

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE

Published Daily Except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO. 27-29 North Fir St. Phone 2-6141

Subscription Rates: By Mail—In Advance Per Copy 10c. Daily and Sunday—One year \$15.00

Official Paper of the City of Medford. Official Paper of Jackson County. United Press—Full Leased Wire

NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION. PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION

NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS 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. Jan. 7, 1947 (Tuesday). Committees to head various functions in the annual March of Dimes drive are being named

20 YEARS AGO. Jan. 7, 1937 (Thursday). First meeting of the Rogue Snowmen this year is announced today by Sam Jennings, president.

30 YEARS AGO. Jan. 7, 1927 (Friday). The plant of the Southern Oregon Clay Products company near Central Point has been taken over by the West Coast Clay Products corporation.

40 YEARS AGO. Jan. 7, 1917 (Sunday). Medynski forces this afternoon quashes plans for debate between Earl Fehl and John G. Pierce on merits of Hansen plan.

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

7. Was Montgomery the capital of Alabama in 1845? 2. Who was nicknamed "Good Queen Bess"?

3. "Now it came to pass in the days of Ahasuerus" is the opening line in which Book of the Bible? 4. Correct the following: "I love fine materials."

5. London: 10 Downing street is the residence of which official? 6. The most frequently ordered dessert in American restaurants is pie; true or false?

7. What is a "sanctum sanctorum"? 8. Is the city of "Buffalo Bill" in Montana, Wyoming, or Kansas?

9. "Or" is used with "either," should it also be used with "neither"? 10. "She watches him as a cat would watch a rat" what?

Answers: 1. No. Tuscaloosa was until 1845. 2. Elizabeth I. 3. Esther. 4. "I like fine materials." 5. Prime Minister of England. 6. True. 7. Holy of Holies. 8. Wyoming. (Cody). 9. No. "Not" should be used. 10. "Mouse." —Swift.

Goose-Step To Be Out In New German Army. Bonn, Germany — (UPI) — The new West German army will not reintroduce the goose-step, Defense Minister Franz Josef Strauss declared today.

Neither will it bring in a "snappier" form of saluting as press reports have stated, he said. "Both reports are a sheer invention intended to do harm," Strauss said.

Annexation Costs

Next week the city council will conduct a public hearing on the proposal to annex the Kenwood and Grandview districts to the city of Medford.

- 1. It can vote the area into the city; 2. It can vote to prevent the area from becoming part of the city; or 3. It can refer the matter to a vote of Medford residents for decision.

THE decision is one of some importance. If annexation is denied, the residents of the areas involved (who voted by a good margin to approve annexation) will be right back where they started, lacking the basic city services, principally sewage disposal, they need so badly.

If, however, annexation is approved, it will cost the city and its taxpayers more money than they are now paying. Not much money, as those things go these days—but still a sum which should be considered.

THE added expense will be chargeable to the water department (for the added costs of other city services will be paid for by increased income resulting from annexation) and will total just under \$14,000 per year, much of it for debt service on bonds of the two existing water districts.

If the council approves annexation, there are at least two ways in which the money could be provided. One would be by a small property levy (0.41 of a mill on all city property). Another would be an increase in water rates.

Since the needed money is chargeable to the water department, the latter method seems more equitable than making it a general obligation of city property.

IF THE water-rate-increase method is adopted, the amount of the increase would average about 18 cents per water connection per month.

But since there are 26 different sizes and classes of service, the increases would vary with the type of service, some more than 18 cents, some less.

Bob Lee, the city water superintendent, has prepared a schedule which could be adopted if the rate-increase plan is adopted for financing the water department's added costs due to annexation. The increases proposed range from 15 cents (for 5/8-inch metered connection in residential and commercial classifications) to \$2.50 (for a 4-inch metered service, of which there are only a few, mostly institutions or major commercial concerns).

Most of the increases would be 25 cents, for customers on a flat rate service with 3/4 or 1 inch connections.

