

Editorial Page

Intolerable Incompetence

The lives of many individual servicemen—not to mention the security of the country—may depend on the soundness with which missiles, planes, submarines and other defense devices are put together.

Wouldn't you imagine, therefore, that workmen and firms who turn these things out would apply themselves to their tasks with extreme care and high dedication?

Large numbers plainly do just that. But, as we are learning from the inquiry into the tragic case of the submarine Thresher, some do not.

If ever a matter called for full congressional investigation, this would seem to.

Indeed, enough evidence of poor performance exists to suggest that we ought to have a revival of the militant spirit which characterized the Senate Preparedness subcommittee in wartime.

And any probe should concern itself not simply with what happened to the Thresher in the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, but with what happens to other submarines and many types of naval craft when they are being built, overhauled or repaired.

Some reports filtering out of these places are pretty frightening. From one yard, a submarine commander examining repairs to his ship's hull said:

"That weld will never hold under pressure."

You might as well send a plane up with a gaping hole in the wing as take a submarine down with a weak spot in its hull.

Testimony already taken with respect to the Thresher offers a considerable catalogue of deficiencies, on the part of both naval yard workmen and outside, private suppliers of components.

Of the vessel's extensive system of hydraulic valves, one in every five was originally installed backwards. The same thing happened to the periscope mechanism. The rudder complex, the air system and other elements were defective at the outset.

Some of the proud working folk at Portsmouth yard do not like to hear such criticisms. One called them "lumps in the mashed potatoes."

But when lives—and the nation's safety—are involved, this is no time to invoke the great alibi of the mid-20th century: "Only a minority were responsible." A minority of one can send a submarine to the bottom.

What goes on in naval construction is only part of what may be a very large and unhappy commentary on certain elements in American labor and management. The Thresher disaster suggests, however, that this is the place to begin digging.

Example Of Others

(Register - Guard, Eugene)

Thirty-six states and nearly 2,000 cities have retail sales taxes. These taxes, furthermore, are growing popular as governments recognize the relative ease with which they are paid. So says a special survey in the New York Times.

In the last year and a half, four states have increased their sales taxes. So have a number of cities. The latest state to go to a sales tax is West Virginia, a state generally regarded as "depressed." One wonders what the West Virginia legislators would say to Oregon legislators who oppose a sales tax because it allegedly hits the less fortunate.

These other states, unlike Oregon, have realized that certain state obligations must be met. They can be met only if the money is raised. And it can be raised only if everybody

in the state pays his fair share. They know, as Oregon legislators apparently do not, that in any state there are only so many rich people. They can be soaked just about so far, and then they, too, dry up—without adding enough to the state treasury. Furthermore, confiscatory taxation directed at the well-off tends to isolate those people, and they are the ones a state needs to keep its head above water.

There is just a chance, thanks to the Senate, that Oregon voters may express themselves on a sales tax a year from next fall—for the first time in 20 years. As they contemplate, they should ask themselves why Oregon must slip into second rate position because of legislative superstition about a sales tax. Why, indeed, are the progressive states, which are meeting their problems, "out of step" with Oregon?

It's Your Money They're Using!

By Congressman John R. Pillion
New York

There are literally thousands of areas of federal activity where shocking and massive wastages repeatedly take place.

The General Accounting Office—GAO—is an independent, non-political, and reliable source of information on the fiscal and management operations of federal agencies. The GAO is directed by the Comptroller General of the United States; he and his staff are performing a most valuable public service in finding and disclosing the inefficiencies, the maladministration and the mismanagement that exist throughout the huge federal bureaucracy.

GAO reports are based upon investigations, examinations, and audits of federal agencies. It issues hundreds of reports annually to the Congress, the President, and various executive agencies. These reports reveal a uniform pattern of gross maladministration and mismanagement that permeates our federal operations.

Following are five briefs extracted from the Comptroller General's reports issued between Feb. 26 and Feb. 28, 1963:

In 1961, U.S. military installations in Japan were staffed by about 1,800 Japanese nationals in excess of accepted manning guides, at an annual wasted cost of \$2,700,000.

