

Editorial Page

Keep The Watchdog

Though the new Congress is barely under way, fresh attempts to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities already are being pressed. They deserve to be beaten off.

Among the new year's petitioners for abolition are several dozen members of the organization, Women Strike for Peace. They are presumably outraged because the Committee recently looked into alleged links between their movement and communism.

We are also hearing again from the National Committee to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee. It supports its new call with an alleged 5,000 signatures.

Without here going into the matter of reported subversive elements operating in—and behind—the abolition group, it is possible to argue that the case against the House committee should be dismissed on its face.

Our principal national watchdog against subversion is, of course, the FBI. Few question that, overall, it does a superb job in ferreting out Red spies, keeping tabs on Communist activities and aims, measuring the size of the internal threat.

But the Communist adversary is ingenious, resourceful, many-faceted. We should welcome some reasonable diversity in our investigative approach to the problem.

The need for such diversity is perhaps

sufficient justification for the House committee's continued existence. Yet there are other reasons.

There is no point in leaving the field of Red subversion to the executive branch alone. It is a legitimate arena of inquiry for Congress, with its properly wide latitude in investigation.

Furthermore, anyone who examines closely the printed record of the House committee's hearings and studies over the years will find the documents informed, with a very substantial knowledge of communism in most of its multifarious aspects.

To argue that what this group does other, regular committees could do as well or better is to ignore two things: the special committee's long background in this field and the already overburdened operations of other committees.

To argue that the Un-American Activities Committee should die because it has sometimes trampled individual liberties is to contend that no instrument is better than an imperfect one.

If that standard were applied broadly, we would have no president, no Congress and no business corporations. We would also have no committees to abolish other committees.

Let the House committee mind closely the rights of those it investigates. But let it stand as the useful second watchdog it is.

The 88th Congress

(The Christian Science Monitor)

On January 9 the first session of the 88th Congress of the United States will convene. It will have a heavy schedule. But its most urgent order of business should be to see that the federal income tax rates, enacted to support a war economy, are reduced to a level more consonant with peacetime economic growth.

The principal obstacles to this objective are two:

(a) Despite predominant business opinion, there is some demand that government expenditures also be cut. If these can be kept from increasing materially it will be a considerable achievement.

(b) Sentiment will differ as to where the more substantial portion of the cuts should be made. This should not be permitted to defeat the purpose. Reductions should be, as the President has indicated, across the board, from top to bottom on both personal and corporate earnings.

Appropriations, of course, are and should be related closely to taxation. The defense budget may rise unavoidably by around \$2,000,000,000 but should be held below that figure if possible. The civil budget should be held within its present limits.

Farm legislation may have as much to do with ultimate budgetary results as any other item outside direct fiscal measures. A scheduled producer referendum on the wheat program may indicate whether farmers will ac-

cept marketing controls. If they do not, a gradual reduction of government support prices seems inevitable.

Foreign aid will evidently be a point of serious attack by those who would either spend less over all or spend more at home. The case for the value of foreign aid is as cogent as ever but that value must more than ever be proved by effective administration.

The Kennedy administration naturally will bring forward a number of measures characterized as part of its program. Among these, federal aid to education has been pending through many administrations. The questions here are largely whether it can be formulated on a basis that will distribute money only where needed and will not subsidize sectarian schools.

Renewed attempts will be made to place medical care for the aged on a social security tax basis. The same reasons exist as at last session for continuing instead with the Kerr-Mills law in that field. A bill to create a department of urban affairs is expected again to find rough going.

One subject may be forced upon congressional attention which is not a carryover from any strong legislative effort last year. This is the matter of governmental powers to deal with widespread and unresolved labor disputes which affect the public interest. Such conflicts exist on the nation's railroads, along the docks of the entire eastern seaboard, in newspapers of the nation's largest city, and potentially in other industries.

THESE DAYS . . .

Compulsory Unionism

By JOHN CHAMBERLAIN

The pressure on Congress to "do something" about strikes and lockouts is building up, and the danger is that an untimely trade will be made, with the big union chiefs yielding to some form of compulsory arbitration in exchange for the union shop. This would give the union chiefs security for themselves by delivering the working men to them without their having to lift a finger to persuade anybody in the union and office.