UNDER this schedule, the highest amount anyone now in the city would pay as his share of enlarging Medford would be \$30 per year. The minimum would be \$1.80. The largest number would pay \$3.

Why should city residents pay more to make it possible for those outside the city to come in? What would they get out of it? Would it be worth it?

Like so many other questions which arise in the course of progress, the benefits are difficult to measure in the same dollars-and-cents terms as the costs.

HOW CAN we measure lessened hazard of disease and epidemics, brought about by improved sanitary facilities for our neighbors?

How can we measure pride in a larger, more effective city, with better police and fire protection for those now living on the outskirts?

How can we measure benefits of better streets, better lighting, better sewer and water service for those now doing without them?

We could, of course, rise up and say, in effect, "To heck with them. They built their homes outside the city. Now let them stew in their own juice. Not all of them want to come into the city anyway."

OR WE could, on the other hand, provide the answer which has been so often given before in similar situations — welcoming the chance to assist in the orderly and progressive growth of Medford as a city in which we can take pride.

This takes time; it takes money; it takes patience and understanding of the problems of others. But in the long run it is the course of wisdom and progress and good government.—E.A.

"Thank You" Letters

What to do with "thank-you" letters? That is a problem which frequently faces newspaper editors. The type of letter to which we refer is the one which is submitted for publication which thanks "everyone" for their kindness during a recent illness, or after a fire, or flood, or at some sort of personal crisis.

The problem for editorial decision is whether or not to permit the "letters to the editor" column to be used as an easy way for a person to say "thank you" to a lot of people.

Polish Leader Facing Biggest Test at Elections January 20

By CHARLES M. McCANN United Press Correspondent

Vladyslaw Gomulka, Poland's Communist leader, faces his biggest test since he led his country's fight against Russian domination last October.

On Jan. 20, about 18 million Poles will vote in an election to fill the 459 seats in the Sejm, the single-chamber parliament. To a great extent, the election will be a vote for or against Gomulka personally.

There is no doubt that Gomulka's Communists — the United Polish Workers' party — will win.

But unless they roll up a convincingly big vote, the stocky, hard-faced man who used to be called Poland's "little Stalin" will be in a dangerous position.

And though Gomulka is a dedicated, hard-core Communist, there is little doubt that Soviet Russian leaders would be glad if he took a beating. They have accepted his victory for independent Communism. But they have done so only because they had to.

Purged as Titoist A card-carrying Communist

since his youth. Gomulka was purged in 1948 as a "Titoist." He was brought back as first secretary of the Communist party after the Poznan riots which opened the east European satellite reply against Russian dictatorship.

Since that dramatic week late last October when Gomulka and his fellow leaders defied Russia and established an independent Communist regime, Gomulka has been walking a political tight rope.

First, he has had to keep under control the bitter enmity of Poles to Russia and to the continued presence of Russian troops on Polish soil.

An outbreak which could decide the Soviet government to intervene as it did in Hungary could come at any time if Gomulka lost control.

Secondly, Gomulka has had to take the blame for Poland's desperate economic situation.

Poland may have won freedom from Russian domination, but it still is faced by bad housing conditions, food shortages and high prices.

Thirdly, Polish workers, students and intellectuals are demanding greater political freedom. They want a really representative parliament, Gomulka is in no position to concede that even if he wanted to.

As the election machinery has been worked out, there will be about 730 candidates for the 459 seats in the Sejm.

Candidates Hand Picked The candidates are being selected by commissions representing various political, trade and other groups.

The candidates will be put on a single ticket under the names of the United Workers, United Peasants and Democratic parties. All are really Communist.

Voters will have some choice in electing candidates, for there will be more candidates than seats. Gomulka is permitting independents to run also, provided they are approved by the nominating commissions.

The danger to Gomulka is that some of those who complain of bad economic conditions, who want to get the Russians completely out of the country or who demand a representative parliament threaten to boycott the election.