Despite this overstaffing, many facilities had not been adequately maintained and large backlogs of work had accumulated.

Part of this backlog, which should have been performed by station forces, was performed by civilian contract in fiscal year 1961, at an additional cost of about \$465,000.

The Comptroller General's Office reported that the Army, Navy, and Air Force had failed to develop complete and valid manning guides to maintain facilities and operate utilities in Japan.

The GAO cited inadequate management controls, inefficient use of personnel, lack of adequate work standards and failure of management personnel to properly perform their duties, as contributing factors to this deplorable situation.

In 1960, the U.S. Army incurred an unnecessary cost of \$5 million to rebuild rubber tracks for tanks that were allowed to deteriorate.

The deteriorations were caused by the failure of the U.S. Army to:

- issue and use the oldest tracks first;
- furnish unused tracks to manufacturers of new tanks;
- protect the tracks by inside storage.

The General Accounting Office report states: "The management weaknesses disclosed in this report on rubber tracks are the type that could pertain to all of the Army's replacement parts which are subject to deterioration."

From April 1960 to April 1962, 103 10-ton crane shovels purchased by the U.S. Army Engineers were released for disposition. These shovels had an acquisition cost of more than \$2 million.

Twenty five crane shovels were sold for \$207,850, which cost the U.S. Army Engineers \$341,200. Eight crane shovels sold for \$56,000, although their cost to the U.S. Government was \$173,000.

A large portion of the shovels were completely new, unused shovels.

During the same period, the U.S. Army Engineers sold \$350,000 worth of repair parts for its crane shovels.

While these new and serviceable shovels and parts were being given away or sold for bargain prices, the U.S. Army Engineers had full knowledge of their future needs for these shovels.

A study by the U.S. Army Engineers, dated April 18, 1962, recommended the purchase of several hundred similar shovels for the period 1963 to 1967, at a cost of \$12 million. There have been no technological improvements in these crane shovels and none were expected in the near future.

The comptroller's report describes these transactions in the following language: "Improvident disposal," "undoubtedly result in substantial waste," "inconsistency indicates a lack of coordination and control within the Corps of Engineers."

In 1960, the U.S. Army Engineers had 1,400 25-horsepower outboard motors on hand. These were completely new and unused motors.

At the same time in 1959, the U.S. Army Engineers unnecessarily purchased 925 25-horsepower motors, at a cost of \$573,000. They also planned to purchase 533 new 25-horsepower motors to replace new or slightly used motors.

There was no indication of tech-

nical obsolescence of the 1,400 new motors on hand.

The comptroller's report refers to these transactions as: "Unnecessarily bought," "We recommend no further disposal of 25-horsepower motors for which there is a foreseeable need."

From July 1959 to September 1960, the U.S. Army Engineers sold 316 30-kilowatt generators in excellent or in good condition at an average price of \$150 a generator.

At the same time, it purchased a larger number of 45-kilowatt generators at a replacement cost of \$4,879 each.

The 30-kilowatt generators were, at the period, classified by the U.S. Army Engineers as acceptable substitutes for the 45-kilowatt generators.

The cost of the new 45-kilowatt generators for which the U.S. Army Engineers had acceptable substitute 30-kilowatt generators was \$1,500,000.

In 1960, the Navy was disposing of 10-kilowatt generators as excess. At the same time, the U.S. Army Engineers were purchasing new generators at a cost of \$1,400 each. The Comptroller General's Office found that the capacity and specifications of the Navy generators being sold were the same as those that the U.S. Army Engineers were purchasing.

Appropriations and taxing power is vested in Congress by our Constitution and the executive department is charged with the responsibility for the efficient administration and management of public funds. I emphasize that irresponsible dissipation of tax funds has existed and grown over many past administrations. But, today's rampant administrative fiscal abuses and mismanagements are the prime responsibility of today's executive department and its administrative officials.

Based upon the reports of the Comptroller General of the United States, I am convinced that the wastages and squandering of public funds in the executive department exceed \$5 billion annually.

This enormous saving could be realized without in any way reducing our military power, or sacrificing any present public service.

