

Herald and News

Editorial Page

Compact Should Be Kept Alive

It is most unfortunate that the Washington state legislature heeded the cries of the public power advocates and killed the Columbia Compact. The action relieves the Oregon legislature from further consideration at this time, because the Compact required that it must be ratified by Oregon, Washington, Montana and Idaho before it could be submitted to Congress for authorization. Up to the time it was killed in Washington, the Compact had a good chance for passage this year, as both Idaho and Montana legislative bodies had approved it.

Admittedly, the Compact had been watered down through the years to the point where it had become hardly more than another advisory agency. Still, it would be better than nothing.

Now, we assume, we can anticipate a flurry of activity in support of establishment of a

Columbia Valley Authority or similar federal agency to step into the vacuum left through the lack of effective state action. With the death of the Compact, public power and socialized electric power advocates will redouble their efforts to set up another TVA in the Pacific Northwest.

The time, money and effort spent on the Compact is not entirely wasted. Each of the seven states had appointed good men to represent them in the proceedings leading to writing of the Compact, and there is presently a greater understanding of the individual state problems leading to development of water resources. While it seems wasted effort to keep submitting the Compact to the legislatures, we are hopeful that representatives of the states involved will continue to meet and discuss ways of implementing an effective program.

Federal Tax Reform

"For four years there has been before the Congress legislation to reform federal tax rates to permit greater economic progress. Over roughly the same period, federal spending has increased \$11 billion, and retarded economic growth has emerged as the nation's chronic problem. If the revenue consumed in the increased spending had been retained in the private economy through tax rate reform, we would already be moving into a new era of more rapid and sustainable economic growth."

Thus begins a joint statement recently issued by Representative A. S. Herlong Jr. (D-Fla.) and Representative Howard H. Baker (R-Tenn.). It was made on the occasion of the re-introduction of the Herlong-Baker Bill for tax reform and tax reduction. This, in their view, is an absolute must if America's economic supremacy is to be maintained, and if the needed degree of economic growth is to be obtained. As they see it, "The philosophy underlying the federal tax system is as outmoded as the breadline." It destroys and prevents the accumulation of capital which otherwise would go into the making of jobs and the production of goods and services. It thus amounts to a brake on growth and progress. It also stands in the way of the creation of the new sources of taxation which are an automatic part of economic development.

In a previous joint statement, Representatives Herlong and Baker said: "Combined with men's energy, vision and technological skill, capital is the source of all economic progress. Its beneficial effect starts with employment. The production of capital goods itself provides jobs. Then, these goods are used to increase the productivity of existing jobs and to create new production and new jobs." The whole purpose of their bill is to put more capital to work in this fashion.

The bill provides for tax reform and tax reduction on a graduated basis over a 5-year period. All individual and corporate income tax rates would be cut. At the end of the five years, the individual brackets would run from 15 per cent up to 47 per cent, as against 20 per cent to 91 per cent now. The corporation tax would be reduced from the present 52 per cent to 47 per cent. The bill also provides for more realistic depreciation rates, decreased estate and gift taxes, and more liberal capital gains provisions. As a safety valve, reductions could be postponed in any year in which an unbalanced budget was threatened.

The reduction in federal revenue in any one year would not be greater than three and one-half billion dollars. And that much new revenue is gained with a growth of three and one-half per cent in our economic output. Students of the problem are convinced that our growth, if the Herlong-Baker provisions were in force, would be substantially greater.

The authors of the bill emphasize that its intent "is to give priority for use of the revenue gain to tax rate reform over any and all spending on new or old programs except that necessary for national security." And stress is laid on the need for economies in non-defense federal spending.



JIM BISHOP: REPORTER...

Tears For The Dead Come From The Living

The exit from life is more important than the entrance. We are born unconscious of the event, and sometimes we leave in the same state. Still, when it is time to step off stage, most of us have an idea that the curtain is going down. Most people go gracefully.

In line of duty, I have seen many people make the final adieu. Some were in bed. Some were in the street. Five were in electric chairs. One, a little boy with blond hair and apple cheeks, died of rheumatic fever. Of all the exits, his left the most lasting impression on me because of what he said.

He looked up at an older sister and said: "I'm going to die, ain't I?" and the girl said: "No, what makes you say that?" He pointed to his parents at the foot of the bed. "Because Mommy and Daddy are crying."

In the long march of man across the face of history, it matters not whether he left at the age of 11 or at the age of 77. He was here—as all of us are—at the will of God. He put us here for a purpose and for a time, and when the time is up, we go. He will judge us by our deeds and, in my opinion, it is better to go in innocence than to live longer and be laden with crimes.