Since, according to the well-known law of the conservation of energy, nobody likes to expend any effort that can be avoided, I suspect that the big union bosses would cheerfully accept a limitation on the right to strike if, in so doing, they would be eliminating all the difficult problems of organization.

Much is being made at the moment about the discomforts that are caused by labor strife. Newspaper readers, deprived of the metropolitan press in New York City and in Cleveland, Ohio, have had to get their news via out-of-town papers or radio. The East Coast longshoremen's strike has caused a hitch in the flow of many things, from bananas to imported Volkswagens. People have had to walk to work in Philadelphia. But these are mere inconveniences; they deprive nobody of basic liberties for the long haul.

The real menace of the union movement is its drive to compulsion on the human being. The notion that men must be forced

into unions as a condition of employment is deeply ingrained in the fundamental philosophy of big union chiefs; they have come to regard the big union as a sort of substitute for the political state.

This assumption is immediately apparent in all their actions. James Carey, head of the International Union of Electrical Workers, is girding to wring the union shop out of Westinghouse and General Electric. On the Pacific Coast the leaders of the aerospace unions are trying to convince with the federal government to force the union shop on their own reluctant followers. But the real temper of the union leaders comes out even more strongly in their words.

For example, there is the record of an exchange between Sen. Barry Goldwater and Walter Reuther, the boss of the United Automobile Workers. When Goldwater asked Reuther, "What about the man who just does not want to belong to a union?" the labor chief replied: "Well, if a fellow works in a General Motors plant and does not want to belong to a union, he does not have to work there."

"But suppose he wants to work there?" Goldwater insisted. Whereupon Mr. Reuther let his Statist preconceptions come to the surface. "If you want to live in a certain community," he said, "and you want the benefits of the work of that community, you have to pay taxes in that community. You do not have to live in

that community. That is the freedom of choice."

Thus the rat emerges from the bag. Mr. Reuther considers union dues, levied compulsorily on every employee in an automobile plant, to be the equivalent of taxes. They are not a voluntary contribution freely agreed upon by union members who hope to get their dues paid in higher wages in exchange for relinquishing a part of their weekly pay checks.

When a union boss starts thinking about union dues as taxes that must be paid to his organization willy-nilly, it is easy to see how the Statist frame of mind gets extended to other things. States not only have the power to levy taxes, they also have a monopoly of police and military force in the territory subject to their jurisdiction. The union boss who is granted the power to tax his followers will hardly boggle about raising an army or a squad of cops to defend his realm. Thus the practice of employing goons to whip recalcitrants into line is just a step away from the imposition of compulsory taxes.

No doubt Reuther, who is a nice enough fellow in his personal relationship, fails to realize the full implications of his own Statist philosophy. But if Reuther and his kind succeed in foisting compulsory unionism on the country as a general condition of employment, they will create an administrative monster, which, in the hands of a less scrupulous generation of later leaders, could mean slavery for practically everybody.

"Talk About Outmoded Positions . . ."



THE GLOBAL VIEW . . .

Schizophrenia Of Neutrals

By LEON DENNEN

Newspaper Enterprise Analyst
NEW YORK (NEA) — Some world statesmen cling to their political illusions even like ordinary mortals. A case in point is India's Jawaharlal Nehru.

The prime minister has informed his Cabinet, believe it or not, that India has no intention of abandoning "non-alignment" thereby joining the anti-Communist nations of the world.

Nonalignment, doubletalk for neutrality, was born in 1961 in Belgrade at a conference of Asian and Middle Eastern nations sponsored by Nehru and Yugoslavia's President Tito. Their aim was to create a "third force" between

the Red bloc and the North Atlantic alliance.

This writer was among a score of reporters in Belgrade who watched Nehru's diplomatic acrobatics as he tried to maneuver between the United States and Russia—always giving the edge to Russia.

India's Prime Minister was never slow in voicing his disapproval of American "colonialist" policy. However, when Soviet Premier Khrushchev violated his agreement with the United States and resumed the testing of atomic weapons, Nehru was in a covey and so-called neutralist nations who had gathered in Belgrade.

History moves swiftly in the atomic age. Almost to the year after the Belgrade conference Red China attacked India and Nehru found himself deserted by his neutralist friends.

