

Herald and News

# Editorial Page

## Right Votes, Wrong Places

The Republicans knew something was sadly wrong when, in the 1962 elections, they piled up 48 per cent of the total vote for U.S. House members but got just 40 per cent of the seats. Now they think they have the answer: bad districting.

If votes and seats were matched at 48 per cent, the GOP today would have 209 house seats instead of the 176 they won.

GOP researchers, seeking the reason they did not get those extra 33 places, took a hard look at congressional apportionment, nationwide. In a study now being privately circulated to governors, legislators and party officials, they concluded that:

A great deal of Republican strength is concentrated in oversized districts. Such districts are defined as those which have at least 15 per cent more population than each district would have if all within a state were equal in population.

The effect of oversize, of course, is often to give the winning party a far bigger cushion of votes than it has any use for. These show up in the total vote—but do not add seats. If some of the "extra" population were placed in a nearby district, it might give the party another seat.

Of the oversized districts in the nation, Republicans won 41, Democrats 44. That seems to put the Democrats in an even worse fix, but it is only part of the story. The balancing evidence is that the Democrats captured 64 seats in undersized districts, while the GOP won only 21 in such areas. The undersized naturally, are those which fall 15

per cent or more below the optimum size.

The party that wins most in the undersized districts obviously makes its votes count for more in seats. In the 88th Congress, one of every four Democrats but only one of every nine Republicans represents an undersized district.

In contrast, one of every four Republican lawmakers but one of every six Democrats represents an oversized district.

GOP studies show that 58 of 97 seats in the Old South (leaving out nine at-large posts) are either too large or too small to be rated fairly apportioned. Though Republicans increased their southern vote mightily in 1962, they won just 11 of the 97 districted seats—for a net gain of four.

Most of the too-fat districts, say the Republicans, are not big city areas but are either in medium-sized cities or in the badly under-represented suburbs, coast to coast.

The net effect of this study is to urge upon GOP leaders everywhere a new, comprehensive effort to achieve more equitable congressional apportionment, which might in turn yield a better party ratio of seats to votes.

The growth of the suburbs makes the matter reasonably urgent for the Republicans, for they count on building new strength there.

Yet many of the nation's 85 undersized districts are today represented by powerfully entrenched figures who pack great weight in their home states. One cannot imagine that they will give ground easily to changes that would make their areas more competitive.

## Proposed Constitution

(Medford Mail - Tribune)

The final report of the Oregon Constitution Revision Commission has been completed and printed. Some 3,000 copies are now being distributed. Free single copies are available to anyone requesting one from the Commission's office, Room 300, Capitol Building, Salem, Ore.

It is the commission's hope that it will be widely read and studied. For only if enough people take an active interest in the proposed new document will it have any chance for passage.

Copies of the report have been sent to circuit and district judges, public and private libraries, department heads, county offices,

school libraries, to the state libraries, governors and supreme courts of the 50 states, and to major universities.

The report not only contains the text of the proposed new Constitution; it also includes explanatory matter approved by the 17-member commission to give its thinking concerning the various changes, why they were made, and what effect they would have.

The commission was not unanimously in favor of all the changes, but was near-unanimous in recommending the document as a good one, worthy of serious consideration.

We suggest that it receive study by all those interested in effective state government.

## THESE DAYS . . .

### Yea-Saying In Politics

By JOHN CHAMBERLAIN

The Republicans in Congress are serving notice this year that they intend to offer "positive" alternatives to measures sponsored by the Democrats. This program for getting the GOP off the book of "negativism" and "obstructionism" is laudable. But it should be judged in the light of its end: every bit of Republican "alternative" legislation should be pitched toward restoring a greater measure of voluntary action in society. Compromises are permissible—but they should be compromises toward freedom, not away from it.

For my own part, I am skeptical of the benefits of too much "positivism" in legislation. Reading over the Ten Commandments the other day in Frances Hazlett's admirable condensation of Holy Writ called "The Concise Bible," they were just as I had remembered them. Nine of the Ten Commandments feature a flat "Thou shalt not"—the only "positive" commandment is the one to "honor thy father and thy mother." If the Lord as a law-giver is nine-tenths a "negativist," why is the rage for legislative "positivism" so admirable?

We have, of course, rewritten the Ten Commandments in recent years. Putting them into the fashionable modern non-King James English, they now read this way:

1. You shall have no other gods

## THEY SAY . . .

For although television serves the eyes and ears of millions of people . . . it is the press that speaks day after day for the heart of America.

Columbia University professor John Hohenberg, urging increased reporting on news of public service by the press.

Agriculture will have to speak with a more unified voice if it is to be heard (in Congress).

Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman.

before me—except when you are called to bow down before the Omnipotent State.

2. You shall not make any graven image, unless your public relations counselor has decided that your present natural image is keeping you from making money or getting elected to office.

3. You shall not take the name of the Lord thy Government in vain.

4. Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy for the pro football game. In it you shall not do any work that can be put off on mama and the kids.

5. Honor your father and your mother—but let "society" provide for their old age with Medicare.

6. You shall not kill, except that it is all right for the UN to kill Katangans in Africa.

7. You shall not commit adultery unless you are a famous international film star.

8. You shall not steal unless you can get permission to do it as a member of an organized pressure group.

9. You shall not bear false witness except against races or regions or groups or nations as a whole.

10. You shall not covet anything that is your neighbor's unless he happens to be in a higher tax bracket than yourself.

This we have tempered the Ten Commandments with the "positive" approach. Since it is obviously independent in return to the old-time simplicity of the Mosaic version of the Decalogue, the Republicans cannot hope to win elections by being nay-sayers. But they might begin to work back to reliance on traditional individualist morality by degrees.

For example, instead of inflicting the unison theft of more and more inflationary deficits on everybody, the Republicans might offer the following as a four-point proposition:

1. Instead of adding to compulsory Social Security, the Federal government might exempt any individual who can prove on his tax statement that he is already providing for such things as his old-age Medicare.

2. Instead of subsidizing rich farmers, the law might be turned around to provide for the poorer farmers pending the day when they will be able to turn their talents to other modes of life.

3. Instead of underwriting grandiose schemes of "urban redevelopment," the government might offer low-interest loans to free associations of local property owners who can present slum clearance or renovation programs of their own.

4. Instead of trying to compel labor and management to abide by federal "guide lines" in the matter of wages and prices and unemployment compensation, the government might offer simple tax rebates to companies willing to grant guaranteed annual wages.

Any such four-point proposition would involve a continuation of some governmental interference.

But the compromises involved would be toward more freedom than we have at present.

## Almanac

By United Press International  
Today is Thursday Jan. 24, the 24th day of 1963 with 341 to follow.

The moon is approaching its new phase.

The morning stars are Venus and Mars.

The evening stars are Mars, Jupiter, and Saturn.

On this day in history:  
In 1848, gold was first discovered in the Sacramento River near Coloma, Calif.

In 1908, the first Boy Scout troop was organized in England by a general in the British army, Robert Baden-Powell.

In 1945, Russian troops crossed the Oder River and landed on German soil for the first time.

In 1946, the General Assembly voted to create a U.N. Atomic Energy Commission.

A thought for the day—American humorist Ogden Nash once said: "Bankers are just like anybody else, except richer."



IN WASHINGTON . . .

## Sen. Goldwater And 1964

By RALPH de TOLEDANO  
Conservatives in Washington are still recovering from the shock of Sen. Barry Goldwater's statement that he would not decide until January of 1964 whether he will seek the Republican Presidential nomination. He has, they realize, put them in a box, for these reasons:

1. By the early days of next year, much of the organizational work which must precede a push for the nomination will have been done by those who seek it. Many delegations will be sufficiently committed to active candidates to make a switch to Senator Goldwater impossible.

2. Between now and next year, many supporters of Mr. Goldwater will be afraid to go out on a limb for him. They know that he is aware of the political realities and must have put off his de-

cision as a means of discouraging activity in his behalf. Money for delegate-gathering will be hard to come by.

3. At the same time, they cannot turn their backs on him. They are therefore prevented from seeking a new spokesman for American conservatism.

In effect, this means that any hope they might have had for setting the national GOP from "liberal" and "Wall Street" Republicans is doomed to failure. It is an axiom of politics that you can't fight somebody with nobody. But as they try to shut out the leading contender, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, this is precisely what Senator Goldwater is forcing them to do.

There is bitterness in conservative circles here for another reason. The more practical in those circles have conceded all along that Senator Goldwater had at best a long-shot chance to win the Republican nomination. But if he went into the 1964 GOP convention with a sizable bloc of delegates, he would be a real power in its deliberations. He could moderate the influence of such Republicans as Sen. Clifford Case of New Jersey and Sen. Jacob Javits of New York who wish to blur party lines by out-doing the New Frontiers and promising all things to almost all men.

Since 1940, left-of-center Republicans have dominated the Presidential nominating conventions and put their stamp on much of the quadrennial platform. Even Richard Nixon, whose major strength was in the Midwest, felt called upon to compromise with the Rockefeller forces in 1960—and this show of weakness may have cost him the election.