If there really is a substantial boycott, Gomulka will be weakened.

Hence, it looks as if a convincing victory for Gomulka, even though he is a Communist, will be a defeat for Moscow and a good thing for Poland at the moment.

In the Day's News

By FRANK JENKINS

President Eisenhower presented to the new congress Saturday his much-talked-about-lately proposal to head off communist conquest of the Middle East—which has seemed to be forecast recently by heavy concentrations of Russian military power in Syria.

The gravity of his proposal is indicated by the fact that this is believed to be the first time in our history when a President has addressed a new congress on a specific issue BEFORE delivering to it his State of the Union message.

That conveys the thought that the President believes no time should be lost.

THE message contains 3,200 words, but the heart of it is included in three basic recommendations, of which this is the first:

A grant of authority (to the President by the congress) for the United States to cooperate with "any nation or group of nations in the general area of the Middle East" in the development of economic strength dedicated to the maintenance of NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE.

That means maintenance of the status quo in the Middle East.

RECOMMENDATION No. 2 requests from the congress authority for the President to undertake in the Middle East programs of military assistance and cooperation WITH ANY NATIONS DESIRING SUCH AID.

That means we won't force our aid on anybody. If any existing nation or group of nations in the Middle East wants our help, they must ASK FOR IT first. (That also is slanted toward maintenance of the status quo — which means keeping things as they are.)

RECOMMENDATION No. 3 asks for authority from the congress for the use of American military force to protect nations of the Middle East "against overt armed aggression from any nation CONTROLLED BY INTERNATIONAL COMMUNISM."

That is the recommendation that puts teeth in the Eisenhower proposal. It asks authority to USE AMERICAN MILITARY FORCE TO PREVENT RUSSIA FROM TAKING OVER THE MIDDLE EAST.

THE President added that the measures he recommended would have to be in agreement with present U.S. treaty obligations, including the United Nations charter. This means, he said, that any program now adopted would, in the event of armed attack in the Middle East, have to be subject to the overriding authority of the United Nations security council.

That is to say, any military action we may take will be taken with the agreement and consent of—and probably in the name of—the U.N. It indicates, however, the President's belief that in itself the U.N. is weak and powerless. He is proposing that if worse comes to worse WE SUPPLY THE POWER the U.N. lacks.

A WORD more here in the way of background: In any intelligent consideration of the Russian problem, we must remember that Russia's long-range program is to DESTROY US. Our policies must be tailored to prevent that. Russia, of course, is against the West—but primarily her inflexible objective must be to destroy us, because we are the STRONG RIGHT ARM of the West. Without us, the rest of what we call the free world would be helpless.

We are believed to be presently superior in modern armament to Russia. But the general expectation is that in time Russia will catch up with us. She is directing her whole economy toward that end—denying the comforts of life to her people so that her whole national effort may be concentrated on increasing her power to make war.

We are undertaking to do both—to provide our people with an ever-advancing standard of living while at the same time building our armament. Russia hopes, by concentrating on armament, to move faster in that direction than we can move.

THIS is the big question: Shall we just WAIT until Russia tackles us, or shall we begin NOW to take preventive measures (such as holding the Middle East, with its strategic location and its vast stores of oil) that fall short of a preventive war?

CASH! A DIVISION OF PACIFIC FINANCE. PACIFIC INDUSTRIAL. Dick Hans, Manager. 16 S. Central • Ph. 3-5308

Matter of Fact By Stewart Alsop

IN THE KREMLIN AND THE WHITE HOUSE

Washington — At almost the same time that President Eisenhower was conferring last week with Congressional leaders in the White House, Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev was addressing a banquet in the Kremlin.

There was a direct connection between what happened in the Kremlin and what happened in the White House.

Khrushchev was, it seems, in an excellent mood. The most significant part of his speech has been largely overlooked. The United Nations, he said, had called on Britain and France to halt the aggression in Egypt. And what happened? Nothing. Then comrade Bulganin had sent a little letter to Eden and Molot. And what happened? Within hours, the British and French had promised to withdraw their forces.

