

Editorial Page

Sad State Of The States

The cry continues loud in many quarters for state-local resistance to new encroachments by the federal government. Gov. Clifford Hansen of Wyoming now adds his voice.

But a veteran observer of federal-state relations wonders whether the states are operating on a footing adequate to the scope of the problems they want to handle.

In a very severe sense, state legislatures tend to be a part-time enterprise. Only 20 of the 50 states have annual sessions. The rest convene their assemblies biennially.

There are six states in which legislatures are limited to sessions of 30 calendar or legislative days. In two others the meetings cannot go beyond 40 days.

Altogether, 29 states, roughly three-fifths of the total, hold their legislative sessions down to 65 days or less.

Where sessions are both short and merely biennial, it is clear the legislatures assemble just long enough to keep the franchise. It is hard to see how much work of consequence can be accomplished in an age of swift-moving developments.

Just 17 states put no legal limits on length of session. Others have sessions varying from 90 to 150 days.

Add to this the well-known but sad fact that state legislators are usually paid microscopic salaries, and you have the ingredients for pretty skimpy effort in many states.

And that is exactly what shows in many places. While high-flying politicians are sounding the gong for "returning power to the states where it belongs," while major domestic problems pile up, state lawmakers are busy licensing beauty operators and debating how to label eggs for market.

If the states want to wield important authority in the late 20th century, it seems wholly reasonable to ask that they equip themselves properly for the job.

They can hardly perform effectively when, as in many instances, their principal organs of power meet rarely and then only on a token basis. While part-time lawmakers are busy running law offices, selling insurance or real estate and managing businesses, the people with big problems take them to Washington.

Good Omen From Canada

The election victory of Lester Pearson and his Liberal party may or may not be quickly translated into command of the Canadian government. But if standard procedures are followed, it seems bound to happen.

Years ago the famous Mackenzie King held onto a minority prime ministership for roughly a year beyond an election. But the expectation this time is that Conservative Prime Minister John Diefenbaker is unlikely to climb to the reins after Canada's new parliament meets in a month and a half.

Ultimate triumph for Pearson, thus widely assumed, is of course hailed in the United States. For he is regarded as considerably friendlier to us than Diefenbaker. And he has stated flatly his willingness to accept U.S. nuclear warheads in the Canadian defense system.

It was this latter issue which precipitated the 1963 Canadian election. Blunt American criticism of Diefenbaker's refusal to accept nuclear warheads produced a storm of feeling both pro and con. The test at the polls followed.

Though anti-Americanism played a prominent part in the campaign now concluded, many observers suggest it was not the decisive matter. Canada is plagued with a host of economic problems, and many voters evidently wish to let the Liberals have a crack at them.

Thus it would be improper to conclude that the Liberal party's gains are wholly and simply a sign that Canada rejects the anti-Americanism propounded most ardently by Diefenbaker.

On the other hand, Canadians clearly did not act solely to emphasize their obvious resentments toward America. However numerous these may be, the voters appear to have taken the sensible view that any deep rift between two neighbors so close and so tightly intertwined strategically, economically and culturally could gravely damage both nations and the whole free world.

The Canadian outcome is not decisive. But it is a trend toward the good sense we must all hope will prevail in the long enduring comradeship of Canadians and Americans.



IN WASHINGTON . . .

Knowland Demand Grows

By RALPH de TOLEDANO

Since his 1958 defeat, William F. Knowland has devoted himself to the affairs of his family newspaper in Oakland, Calif. Senator Knowland ran into a buzz-saw when he sought the California governorship, for a whole complex of reasons. Subsequently, even his most ardent supporters felt that the Knowland contribution to Republican politics could at best be in the role of elder statesman. This is a pretty thankless and ceremonial job, and a man as energetic as the former senior senator from California could hardly be happy in it.

But the wheel of fortune, spins unpredictably. As the late Major Bowes used to say, "Round and round she goes, and where she'll stop nobody knows." Suddenly, Bill Knowland has emerged from obscurity, for reasons as puzzling as those that led to his 1958 fiasco. Certainly, he is not seeking the limelight. But in political circles, it is being asked with increasing frequency, "Will he run for the Senate in 1964?"

The emergence of Mr. Knowland as a surprise candidate can be attributed to a number of factors. To begin with, Californians became accustomed to having their two Senators be figures of national eminence. Senators Knowland and Nixon, whatever differences in emphasis may have marked their views, were leaders in both the Senate and the nation. They were known, and Californians enjoyed their prominence.