This sorely needed fiscal relief for our economy and our taxpayers cannot be gained without a clear, immediate public demand and the coordinated efforts of the Congress and the executive department.



STRICTLY PERSONAL

By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

A young woman of my acquaintance who is learning English during her first year in this country asked me the other day, "If 'was' is a singular verb, and 'were' is a plural verb, why do we say 'you were' when talking about only one person? Shouldn't it be 'you was'?"

This is one of the troubles in learning so flexible, so sprawling and so illogical a language as English. "You was" is today considered the depth of ignorance and illiteracy, an outrageous breach of grammar. And it would surprise most people to learn it was not always so.

"You were" is a matter of custom, not of grammar at all. The locution "you was" may be found in many of the best 18th Century writers. Fielding's classic "Tom Jones" has all its characters—lords, lawyers, preachers and teachers—saying "you was." None of them ever says "you were."

Cowper, 1763, begins one of his letters, "I am exceedingly obliged to you for the letter with which you was so kind to favor me." And Byron, as late as the composition of "Don Juan," used the line: "You was not last year at the fair of Lago."

Most of the "purest" writers of the 18th Century followed this practice—Addison, Pope, Swift and Horace Walpole. What happened, however, was that in subsequent editions the editors altered "you was" to "you were."

In order to conform to modern usage. All editions of "Tom Jones" published in the last century made these changes.

When the pronoun "thou" began to be abandoned in favor of "you," the word "you" was considered as singular where only one persons was concerned (following "thou wast"). "Was you" referred to one person; "were you" to two or more.

Before the 17th Century, "thou" was the singular pronoun, and "you" was the plural only. When the former was dropped, "you" came to have too much work to do, and thus was weakened by overwork. The Southern expression "you-all" sounds ridiculous and affected in the North, but it is psychologically understandable as a means of distinguishing between the singular and the plural "you."

If English grammar were logical, for instance, singular verbs would not end in "s" ("he looks"), while the plural would end without the "s" ("they look"). Language will never be amenable to logic because, as someone has said, people began talking before they began thinking.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q—How close to the United States does Cuba lie?

A—Some 90 miles southwest of Key West, Fla.

Actress												Answer to Previous Puzzle											
ACROSS 1 Actress — Reynolds 7 She is a note 13 Otic acid ester 14 Song bird 15 Leasehold right 16 Tossed again 17 Danish county 18 For fear that 20 Biblical name 21 Musical instrument 22 Land measure 23 Transmittal 24 Moist 25 King of Judah (bib.) 31 Violations 34 Haze 36 Rai 37 Undefined 38 Female sheep 39 Ennui 41 Devotees 42 Preposition 43 Anchor 44 Nautical term												DOWN 1 Feminine appellation 2 Elementary (ab.) 3 Tendency 4 Baseball club 5 European nation 6 Lamprey 7 Suburban 8 Fashion 9 Anger 10 Incite 11 Otherwise 12 Role by exposure 19 Slitch 21 Halt 22 Solar disk 23 Measure of land 24 Black bird 25 Ocean movement 27 Roof tinal 28 Indemnities of 29 Mindanao 30 Denomination 30 Crafts 32 Within (comb. form) 33 Eye tumor 35 Mix 40 Dutch uncle 42 Drops of eye fluid 44 Command 45 Faxon 46 Helper (ab.) 47 Solitary 48 Enthusiastic 49 Drive 50 Eight (comb. form) 51 Rind 52 Gothic 54 English letter 56 National Academy Sciences (ab.)											

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Cat Problem

I have read several articles about someone's pet cat getting killed and just left lying there. How do people know that it's a pet or a stray? This last weekend my little granddaughter went out to play and a cat bit her. Is there a cat owner that would admit that it might be their cat? Not but if I would destroy that cat someone would scream.

This child suffers from shots given to her because of this bite. She can hardly walk and the shots have made her cross. She suffers because it seems that pets are more important than children. I've been told nothing can be done about this, unless a human life has been taken. It's too late then; the cat owners don't suffer from this, someone else does.