Khrushchev "postponed" the delivery of war planes to India. He had promised them originally in an obvious effort to use Nehru against his hated Red Chinese rival Mao Tse-tung. That other "neutralist," Tito, rushed to Moscow to rejoin the Soviet camp.

Only the NATO nations, especially "capitalist" United States, came to Nehru's aid with weapons and war supplies when India was in danger of being overrun by Red China's armed hordes.

President Kennedy acted more from strategic calculations than visionary love for India. But it is an ironic note to history that while the neutralists passed resolutions which in effect urged Nehru to bow to Red China, Americans were risking their lives in the jungles of India.

And still Nehru insists on India's role as an "unaligned" nation. He even told Yugoslavia's Vice President Edvard Kardelj, who recently visited India, that America-hating and America-baiting Krishna Menon might "be back" in India's Cabinet, "though not perhaps for a while."

Was Menon fired from India's Cabinet last November because his pro-Red policies in the United Nations and as defense minister brought India to the brink of disaster?

Not at all, Nehru assured Kardelj. Menon was merely the victim of anti-Communist pressure. "In situations like this," Nehru said, "there is always the need to fire someone."

Not even the American taxpayers' massive aid seems to have changed Nehru's mind. He obviously still hopes to act the honest broker between the free world and the Red dictatorship.

Why, then, does not New Embroider John Kenneth Galbraith, U.S. ambassador to India, tell Nehru the facts of life?

President Kennedy's academic advisers have recently been flexing their muscles in an attempt to assert American world leadership. They have irritated America's NATO allies. They have had some harsh words for Macmillan, De Gaulle and Adenauer.

Why not also inform Prime Minister Nehru that nonalignment in 1961 is dead?

The recent confrontation of the United States and Russia over Khrushchev's attempt to base offensive missiles in Cuba emphasized that in a world sharply divided between great atomic powers the possibilities of effective action by neutral nations is an illusion.

Yugoslavia's Tito has already drawn his own Marxist-Leninist conclusions. He is making Yugoslavia back into the Soviet camp. On Nehru remain perched on the neutralist sidelines much longer.

FLETCHER SNEEL



EDSON IN WASHINGTON . . .

Congress To Update Creaking Machinery

By PETER EDSON
Washington Correspondent
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.

WASHINGTON (NEA)—Fed up with their own inability to get things done under outmoded rules and traditions that have been considered almost sacred, more and more congressmen are lining up this year behind proposals for reform and reorganization of Congress.

The case with which the House of Representatives put through permanent enlargement of its Rules Committee to 15 members on opening day indicates the change in sentiment.

An effort to make it a little easier to curb Senate debate by majority vote after 15 days of filibustering may have tougher sledding. With bipartisan backing from 10 senators the new proposal was given a chance until Sen. Everett Dirksen, Republican minority leader, called for a quick end of debate on the subject, saying there was no steam behind it.

These reforms, intended to let Congress work instead of preventing it from acting on legislative proposals blocked by minorities are just a beginning—straws in the wind.

Twenty-two senators from both parties have already signed up as cosponsors of Pennsylvania Democrat Joseph S. Clark's plan to set up a new Joint Committee on Organization of Congress. They have staked top billing for it as Concurrent Resolution No. 1.

It will be open for 90 days to receive signatures from other senators who may wish to sponsor it before it is referred to the Rules Committee for consideration. A similar resolution is being introduced in the House by Rep. John Lindsay, R-N.Y.

It has been 16 years since Congress was last reorganized. But there is some feeling in both houses that, since the earlier reorganization didn't do all that was expected of it, another reform drive won't do any more.

A principal feature of the La Follette-Monroney Reorganization Act of 1947 was simplification of the committee structure. While the number of standing committees was reduced, subcommittees multiplied. This made the ma-

chinery as complex as it was before.

Senior Congressmen who want things left as they are argue that while congressional practices may be cumbersome and slow-moving, they have served the country well, so why change?

But the last session of Congress did not adjourn until Oct. 13. This was only three weeks before election. There was a tie-up of money bills caused by a personal prestige feud between House and Senate Appropriations committees. That tied up many government agencies and disgusted even some of the oldest members.

This has resulted in a number of new proposals for congressional reorganization this year. One of the most promising has come from Sen. Clifford Case, R-N.J. He is a cosponsor of the Clark resolution, and its other backers are also sponsoring the Case proposal. Rep. Henry S. Reuss, D-Wis., is introducing a similar proposal in the House.