I have always been puzzled by people with a morbid fear of death. One cannot live forever and the body betrays us more and more with each passing year. Death holds terror only for the living. It is pointless to grieve for those who have gone, because

they have made the final trip to life everlasting. If you must grieve, do it for the next of kin. They are the ones who are hurt.

When the chips are down, I think that women have more courage than men. They are nervous, emotional people throughout most of their lives, and they complain about imaginary aches and ills, but, they are serene when the book is ready to be closed.

My maternal grandmother was Mary McSwiggen Tier. Her face was etched with sharp lines when the time came. She was in bed in the back room at 41 Randolph Avenue, Jersey City. She was conscious and she called her two daughters into the room. One was my mother; one was Aunt Etta. She talked to them and they started to cry. "Go downtown on Newark Avenue," she said, "and buy me a nice dress to be buried in. Get me something blue or orchid, with long sleeves. A lace yoke would be nice if you can find one. And stop that damn crying—God forgive me!"

They obeyed. Their eyes were red. Hers weren't. They came back with the dress and put it on a hanger and hung it on the bedroom door so that she could see. "That's nice," she said, approvingly. "That's very nice." In a few days she was gone.

My paternal grandmother was Mary Murphy Bishop. She was born in the City of Cork. When her time came, she was living with my Aunt Margaret McCarthy. It was a cold night in January. She was a tiny woman with cheeks like Queen Victoria and a

little bun of snowy hair on her head.

In the middle of the night, she called "Margaret! Margaret!" My grandmother was deep in the eighties and she had sustained a heart attack. It was the last one. Aunt Margaret phoned for a priest and a doctor. The priest was young. When he came into the room, blowing the intense cold off his hands, she raised herself on one elbow and said:

"What are you doing here on such a cold night? A young man like you needs his sleep."

He told her to shhh. She looked at him and smiled apologetically. "What would an old woman like me have to confess?" she said. It was a question of inarguable logic. Still, he went through the ritual of Extreme Unction and grandma resigned herself to it. When he was finished, she thanked him kindly, and died.

Both ladies had lived full lives and, in advanced years, they became bored with life. It was like sitting through a movie the second time. Grandma Bishop said: "She knew the plot and the whole cast of characters. Not long ago, my father was in a half-kidding, half-serious mood and he said: 'When I go, remember, no tears. In my time I have lived two and a half lives. I'm far ahead of the game.'"

He coughed noisily. "And for goodness' sake, if anybody comes to the services, please offer him a drink."

After all, the end is the true beginning...



Goldberg Emerging As Strong Man In Kennedy's Top Flight

By JAMES MARLOW Associated Press News Analyst WASHINGTON (AP)—It's that time in the life of a new administration when looking at the President's Cabinet is like examining a chorus line to guess who'll star.

By this time in President Eisenhower's first administration three of his Cabinet already were tagged as standouts: Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, Treasury Secretary George M. Humphrey and Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson.

It's not that easy with President Kennedy's Cabinet. Yet, he has some extremely forceful men around him. But so far Labor Secretary Arthur J. Goldberg has had far more attention than the others.

Dulles, Humphrey and Wilson all lived up to early expectations, but in different ways, and were on stage till the end of their service. Dulles and Humphrey be-

came dominant and controversial. Wilson, who occasionally popped off to his own disadvantage, was as controversial as either of the other two but never seemed to acquire their authoritative voice.

By comparison the rest of that first Eisenhower team—with the exception of Agriculture Secretary Ezra Taft Benson—remained shadowy figures.

Goldberg is only because of the events which immediately began to overtake him, so far has given the impression of more speed than anyone else in the Kennedy Cabinet. His problems, of course, were of the kind to make headlines.

First, he had to settle a tugboat strike which had New York in knots; then he had to settle an airline strike which had the nation in knots. He made a trip through the depressed areas, appeared repeatedly before Congress, and even flew to Miami to talk turkey to the AFL-CIO Executive Council.

Some of the others in the Cabinet will move up front and center as their problems multiply. So far they've stayed pretty much out of sight, as if hibernating until spring.

It's doubtful Secretary of State Dean Rusk will ever get the publicity of Dulles. He's not the type. Dulles was undisputed boss of foreign policy, went in for dramatics, was leaned on heavily by Eisenhower.

Rusk lacks Dulles' sense of dramatics, doesn't push himself or his ideas into the spotlight, seems determined to let Kennedy make the big statements in the foreign field.

Except for a few statements Agriculture Secretary Orville L. Freeman has been in the background. And this is a guess—unless his farm programs strike sparks he isn't likely to be a fiery figure.

J. Edward Day, by the very nature of his job as postmaster general, isn't front page material. And there's nothing theatrical about Abraham A. Ribicoff, secretary of health, education and welfare, an earnest, quiet man. The rest of the Cabinet

is unpredictable. The President's brother, Robert F. Kennedy, attorney general, isn't apt to cause problems for the President by pushing forward.