I asked several neighbors why this hasn't been reported before now. The answers I got were, "What's the use? They won't do anything about it. That I have found out. When pets get to be more important than children, I say let the pets run the town and the people move out. If you cat owners think you get hurt when your pet gets killed, just watch a child cry when it tries to walk from shots it had to take because of a cat bite."

This town is being overrun by cats and it's said, "There's nothing you can do." I assume we are supposed to keep our children in the house and let the cats have the run of the neighborhood. The cat owners love their cats but they sure don't love the responsibility that they cause other people. People just aren't that "big."

If you kill one of their cats then they will show you how big they are. I might be walking on someone's toes but mine have already been walked on.

Wanda Barnett,
415 Upham

Almanac

By United Press International
Today is Tuesday, May 14, the 124th day of 1963 with 231 to follow.

The moon is approaching its last quarter.

The morning stars are Venus, Jupiter and Saturn.

The evening star is Mars.

On this day in history:

In 1804, explorers Lewis and Clark set out on their expedition to the Pacific Coast.

In 1932, Filipinos ratified the constitution of the Philippines Republic in a special election.

In 1948, the state of Israel was officially born as Britain ended her 21-year rule in Palestine. (The date is April 29 under the Hebrew calendar.)

In 1962, Muslim gunmen killed 17 Europeans as renewed fighting broke out between Algerian Nationalists and French forces.

A thought for the day—British statesman Arthur James Balfour said: "Biography should be written by an acute enemy."



THE GLOBAL VIEW . . .

Succession Struggle In Kremlin Underway

By LEON DENNEN
NEW YORK (NEA) — With Nikita Khrushchev in his 70th year, the struggle for succession in the Kremlin is well under way.

The Russians even have a shorthand expression for the struggle, "Kto Kogo." Literally, who gets whom: figuratively, who will outwit or destroy his rival in the ruling Communist Party.

This contest has been a grim reality in Soviet politics ever since Lenin created the Red dictatorship in 1917. Khrushchev, a tough conspirator trained in Stalin's harsh school, was never spared the intrigues that periodically have rocked the Kremlin.

Nevertheless, specialists on Russia see tricky Nikita's own fine hand behind the new rash of rumors that he will announce his retirement as premier and secretary of the Russian Communist Party at the Central Committee meeting scheduled for May 28. There is no doubt that many top ranking bureaucrats in the party and in the Red army find little that pleases them in the balance sheet of Khrushchev's 10-year rule.

Russia has made spectacular advances in the conquest of space and in the development of nuclear weapons, but the economic and agricultural results of Khrushchev's stewardship have been conspicuous failures. More important, his personal feud with Red China's Mao Tse-tung has caused havoc in the ranks of international Communism which threatens to destroy the Red monolith.

But while Khrushchev may be in trouble, he is not yet on the way out. A shrewd and tricky politician, he knows how to make his enemies pay for his mistakes. The Soviet premier's legs may be short but they are sturdy and firmly planted on the slippery floor of the Kremlin. He has outwitted and outmaneuvered his rivals in the past and there is little likelihood that he will relinquish power without a fight.

What, then, is behind Khrushchev's broad hints that he is "old, mortal" and ready to lay down his burden? He is obviously aware that any suggestion of his retirement or even partial withdrawal from the conduct of

Russia's affairs is bound to cause world-wide speculation about his successor among friend and foe alike.

The Soviet premier, noted for his sense of humor, gave part of the answer when he recently told an East European diplomat: "It is good to keep our friends and enemies a little in suspense. I find it most interesting to read their speculations."

But a weightier reason for Khrushchev's hints of voluntary abdication, according to specialists on Russia, is his aim to impress the Free World that he is the indispensable man of peace. It is another typical Khrushchev maneuver to gain easy concessions from the West. The Soviet premier in effect warns the Free World: "Make concessions now because my successor may not be as committed to peaceful co-existence as I am."

Is it, then, worth paying the price in concessions to keep Khrushchev, the "man of peace," in power in Russia?

Such a policy has long been urged in the West by influential members of the British Labor Party, including Harold Wilson who is likely to be the prime minister after the next British general election.