Their successors, Republican Thomas Kuchel and Democrat Clare Engle, are among the lesser lights of the Washington scene. Mr. Kuchel holds the position of Republican Whip in the Senate. But his name makes the national press only when he supports some left-of-center measure or throws in his lot with the Kennedy Administration. His influence on Capitol Hill is very small, and he himself is a colorless man. In fact, he is the kind of person who must always be reintroduced because people have forgotten him. Mr. Engle has not achieved sufficient seniority to be a power, and since his ideological position blends in with that of the leadership, he fails to make an impression.

In his years of retirement, however, Bill Knowland has retained the loyalty of his supporters in and out of California. There is also a growing feeling among Republicans that his departure from the national scene has hurt the party seriously. Mr. Knowland was a tower of strength—in the United States Senate—second only to Robert A. Taft in the respect he commanded in the GOP. Since 1958, the Republicans in the Senate have needed him badly. A Minority Leader he was a force with which to reckon—and at present a vacuum exists.

Mr. Knowland was succeeded by Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen. But the Senator from Illinois, however great his oratorical powers, never seemed to take hold. He was fearful of Demo-

cratic wrath at the wrong times. And he has never seemed able to mobilize Republican troops when the battle lines are drawn. Recently, moreover, his health has not been of the best.

On the Senate side of the Hill, it is not uncommon for Republicans to bemoan the present lack of leadership. Whatever post he might hold, a William Knowland back in Washington in 1965 would mean that the GOP would have a rock and an anchor. Whether or not President Kennedy wins reelection, Mr. Knowland can do much to re-establish the authority of the legislative branch and give it once more the kind of prestige it has been steadily losing.

By United Press International

Today is Monday, May 6, the 126th day of 1963 with 239 to follow.

The moon is approaching full phase. The morning stars are Venus, Saturn and Jupiter.

The evening star is Mars. On this day in history: In 1935, the Works Progress Administration was created by Congress to provide work for the unemployed through a series of projects supported by federal funds.

In 1937, the German dirigible "Hindenburg" exploded at Lakehurst, N. J., killing 36 persons.

In 1941, Communist dictator Joseph Stalin became a premier of Russia, succeeding V. M. Molotov.



By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

The best things work for their own reduction and elimination. If we understand this curious process, we can then judge the value and the direction of our efforts.

"Medicine," said Lord Bryce, "is the only profession that labors incessantly to destroy the reason for its own existence." The aim of the art of medicine—when it is not perverted by greed—is to put itself out of business.

The aim of parenthood, likewise, ought to be to set the child on its own feet and make the parents more and more superfluous. The aim of true education is to make the student less and less dependent upon the teacher and the textbook.

In these three essential realms—the physical, the intellectual and the emotional—the proper end of medicine, education and parenthood is the freedom of the object. Whatever binds the object more tightly violates this end and damages the object.

This is the only test we can apply to discover whether our dedication and love are real or counterfeit—for the counterfeit always discloses itself by trying to possess the object rather than liberate it.

Parental love, for instance, should be a ladder, leading the child upward and outward; too often, however, it is a cage or a chain or a corset of unyielding suffocation. Its aim is not the child's liberation, but the parent's gratification.

We can see how this perverted process works most clearly in

education. The most badly mis-educated person is the one who must continually use references, appeal to authorities, and substitute what has already been said by others for his own thinking. His education has crippled him for creative thought and made him totally dependent on "the books."

The readiness (however painful in part) to give up their children is the most profound characteristic of genuine parental love. Just as the doctor aims at liberating the patient from his physical ills, the teacher aims at liberating the pupil from his intellectual confinements, so the parent must aim at freeing the child from its emotional dependencies.

And the end of this paradox is that only when the child is thus free can he have the proper attachment to his parents; only when we allow his independence can he then freely offer us love and respect, without conflict and without resentment. It is the hardest lesson to learn that the goal of parenthood is not to reign forever but to abdicate gracefully at the right time.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q—What is the length of the New Jersey turnpike?

A—The road is 131 miles long.

Q—Who was the nation's first Republican president?

A—Abraham Lincoln.

Medley

ACROSS
1 Baseball club
2 Came into existence
3 Cavern
4 Mineral rock
5 Soap
6 Kind of Judah (Bib.)
7 Nothing
8 Compound
9 Hydrogen, for instance
10 Enriches with bacon
11 Biblical prophet
12 Eject
13 Harbor
14 Unfettered
15 Pronoun
16 Legal plea
17 Kind of bullet
18 Photographic device
19 Discards
20 Abstract being
21 Tears

DOWN
1 Rite for instance
2 Seed covering
3 Wires
4 Established
5 Algerian seaport
6 Loose
7 Small horse
8 Gate weight
9 Love god
10 Vacant
11 Conclusions
12 Aviators
13 Dull finish
14 Measures
15 Step
16 Japanese coin
17 Destructible
18 Neuritis of sciatic nerve, (pl.)
19 Foot part
20 Formerly



"But, Pop, How Will a Tax Cut Help When You're on Strike All the Time?"