At the White House, the President, to support his request for a Congressional resolution empowering him to oppose Soviet aggression in the Middle East, gave the Congressional leaders a briefing on the situation there. It was described as "somber." And Secretary of State Dulles added a further somber note when he remarked: "If the Russians go into the Middle East, and we don't stop them, we are gone."

THE connection between the scene in the White House and the scene in the Kremlin is clear, if one recalls the sequence of events during the Middle East crisis. On Oct. 31, without prior consultation with the United States, British Prime Minister Sir Anthony Eden announced the forthcoming Anglo-French intervention in Egypt. On Nov. 1,

Secretary Dulles submitted to the United Nations a resolution calling for an immediate ceasefire. It was promptly vetoed by Britain and France.

Meanwhile, the Soviet press suddenly blossomed with accounts of how 75,000 "volunteers" were to be sent to fight with the Egyptians against the "imperialists." On Nov. 5, Moscow Radio broadcast the purported text of a letter from Soviet Premier Bulganin to Eden and French Premier Guy Mollet, asking them how they would feel if a "stronger power" used "rocket systems" against Britain and France.

The threat was scarcely veiled. On Nov. 6, at 7 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, a cease-fire in Egypt was declared in effect.

DOUGLAS DILLON, American Ambassador to France, spelled out the meaning of this sequence of events when he was in Washington a few weeks ago. He said, in effect, that the controlling factor in the French and British decision to accept a ceasefire in Egypt was not the United Nations resolution or United States policy but Soviet threats to use force. This was perhaps a tactless thing to say, but like many tactless things, it was almost certainly true.

It is true, at the very least, that informed persons, whether in Cairo or London or Washington or Moscow, believe that the Anglo-French intervention was halted, and Colonel Nasser's bacon saved, not by "moral forces" but by Soviet threats. And the fact that this is believed in Moscow—represents a grave danger to the West. For where threats have succeeded once, there is always a strong temptation to threaten again.

At the time, there were those, especially in the Pentagon, who believed that the Soviet threats were sheer bluff, and that the bluff should be called. The United States Sixth Fleet, they believed, had the undoubted capability of stopping Soviet "volunteers" from reaching Egypt in significant numbers. The United States had at least as much right to send volunteers to Hungary where brutal Soviet actions had been condemned by the U.N., as the Soviets had to send volunteers to Egypt.

FINALLY, the United States is absolutely committed to retaliate against any attack on Britain and France with a massive counter-attack on the Soviet Union. Those who wished to call the bluff wanted these facts spelled out as quickly, firmly, and publicly as possible. The President ruled otherwise. Perhaps he was right. There is always a risk in calling a bluff, since it may not turn out to be a bluff after all. At any rate, the connection between Khrushchev's boasts and the scene in the White House is obvious.

The proposal for a Congressional resolution restating the American intention to resist with force Soviet aggression is not motivated by any real belief that the Soviets are planning an armed invasion of the Middle East. The resolution is intended, instead, to quote one of those present at the White House briefing, "to tell the world, and especially the Russians, that the United States has not suddenly turned pacifist."

No doubt the Congressional resolution will serve that purpose. But it will not erase the damage to the West resulting from the seeming success of the Soviet threats. And it is at least worth asking in retrospect whether the world should ever have been permitted to conclude that the United States had "suddenly turned pacifist."

Copyright 1957, New York Herald Tribune Inc.

Today and Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann

CONGRESSIONAL POWERS

Although a group of northern Senators attempted to limit the right to filibuster—the right,

that is to say, of unlimited debate in order to prevent a vote on a bill—it would have been a spectacular surprise if the Senate had voted to amend its rules. The amendment would have required not only a big majority of the Senators. The Senators would have had to have been in a mood to fight for the amendment to the bitter end and at the risk of stalling all the other business of the Senate. For Rule XXII, which allows the filibuster, is in effect a veto, held by the southern states, on Federal legislation dealing with the relations of Negroes and whites.