Case calls for creation of a new Commission on Congressional Reorganization. It would be modeled on former President Herbert Hoover's Commission on Organization of Government. Its membership would be three senators, three representatives and six private citizens qualified to make studies and recommendations on improving the functioning of the legislative processes.

Specifically, the Case plan would require the bi-partisan commission to report on 12 of the most frequently criticized congressional procedures:

Obsolete rules. Staffing and operation of committees. The congressional work load. Floor procedures. Conflicts of interest of congressmen. Senate and House expense accounting. Financing of congressional duties on executive appointments. Legislative oversight. Congressional power over appropriations. Operation and regulation of lobbyists.

Other "reforms" which have been widely discussed without receiving open backing include increasing representatives' terms from two years to four and increasing all congressmen's salaries by \$7,500 a year to a total of \$30,000—because they work so hard.



WASHINGTON REPORT . . .

Federal Payroll Grows; Meets Frontier Need

By FULTON LEWIS JR.

Buried in the files of agencies and bureaus scattered across this capital city is a Presidential directive of Oct. 25, 1961.

In a message to all Department and Bureau chiefs, John Kennedy lays down the law. The bloated Federal payroll, he says, must be slashed and costs cut. Do not, orders the President, spend all those funds authorized by Congress.

There is no question that employment can be held substantially below the levels which would be possible under the funds authorized by the Congress, if strong efforts are made to achieve increases in efficiency . . . and to staff each activity with only the minimum number of employees needed to carry out our objectives.

One year later, the President issued a similar directive on manpower utilization, ordering the "same amount of work to be performed by increasingly fewer people."

In his State of the Union message last week, President Kennedy indicated the problem had been licked: "I will shortly submit a fiscal 1964 administrative budget which, while allowing for needed rises in defense, space and fixed interest charges, holds total expenditures for all other purposes below this year's level."

Several days later came the President's budget message. A close examination of that massive document shows the President did not, in fact, keep his promise to hold expenditures "below this year's level."

The number of employees now on the Federal payroll will jump 30,000 in fiscal 1964. This will bring to 1,080,000 the number of new workers added since John Kennedy took the reins of government two years ago. The cost of 1,080,000 employees a year, more than a billion dollars.

Take a look at the specific increases called for in the President's new budget:

1. The White House alone will employ 60 new workers. Its budget will rise \$6 million.

2. Commerce Secretary Luther Hodges, who once said he could get along with several thousand fewer employees, gets 3,407 new ones. His budget increase \$130 million.

3. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare, whose an-

mal growth rate tops the Federal Establishment, is given 5,501 new employees. Its budget hiked by \$694 million.

4. Attorney General Bob Kennedy gets 755 new lawyers, clerks, janitors and chauffeurs. His budget goes up \$29 million.

5. The Post Office deficit is cut by \$248 million in one year—thanks to increased postal rates, not Federal economy. Secretary J. Edgar Day, as a matter of fact, will have 9,650 new workers.

6. More than 5,000 new employees are assigned to Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman. A Presidential claim that the Department's budget will be cut \$923 million is "false," according to Delaware Sen. John J. Williams, a fiscal expert. He said, "The proposed reduction is achieved only by charging a part of the cost of administering the agricultural program to the Commodity Credit Corporation, postponing the day of reckoning when we must absorb that loss either by cancelling some of the notes or by appropriations to cover the deficit."

7. Treasury Secretary C. Douglas Dillon will have 4,414 new employees under terms of the proposed budget, plus \$421 million more with which to play.

Throughout the budget in virtually every Bureau and Agency, provisions are made for new employees, and for new appropriation hogs. The Labor Department gets \$104 million more and 1,263 extra employees. The Federal Aviation Agency: \$19 million and 625 new workers. General Services Administration: \$62 million and 2,308 additional employees.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration receives permission to hire 2,393 workers and gets an additional \$1.8 billion. The Department of Defense is one of the few areas where the payroll is cut (by 10,126). Its appropriation is up \$2.7 billion, however.

THEY SAY . . .

The United States has not—and we will never—enter any commitment by which Communist imperialism shall be fortified against the united action of free men, in this hemisphere or any other. —Vice President Lyndon Johnson.