He is, however, a very active young man. And his actions, rather than his words, may assume an extremely important role in any appraisal of the Kennedy administration.

Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall, aggressive and outspoken, almost certainly won't stay quiet to avoid conflict. It's too soon to guess about Luther H. Hodges, secretary of commerce.

Traditionally, though, that job doesn't produce fireworks. Two men to watch are Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara and Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon. Both have played pretty much while getting their house in order.

But both are strong men, with brains.

Almanac

By United Press International Today is Monday, March 13, the 72nd day of the year with 293 more to follow in 1961. The moon is approaching its new quarter. The morning stars are Jupiter and Saturn. The evening stars are Venus and Mars.

On this day in history: In 1733, Joseph Priestley, the English chemist who discovered oxygen, was born.

In 1791, "The Rights of Man" by Thomas Paine was published in London.

In 1852, a cartoon depicting Uncle Sam as the symbol of the United States appeared for the first time, in the New York Lantern.

In 1888, impeachment proceedings against President Andrew Johnson got under way in the Senate.

In 1933, banks throughout the country began to open following the bank holiday proclaimed March 3 by President Roosevelt.

Woodland Walk

- ACROSS 1 Sub device 2 Tropical tree 3 Hardwood tree 10 A few 11 Occurs (poet) 12 States or Long 20 Disbelieve 21 Senior 17 Small devil 18 Wise men 19 Sewing tools 23 Snow vehicle 21 French king 24 Donkey 27 Sorrowful cry 28 Indians 32 Sand back 34 Drink 36 honorable 37 Fathers 38 Whip 39 Sora 41 Distress signal 42 Edge 44 Sacred image 46 Prosperity 49 Female relative 53 Japanese outcast 54 Payment solicitor 56 Existed 57 Girl's nickname 58 Nested boxes 59 Pronoun 60 Arguments 61 Browns DOWN 1 Fish 2 Plastic ingredient 3 Warble 4 Detroit 5 Pet dog (ab.) 6 Things to be done 7 Unspirited

Answer to Previous Puzzle

Grid with words filled in: YUKON, WHITE, ANGLE, BASED, SNIPES, ESTATE, MKT, OTTO, GER, PIER, SW, BERN, EDEN, TACISM, VIE, IDA, BEA, UER, GARLES, EIANE, BIANE, TIM, GOR, ELS, KEP, ROE, ELATER, BODINE, ETUDE, DULCE, GENES, OLYER, 40 Having corridors 48 Vended 43 Mohammedan sacred city 45 Legal 46 Stitches 47 Western state 48 Vended 50 Heating device 51 Cereal 52 Love god 55 Spanish article



EDSON IN WASHINGTON

Foreign Aid Faces Stiff Opposition

By PETER EDSON Washington Correspondent Newspaper Enterprise Assn. WASHINGTON (NEA)—Efforts to beat down the U.S. foreign aid program are going full tilt while the Kennedy administration is still trying to decide what its future policy shall be.

Principal argument of the groups against foreign aid is that the United States can't afford to send more billions overseas while the U.S. balance of payments situation is so precarious and the U.S. domestic economy is so disturbed.

This argument has a strong appeal to businessmen feeling the pinch of recession, to the unemployed and to Congressmen whose principal interest is cutting any and all government expenses, particularly abroad.

Henry R. Labouisse Jr. has only recently been confirmed and sworn in as new director of the U.S. International Cooperation Administration which administers foreign aid. He has been, however, working with White House and State Department officials on details of a new program to be sent Congress later in the year.

Its broad outlines were sketched in President Kennedy's State of the Union message. He called then for central policy direction of all U.S. foreign aid programs "that now so often overlap, conflict and diffuse our energies."

Since the Marshall Plan was set up there have been four such reorganizations. First it was Economic Cooperation Administration, then Mutual Security Administration, then Foreign Operations Administration and now International Cooperation Administration.

By whatever name they call it next—thereby further confusing countries receiving aid—what is being sought now is a turnaround that will head the programs in new directions. No policy has been agreed on yet.

But in his State of the Union message the President said he would ask Congress for authority to establish a new and more effective program to assist the economic, educational and social de-

velopment of other countries and continents—a new emphasis. He did not mention the military aid programs, though it would be wrong to assume from this they will be left out.

This year about \$2.4 billion is appropriated for military aid and defense support activities, with \$1.1 billion for scattered economic assistance and relief programs.

This aid is now being administered—as someone has described it—a good bit like assistance to the New York, New Haven and Hartford railroad. This is to keep it from bankruptcy. About all such aid does is buy time. This is often expensive, as has been proved in places like Korea and Nationalist China.