It is interesting to note the history of the filibuster. As summarized by Mr. Irving Brant, the biographer of President Monroe, the right to filibuster did not exist in the early days of the Republic. From 1789 until 1806 debate could be ended at any time by a vote of the majority of the Senators present. From 1806 until 1917, there was no limitation on debate. In 1917, on the eve of our entrance into the first World War, the filibuster was used to block war-like measures which the Wilson administration was proposing. It was then that a cloture rule was adopted, providing that a debate could be ended by a vote of two-thirds of the Senators who were present and voting. As Mr. Brant points out, under this rule, supposing there were 20 Senators absent, debate could be ended by a vote of 51 to 25—that is to say, by a very few more than a majority of all the Senators.

THE interesting and significant fact is that in 1949 the Senate amended its rules in favor of the filibuster, and to make it virtually impossible to limit debate. It adopted the famous Rule XXII, which some of the northern Senators are now trying to amend.

Rule XXII does two things. Debate can be ended only if 64 Senators are present and vote affirmatively to end it. Thus if 63 Senators voted to end debate, while only 13 voted not to end debate, the 13 would prevail and the debate could not be ended. Then, to protect this right of filibuster, Rule XXII provides that there is an unlimited right to filibuster against an attempt to amend Rule XXII itself.

WHAT happened in 1949? What happened was the Truman administration, with its determination to pass Federal laws dealing with race relations. Although there was unlimited debate in the Senate for more than a century and until the first World War, the right to filibuster was never entrenched as it has been since 1949. The proof is that in 1917 the Senate did adopt a rule for closing debate. It was not until 1949 that Rule XXII virtually deprived the Senate of the right to amend Rule XXII. It is plain enough that Rule XXII was designed to establish what is tantamount to a southern veto on the problems which may be subject to Federal legislation.

The real issue in the argument about Rule XXII is whether Congress may legislate in the field of race relations. It is because Truman and then Eisenhower have wanted to legislate in this

field that Rule XXII will almost certainly be kept in force.

The movement in this century towards desegregation and against legal and economic discrimination is one of the most impressive phenomena of our era. But it is highly unlikely that Federal legislation will be allowed to play much of a part in this movement. The movement will proceed mainly by local actions that reflect extraordinary change of public opinion in almost all sections of the country.

ANOTHER interesting question about the powers of Congress is posed by the President's request for authority to use force in the Middle East. The theory of the Constitution is supposed to be that when the President tells Congress that a state of war exists or that a state of war should be declared, Congress then has the power to legalize the waging of war. In a case where the President is convinced before Congress is convened that war is inevitable or that it is necessary—as for example President Roosevelt before Pearl Harbor—the legal authority of Congress has acted as a powerful check upon the President's pre-war actions.

The Eisenhower procedure is to ask Congress to underwrite in advance, even if it means war, the moves the President may decide to take. In the nature of things it is impossible for the President to be specific or clear as to what moves he may feel impelled or compelled to make.

Therefore, a Congressional vote of the kind President Eisenhower is asking is in effect a vote of confidence and a Congressional commitment to support him in what follows.

Not every President would ask or could hope to get authority of this kind from Congress. If President Eisenhower asks for it, he will get it. But he will be incurring an obligation to keep Congress fully informed and closely advised not only as to what he does, but as to why he does it.

Copyright 1957 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

An estimated 50 miles of permanent piping for water lines and steam services are installed for tenants in the Empire State building.

FUNERAL SERVICES In Every Price Range Since 1908 PERL Funeral Home Phone 2-6675

FUNERAL SERVICES In Every Price Range Since 1908 PERL Funeral Home Phone 2-6675 AT PERL'S every family may make funeral arrangements which are in keeping with its means. A selection of services in every price range is offered to satisfy individual preferences and to meet all financial circumstances. Convenient terms? Certainly!