STRICTLY PERSONAL

OTHER EDITORS' OPINIONS

No More Bonds!

(Register-Guard, Eugene)

Heavy pressures are being put on Oregon's Legislature to authorize issuance of more state highway construction bonds. Mainly, these pressures are being inspired by die-hard advocates of immediate improvement of the northern part of Coast Highway 101.

It isn't enough, in the eyes of these 101 partisans, that the state has spent more improving the coastal route than it has on any similar highway in recent years. It isn't enough that the 1961 legislature approved a special bond issue for the construction of a bridge across the Columbia at Astoria—despite State Highway Commission objections. They don't seem to care that Governor Hatfield has warned against the issuance of any more bonds as a threat to the entire state highway program, a program which must go ahead at the same time outstanding bonds are being paid off with interest which might have bought additional paving.

Gathering support from other groups, who want pork-barrel financing for other special projects, the 101 lobby is brazenly asking that Oregon's state gas tax be increased to finance at least \$25 million in new highway bonds. And, mind you, this is happening at the same time the legislature is struggling to find enough money to take care of a basketful of critical public needs.

Sure, additional taxes would prevent depletion of cash funds available for programmed highway projects. But we've a strong notion that Oregonians, generally, are well satisfied with the way priorities have been assigned for continued improvement of all state highways. We doubt that the majority of Oregonians are in any mood to see the legislature approve a crash program—which would add a half-cent to the price of every gallon of gas—simply because a persistent self-interested minority insists on it.

Now we hope that some in the majority will raise quick protests to remind the legislature of these facts.

LETTERS

Several letters have been written suggesting the people of Klamath Falls would not be willing to vote themselves a tax increase in order to enlarge their school system. I hope they, also, would not be willing to vote the rural people a tax raise to enlarge their school system. I sincerely believe there are a lot of people who would not, if they understood our situation.

Looking into it, we find that the rural taxes would increase 9 mills per family under a one unit system. Will this make all students equal? Will there be a swimming pool for the 29 students at Rly? Will we hire enough teachers and buy enough equipment at Bonanza to equal the educational opportunities at Henley or Kly? Is it even a practical idea to try to equal all students?

We do not think so. We have stayed within our budget in the rural district. Our children are getting a sound basic education, which is what we can afford to give them.

What advantages would a tax raise have, then, for the rural people?

Name On File



EDSON IN WASHINGTON . . .

Private Investment Overseas Protected

By PETER EDSON

WASHINGTON (NEA)—American investors looking for business opportunities in developing nations now have an assurance that debts contracted by the government of a foreign country will be paid by a succeeding administration which seizes power by revolution.

A four-year-old test case on this issue—involving Howard International, Inc., of New York and the government of Turkey—has just been approved by the Turkish parliament.

This action makes it unnecessary for the United States to threaten a cutoff of American aid to Turkey as a means of enforcing payment.

In view of President Kennedy's recent proposals to promote greater private investment overseas, settlement of the Howard case sets an important precedent for furthering the aid program. Howard International, headed by Sidney A. Lowry, is an importing company that has brought large quantities of Turkish chrome into the United States.

In 1954 Howard officials were approached by Ahmet Oguz Akal who had large personal mining interests and also headed a government ministry for resource development. He wanted to find a small steel mill in the United States which could be brought to Turkey to make construction industry bars and shapes. Such a mill would cut down Turkish dollar purchases of steel products, conserve foreign exchange and reduce aid.

Howard located a 50,000-ton mill owned by a company in financial difficulty. Contracts were signed in July 1956 to export this mill to Turkey for sale to Akal at \$2.4 million.

The Turkish government issued the necessary import permits and the Agricultural Bank of Turkey, Ziraat, issued a guarantee of payment letter to Chase Manhattan Bank of New York, for benefit of Howard.

The mill was shipped in August 1959 and Howard received pay-

ments in 1960 of approximately \$1.5 million. The Ziraat bank acknowledged delivery of the mill in Istanbul and released Howard from its performance bond. The contract did not call for Howard to erect the mill.

All this happened during the regime of Turkey's Premier Adnan Menderes. But in May 1960, it will be recalled this government was overthrown by the Army under Lt. Gen. Camal Gurses.

Parliament was dissolved, President Celal Bayar, Menderes and several hundred more officials and businessmen, including Akal, were arrested, tried and sentenced to prison for crimes against the Turkish constitution. Menderes and two cabinet officers were executed and President Bayar is still confined.