In the United States, Sen. J. W. Fulbright, D-Ark., chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, suggested recently that the West should seek in every way to encourage Russia to persevere in the "more moderate" course of Premier Khrushchev.

"Powerful forces for change are at work within the Soviet Union," Fulbright declared at Tufts University. He said Russian society and its economy are becoming too complex to be completely controlled by a centralized dictatorship. This trend, together with the West's growing strength, might provoke Soviet leaders into an act of desperation.

Fulbright therefore warned strongly against those in the West who would proclaim "total victory" against communism as the Free World's aim.

Perhaps the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has never heard Premier Khrushchev's favorite proverb about the man who has "honor and peace on the top of his tongue, and a knife under it."



WASHINGTON REPORT . . .

Americans Continue Ranting In Havana

By FULTON LEWIS JR.

The return to Cuba of three saboteurs and one killer could not persuade Fidel Castro to free Rafael del Pino, an American citizen who rots today in a Cuban prison.

Twenty six Americans were freed in the latest "deal" negotiated by New York lawyer James Donovan. Despite the fact that Castro got back his four "political prisoners," he would not free Del Pino.

Why, no one is sure. Del Pino is an old acquaintance of Castro's who was his sidekick in the bloody Bogota riots in 1948. At that time an attempt was made to take the life of the U.S. Secretary of State, George Marshall.

Del Pino later broke with Castro and became an American citizen. A pilot, he flew on numerous occasions into Cuba smuggling weapons to anti-Castro forces there. On one such flight, his small, one-engine plane was shot down and he was captured. Only last month Castro refused to let him return to the United States.

Del Pino is not, however, the only American to remain in Cuba. An untold number of Yankees now call Havana their home, many of them working for the Castro regime.

The latest American to renounce his homeland for Cuba is George Eisen, a physician whose defection was announced Feb. 18 by Radio Havana. The defection came as no surprise to security officials of the U.S. Government, for Eisen and his wife, Ruth, have long histories of left-wing activity.

Early in 1939, the Eisens left for Europe, then vanished behind the Iron Curtain. They returned to the states, then left a year later for another trip to the workers' paradise. Little was heard from them until they showed up in Cuba after leaving Czechoslovakia.

Warsaw-born George Eisen came to the United States in 1921 at age 7 and became a U.S. citizen in 1928. He graduated from the University of California medical school in 1930.

He met Ruth Magnus Popper, five years his senior. In those days Ruth was establishing a name for herself in the far left-wing circles of San Francisco.

Early in the 1940s she registered as a Communist with the registrar of voters in San Francisco.

Served their credit, both Eisens served honorably in World War II. George in the Pacific theater, Ruth as a member of the WACS.

After the war, however, the pair resumed their flirtation with Marxism. They were seen at meetings of the East Bay Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions, and George was chairman at some of those affairs. That group has been labeled a Communist front by two separate committees of Congress.

The Eisens were active in the Progressive Party, cited by a House committee as one of the "largest and most successful fronts ever created by the Communists."

Their background is similar in many ways to that of two other Californians, David and Betty Michaels, who defected to Cuba last year. The Michaels had been active in San Francisco Communist fronts before they took their children to Cuba via Mexico.

It is a motley collection of psychopaths, criminals and starry-eyed Marxists who make up most of Havana's American colony. The leader of that group is Robert Williams, wanted on a kidnapping charge in this country. He broadcasts tirades over Radio Havana against the "Fascist dogs" who run this government.

Jose Santiago, a New York diamond cutter, left for Cuba when his wife was deported for Communist activities in 1959. An admitted Communist, he works on the campaign to "liberate Puerto Rico."

The daughter of an American minister, Barbara Collins, defected to Cuba when Senate investigators sought to question her about the pro-Communist Fair Play for Cuba Committee. She is known as "beardless Barbara" for her Tokyo Rose-style broadcasts to this country.

At least two defectors recently returned to the United States. Joe North, a top-ranking Communist, now speaks on Cuba before left-wing groups in this country.

Joseph Morray, a professor who left the University of California because of "conscience," returned home from Cuba recently. He has been subpoenaed by the House Un-American Activities Committee.