The kind of aid administered frequently determines the kind of government the receiving countries get. If a lot of military aid is given, a general emerges as head of government, as in Pakistan or Turkey. This may not promote democracy and economic growth.

To get the U.S. foreign aid program out of this rut of just keeping the recipient countries from going bankrupt, it is now proposed that more U.S. foreign aid be matched by native capital for investment in new enterprises and economic development. America can't furnish all the capital needed forever.

One other requisite of President Kennedy's is that larger contributions must be made by America's allies for aid to the new and less developed countries.

A start in this direction has been made by West Germany's recent agreement to finance a foreign aid program of its own. But the German parliament must first ratify this and appropriate money for it. German funds may therefore not become available before next January.

It is conceded that the German contribution to international foreign aid may be large. But first reports that this would be a billion dollars a year are now said to be exaggerated. The size of the German contribution may be determined by contributions made by other foreign countries.



THE DOCTOR SAYS...

Abnormalities Not Always Hereditary

By HAROLD T. HYMAN, M.D. Written for Newspaper Enterprise Assn.

In recent years we've learned that many of the abnormalities present at birth are not truly congenital, in the sense that they're hereditary, but acquired in the sense that they occurred during the carrying period.

To use a word you'll be reading more about in the near future, they're embryopathic, meaning that they took place while the developing infant was resident within the mother's body.

Now let me explain that this differentiation is no mere hairsplitting, as you'll understand when I give you details of a disturbing letter sent by a well-meaning mother who, quite understandably, is uninformed in this complex field of medicine.

The great difference between hereditary and embryopathic dis-

turbances lies in the fact that the latter, being acquired, are not handed down from generation to generation.

Stated in positive terms, the child who is born with an embryopathic defect or deformity will not transmit that defect or deformity to his or her own children.

"I am a widow," writes the good mother who brings this subject to our attention, "and I have a son who was born blind. He had eight operations when a child but none of them did any good. We spent our life's savings on these operations and his education. He is a musician and plays organ and accordion. The only income he has is his blind pension and what little he can make with his music."

"And now to my problem. He is going to marry this summer and his fiancée has just partial sight. I am afraid that if they should have a child it might be blind, too. I know what suffering that would cause parents with small means and a child who would never see. Is there any medication he can get that would keep him from being fertile? Please help me in this matter."

I can indeed help you in this matter, dear mother. But not in the way you might imagine.

Since you do not state that either you or your husband suffered any visual defect and your letter is well written in a firm hand, I am going to assume that your son's blindness was embryopathic. As such, it is not transmissible to the next generation. And if this is also true of the partial blindness of his fiancée, as is most likely, there is no reason to fear for the visual acuity of their child or children.

Would it not be an act of cruel injustice to deprive this young couple, who've already had more than their share of suffering, of the joys of parenthood? And, although my experience is limited to only one blind couple blessed with offspring, I can assure you that your grandchild-to-be will probably be just about the most beloved youngster in your community. Or, for that matter, in any other. He'll not be packed in the back seat while his parents traipse around the countryside or go to a drive-in late, late movie. And he'll have no baby sitter to tend him while his parents are gallivanting around.

"How about casting out fear, grandmother-to-be, and getting started on some sort of knitting assignment?" Baby booties, for example?

Mr. Lyle Hartzell Sr. Florence, Oregon

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Lost Freedom

Most people think of revolution as the violent overthrow of government and cannot conceive that it can be just as completely destroyed a little at a time from within.

In my opinion the United States is not too far from the final stages of just such a revolution which started as the new deal in 1933.

We are turning our republic, which was probably the finest system the world has ever known, into one similar to the totalitarian governments which have prevailed in many foreign countries from ancient times.

A few of those responsible were true revolutionaries working for the international communist conspiracy who have been following a brilliantly conceived and superlatively executed plan for the communist conquest of the world, but the vast majority are misguided intellectuals who believe they are building a new order where all people will enjoy a happier life, free from want, with security for all.

To accomplish this the wealth of our country is being redistributed through excessive taxation and vast spending programs. While these architects of the new order vehemently deny they are socialists, they are following quite closely the socialist plan, which does not create new wealth but will only be successful until the wealth produced by the free enterprise system is squandered and then human nature being what it is, compulsion becomes necessary to insure production.

Bureaus must be set up to make and enforce the thousands of rules and regulations inherent in this system, which, when it reaches this stage is changing from socialism to a bureaucratic dictatorship.

These bureaus are constantly enlarged, become hard to control and finally become so complicated that one bureau may at the same time be carrying on projects in direct opposition to one another. A good example of this is the mess caused by government med-