The Congressional Republican Party has far more accurately reflected the political sentiments of the grassroots GOP than the national party—which may account for the fact that of the roughly five million voters added to the rolls between 1958 and 1962, four-fifths voted for Republican Congressional candidates. It was the hope of moderate to solid conservatives that, whether or not they could nominate Mr. Goldwater in 1964, his candidacy for that designation would allow them to capture at least a part of the national party machinery.

There is, of course, a silver lining. Mr. Goldwater has pledged that in the present session of Congress he will devote himself almost exclusively to Senate business. In the past, he spent so much time traveling about the country—and as one Republican put it, "talking to college boys"—that he has been unable to exert the considerable leadership he might have had in Senate deliberations. If Mr. Goldwater sticks to his Senatorial list, it is being predicted, the Senate will not be as subservient to the Kennedy Administration as it was in the second session of the 87th Congress.

When we are young, everything familiar is boring and only the exotic attracts; when we are old, we begin to experience the odd reversal that everything exotic is boring, and only the familiar is attractive.

Why was Othello so easy to duped, so willing to believe in the infidelity of Desdemona? Not until we understand the answer to this question, can we grasp the true psychological nature of jealousy.

Even truer in the atomic age than when he spoke them two centuries ago are Liechtenberg's prophetic words: "Honest, unalloyed distrust of the powers of man is the surest sign of intelligence."

An administrator is too often someone who begins worrying about the "morale" of the staff only when it is so low that nothing but a change of administrators can help it.

Children who laugh uproariously at their reflections in the warped mirror of a fun-house have yet to learn that all mirrors are distorted ones, for none of us is capable of seeing his face as others see it, but only as he carefully poses it in the looking glass.

It is an error of the vulgar to believe that history repeats itself.

Even truer in the atomic age than when he spoke them two centuries ago are Liechtenberg's prophetic words: "Honest, unalloyed distrust of the powers of man is the surest sign of intelligence."

Even truer in the atomic age than when he spoke them two centuries ago are Liechtenberg's prophetic words: "Honest, unalloyed distrust of the powers of man is the surest sign of intelligence."

Even truer in the atomic age than when he spoke them two centuries ago are Liechtenberg's prophetic words: "Honest, unalloyed distrust of the powers of man is the surest sign of intelligence."

Even truer in the atomic age than when he spoke them two centuries ago are Liechtenberg's prophetic words: "Honest, unalloyed distrust of the powers of man is the surest sign of intelligence."

Even truer in the atomic age than when he spoke them two centuries ago are Liechtenberg's prophetic words: "Honest, unalloyed distrust of the powers of man is the surest sign of intelligence."



EDSON IN WASHINGTON . . .

## Budget Is A Natural For Wrecking Crew

By PETER EDSON  
Washington Correspondent  
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.  
WASHINGTON (NEA) — President Kennedy's budget message to Congress may wipe out much of the favorable reaction he got from business and even some Republicans on his State of the Union Message.

That first message, in general terms, promised a tax cut, reduction of government expenses other than for national defense, space research and fixed interest charges on the debt. It also promised a reduction of government personnel and the substitution of private credit for some government financing.

The State of the Union Message rejected massive increases in federal spending and temporary tax cuts. It turned thumbs down in the interests of economy on many "desirable" new projects that would have cost \$7 billion to \$8 billion more. It was a moderate, conciliatory program with optimistic outlook.

The budget message puts most of this back where it was. It will be necessary to wait on the special tax message scheduled for Jan. 24 to get all the bad news. But the outlook now is for a long, hard, uphill pull. It will take four years to achieve anything like a balanced budget and full employment.

This assumes that Congress approves all the proposed administration reforms, that they work as planned and that there is no recession or war in the meantime to gum up the works.

The consolidated cash budget deficit for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1963 is put at \$8.3 billion, with \$3.9 billion of supplemental appropriation requests still to come. The deficit for fiscal 1964 is now estimated at \$10.3 billion. But already there are forecasts that it will surely hit \$13 billion, about the same as in the previous peacetime record year of 1959.

The national debt is estimated at \$305.5 billion as of next June 30 and \$315.6 billion a year later. The national debt will increase every year the budget is not balanced.

On the schedule of anticipated tax receipt reductions the national debt may go well over the \$320 billion mark before the budget is again brought into balance. This assumes that government expenses

are not allowed to go any higher than they are now, which seldom if ever happens.

If the Kennedy tax cut and reform program is approved by Congress and works as planned, it is expected to generate \$1.5 billion of new revenues for fiscal 1964 through growth of the economy. Tax receipts will also be increased by \$1.1 billion by advancing six months the schedule on which business will make tax payments on estimated current year earnings.