The new government soon found itself in strained financial condition. It was charged that purchase of the mill had been an extravagance of the old regime.

The mill was never erected and the \$900,000 due Howard went unpaid. The Turkish press took up the case and it became a hot political issue.

The consequences of nonpayment could have been serious for Turkey. Section 620-C of the 1962 Foreign Aid Act provides that when a bank owned or controlled by a foreign government fails to honor a guaranty issued in favor of an American firm, further foreign aid will not be granted.

The U.S. State Department and Ambassador Raymond Hare in Ankara moved in to support Howard's claim. For over two years every diplomatic pressure was exerted to persuade the Turks to pay the debt.

The new government, now under Premier Ismet Inonu would not take responsibility for payment of the claim. Instead, after several cabinet meetings, Inonu introduced a bill in parliament, asking authorization for payment. It passed.

It is expected that Howard's claim soon will be paid, re-establishing Turkey's claim that its credit is good.



WASHINGTON REPORT . . .

Kennedy Policies On Cuba Question

By FULTON LEWIS JR.

At long last, after considerable prodding, President Kennedy has unveiled his Cuban policy. Blame him.

He used a nationally televised press conference to answer critics who charge that the Administration has formulated no policy at all. Eyes flashing, he admitted there is "a good deal of concern in the United States because Castro is still there." He continued to outline his policy: "I think it is unfortunate that he was permitted to assume control in the 1950's and perhaps it would have been easier to take an action then than it is now."

One thing is certain: John Kennedy not once warned of Castro's rise to power, not once asked if the bearded one might not be something less than a modern-day Simon Bolivar. I sat in the Senate Press Gallery many times and watched others—George Smathers for one—warn of danger to the South. And John Kennedy yawned.

It was not until January, 1960, seven years after Castro opened his revolution, a full year after that revolution was won, that Senator Kennedy publicly acknowledged Castro's existence. In his book, "The Strategy of Peace," he wrote that "Castro is part of the legacy of Bolivar."

He indicated that it was perhaps unwise of President Eisenhower to back "so long and unenthusiastically" the anti-Communist Fulgencio Batista. Should not Eisenhower have given Castro "a warmer welcome in his hour of triumph?" asked the very junior Senator from Massachusetts.

Four months later, Kennedy was questioned about Cuba on Washington television. Asked if the United States should take positive action against Castro, Kennedy hemmed and hawed thusly:

"Well the situation in Cuba, of course, continues to deteriorate but for the present I think the Administration's policy is the right one . . . for the time being, I would conduct our policy on the basis that it is being conducted. The situation could change at any time . . . for the present, I support the Administration policy."

The situation, apparently, changed in campaign travels from coast to coast. Kennedy sensed that the people desired action. He told cheering Americans on Oct. 13, 1960:

"We must end the harassment, which this government has carried on, of liberty-loving anti-Castro forces in Cuba and in other lands. While we cannot vio-

late international law, we must recognize that these exiles and rebels represent the real voice of Cuba, and should not be constantly handicapped by our Immigration and Justice Department authorities."

So favorable was the reaction that candidate Kennedy continued to play the theme. Five days later, on Oct. 20, he said:

"We must attempt to strengthen the non-Batista democratic anti-Castro forces in exile and in Cuba itself who offer eventual hope of overthrowing Castro."

Two and a half years later, the same exiles, the same "liberty-loving anti-Castro forces," are threatened with deportation, with jail, for doing exactly what candidate Kennedy advocated in 1960, winning back their homeland.

Note: The only foreign policy question that seemed to concern Senator Kennedy prior to his Presidential campaign was Algeria. In his first major foreign policy speech, in 1957, the Senator urged the Administration to pressure France into giving up its African colony.

Former Secretary of State Dean Acheson, a Democrat, derided the Senator's Algerian proposals as "the supreme touch of naivete." New York Congressman Emanuel Celler, another Democrat, was biting in his observations:

"I know France well and has spent some time in Algeria. Can Senator Kennedy say the same? Does he realize that if the French were to leave Algeria, the vacuum created would be quickly filled by Communist influences? Does he know that the rebel forces are being supplied with arms by the newest dictator to appear on the international scene, Communist-backed Nasser of Egypt?"

How right, it turned out, was Congressman Celler. An independent Algeria is today firmly implanted in the neutralist camp. Dictator Ahmed Ben Bella parrots the Communist line and assures Fidel Castro that Uncle Sam should get out of Guantanamo Bay.

THEY SAY . . .

My feeling is that nothing good can come of this.
—Candy Jones, former model and author of juvenile advice book.