers benefit from
an expanding industrial economy. The utility of this city
has been of vast assistance in making past and future
growth possible.

If Tucson wants to shrink back to cow-town status,
it will reduce the service potential of the Tucson Gas
and Electric Light & Power Company. If it wants to advance
and expand to its fullest capacity, it will co-operate with busi-
ness—not club it to submission and death.

Tonight the city council should approve the new fran-
chise as it is submitted, and pass it on to the people for
their vote.

Butter Battles Looming Today Over Controversial Measures

House Rules Committee Advances Relative's Clause For Welfare Bill, Pushes Proposal for General Vote on Recall of Arizona Retirement Act

By LESTER E. INSKIP
The House Rules Committee today
of the current welfare bill may be the most explosive day
of legislation now pending.

One bill is a measure which
will give welfare recipients the right to sue for the children of
children are well able to care for
them, thus leaving more money for
those in actual need.

Lobby Fighting
The provision, which is the
subject of a bill, is being fought
by the welfare recipients. The bill
is being fought by the welfare
recipients. The bill is being
fought by the welfare recipients.

The bill is being fought by the
welfare recipients. The bill is
being fought by the welfare
recipients. The bill is being
fought by the welfare recipients.

The bill is being fought by the
welfare recipients. The bill is
being fought by the welfare
recipients. The bill is being
fought by the welfare recipients.

The bill is being fought by the
welfare recipients. The bill is
being fought by the welfare
recipients. The bill is being
fought by the welfare recipients.