This total increase in receipts of \$2.6 billion will bring the first year's estimated individual income tax receipt loss at \$5.3 billion down to a net loss of \$2.7 billion.

Business also gets socked by a proposed six-month delay in reduction of the corporate income tax rate from 52 to 47 per cent until Jan. 1, 1964. And both business and the consumers suffer from continuation of present excise tax rates for a full year, to July 1, 1964.

Treasury projections estimate that increased revenues won't offset the tax cuts until fiscal 1966 or 1967. By that time it is hoped business will be stimulated enough to get the unemployment rate down to four per cent, considered a minimum.

The promised economies in government are hard to find in the over-all budget figures.

For the next fiscal year, reduction in general government expenses of \$300 million are promised. But expenses for defense, space and fixed interest charges rise by \$4.5 billion — 15 times greater than savings.

The promised reduction in government employees to make up for recent pay increases doesn't show. Total employment of government civilian workers is expected to rise by 36,000 during the next fiscal year.

Defense will cut jobs by 10,000, but Agriculture will hire 5,000 more, Commerce 3,500, Post Office 3,000. Agency for International Development promises to reduce its personnel by 48 — which will be something to see — and Tennessee Valley Authority by 400.

The \$100 million cut in foreign aid programs to \$1.75 billion is not expected to be big enough to satisfy Congress. By the time Congress gets through with this budget message, you may not recognize it.



WASHINGTON REPORT . . .

## Campaign Spending Reports Misleading

By FULTON LEWIS, JR.

His colleagues — Republicans and Democrats alike — could take a few lessons in political honesty from North Carolina's senior Senator, Sam Ervin.

There are few members of the U.S. Senate who file as complete and thorough reports on campaign finances as Ervin. Most seldom take advantage of gaping loopholes within the law to file totally misleading statements.

Under the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925, candidates for the Senate must file within 30 days after election a complete report on campaign receipts and expenditures.

The law requires a candidate to list all funds received by him or any person "for him with his knowledge and consent."

Senator Ervin, whose career of public service began in 1935, when he first served as judge on the Burke County Criminal Court, is much loved. He has served in Congress, on the State Supreme Court, and for eight years in the Senate.

Up for re-election last Fall, Senator Ervin traveled extensively throughout the state, shaking hands and greeting people in courthouse squares. He shunned radio and TV, his billboards, and direct mail appeals.

His campaign expenditures equaled his campaign receipts: \$1,241.03. In his report to the Secretary of the Senate, Ervin listed every nickel spent in his campaign. (A typical entry: "October 31, 42 cents, for meal at Sir Walter Coffee Shop, Raleigh.")

Few of Ervin's colleagues are so frank. Many Senators set up special committees to accept campaign gifts and make campaign expenditures. They can then swear they received no contributions and have no knowledge of monies spent in their behalf.

Senator Ted Kennedy swore that he received no funds and

made no expenditures. Massachusetts law, however, requires financial statements of all political committees. The Edward M. Kennedy Campaign Committee admitted spending \$436,000.

Pennsylvania Senator Joe Clark acknowledged heavy spending in reports required by Pennsylvania law. In his statement filed with the Secretary of the Senate, however, Clark said that he received no gifts and spent no funds in his campaign.

Idaho's Frank Church, listed \$5,965 in contributions received (including \$1 from one Guy Obenchain). He did not, for some reason, acknowledge contributions from the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee, the International Ladies Garment Union, the Communication Workers of America or the Amalgamated Political Education Committee.

Senator Dan Inoué, Hawaii war hero, acknowledged contributions of \$39,274 for his campaign. He itemized only \$3,124 of them, however.

Oregon's Wayne Morse, the recipient of massive labor aid, seemed a little embarrassed by it all. He neglected to report gifts from at least six labor organizations including the United Steel Workers (\$85,000), the International Ladies Garment Workers Union (\$2,000) and the Building and Construction Trades Department (\$1,000).

Freshman Senator George McGovern of South Dakota reported no contributions and no expenditures. Connecticut's Abe Ribicoff reported contributions of only \$5,701, far below that spent in his campaign.

Note: Indiana's Birch Bayh, an attractive Democrat who torpedoes Republican Homer Casperhart, spent all his funds through a "Birch Bayh for Senate Committee."

Bayh, however, did not try to hide his expenses. His report to the Secretary of the Senate includes complete financial records of the Bayh for Senate Committee. That report discloses that Bayh's Committee received \$131,300 in contributions, and spent \$151,190.50. Bayh's group shelled out \$90,900 in one two-day period of radio and TV advertising. It spent 50 cents for a telegram on one occasion and \$1.72 for a public utilities bill on another.

FLETCHER KNEBEL