

Herald and News

Editorial Page

Businessmen And Politics

Looking for some businessmen to fill cabinet posts. William Scranton, Pennsylvania's new Republican governor, ran into a disturbing situation.

Most of those he contacted were either on the verge of retiring and wanted to take life easy or were in their early forties — a prime competitive period of business life — and had no desire to enter government. When he finally got about 22 businessmen who

seemed possible cabinet members, Scranton was shocked to discover that 11 had not voted in the primary, eight had not voted in the general election and six had not voted for president in 1960.

Said Scranton recently: "It seems to me that the American business community in considering the future of the free enterprise system might profitably investigate the political and governmental awareness of its own members.

Dormant Threat

(St. Louis Globe - Democrat)

Lying in a pigeonhole in the House Ways and Means Committee is a political time bomb set for election year 1964. It is John Kennedy's pitch to the millions known as "senior citizens."

The Kennedy program is built on a foundation of a reconstructed King-Anderson bill, which was defeated last year. The new version would cost \$5,000,000,000 in the first five years and be financed under Social Security.

Americans, generous by nature, might go along with using tax money to help destitutes unable to care for themselves. But a good look at the measure will show that "medicare" is not that, but a socialistic hoax.

First, the bill ignores the four out of five cases that could be treated at home, since it makes no provision for doctors' visits. Here is a blanket invitation for every aging man or woman to go right down and check into the hospital as soon as the leg or back starts acting up.

It tempts the young American to put his responsibility for his elders on the state.

This would mean hospitals inundated with patients and freeloaders, as well as over-worked hospital staffs. More funds, more hospitals would be needed. And there would be the costly mountains of paperwork, normal

outgrowth of the massive Federal bureaucracy required to administer any such Federal plan.

The answer offered by the President is far too drastic. It is like using a flamethrower to rid the house of termites. True, there are people over 65 without hospital insurance who cannot take care of themselves. But they are a minority.

In 1952, some 26 per cent of those 65 and over had hospital insurance; now it is 52 per cent and the figure is growing. In 1952, some 61 per cent of those under 65 years of age had the health insurance; today the figure is 77 per cent.

Many states are moving to adopt the Kerr-Mills proposal which provides wide medical aid to those who need it and can't reasonably pay.

Why should every American be subjected to a socialistic solution to a problem which is already solving itself?

Why, indeed, do its sponsors refuse to allow participation in the plan by private insurance firms?

The only answer can be the American government is trying to convince us that without Federal intervention Americans would not provide for their future but would squander their substance foolishly. Thus more and more is taken from a man's paycheck and less and less does he spend himself.

The Higher, The Funnier

(The Christian Science Monitor)

Rep. Wilbur Mills, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, has introduced a bill to levy social security taxes on personal earnings up to \$5,400 a year instead of the present ceiling of \$4,800. Efforts of Kennedy administration spokesmen to relate this to their proposal for hospital care for the aged are slightly amusing.

The chairman's bill, they pretend, will improve the outlook for adding their proposition to social security. They are whistling to keep up their courage. It will have the opposite effect if its significance is at all understood.

The hospital care or "medicare" bill could benefit only if the increase recommended by Mr. Mills were to be used to help finance hospital care for the aged. But the revenue

from it is already more than earmarked.

The trustees of the social security trust fund reported a few months ago an indicated long-range income deficiency for the fund of about 3 per cent. This situation is due in part to the addition a few years ago of payments for disability besides the original old-age insurance. The Mills bill proposes to cover only half of the 3 per cent deficiency, leaving a prospect that the trust fund will run into the red even without "medicare."

Is this an argument for adding hospital care for the aged to the cost of social security? The social security payroll tax now is 7 1/4 per cent on employee and employer together, scheduled to rise to 9 1/4 per cent in 1968. The "medicare" system would add at least one fourth of one per cent at the outset, probably a great deal more in the long run.



IN WASHINGTON ...

Goldwater's Real Record

By RALPH de TOLEDANO

A new and systematic campaign to tar and feather the "draft Goldwater" movement is in the making. The means being used are these:

Senator Goldwater's only chance to win the nomination and be elected comes from his strength in the South. If the Republican Party seeks to take the Southern vote away from the Democrats, the GOP will have to become "lily white." In fact, Mr. Goldwater is turning the GOP into the "white man's party."

Those who propose these arguments are very careful to disclaim any malign intent. They have not yet really tried to pin the anti-Negro label on Mr. Goldwater. But the insistence that he is converting the "party of Lincoln" into a Dixiecrat grouping can only lead to false and vicious assumptions.

Barry Goldwater is not anti-Negro and the Southerners who support him are for the most part citizens who are far more interested in the economic problems created by the New Frontier and the steady decline of American power abroad. I am not authorized to speak for Senator Goldwater, but I do have his record on civil rights—and it is one that

any American would be proud of.

This is not hyperbole. The men and women of the South with whom I have spoken do not wish to persecute the Negro. They agree that Negro rights should be respected. But they do not want the federal government holding a pistol to their heads. Nor do they want to see the civil rights issue destroy the constitutional fabric of the nation. Long before the Supreme Court decision, many Southerners were working to raise the Negro standard of living and to open doors to the colored people. Interestingly, the Supreme Court's 1954 school decision did more to set back Negro-white relations in the South than any single event since the Reconstruction.

Senator Goldwater has long believed in voluntary action and cooperation rather than bayonets and court orders. He believes in this even though the Negro vote in Arizona is negligible—43,400 in a population of almost 1.3 million.

When he got out of the Air Force in 1946, Mr. Goldwater took a reduction in rank in order to organize the Arizona Air National Guard. As executive officer, he established the first integrated National Guard of the postwar era. He did not do it to win votes

or to irritate his neighbors. He neither won nor lost votes from it.

As a member of the Phoenix City Council, Mr. Goldwater took the lead in bringing about the desegregation of the restaurant at the municipal airport. He was also able to help desegregate Arizona theaters. He and his fellow Phoenixians did not exercise compulsion. They were acting with a states' rights framework to do what they felt had to be done.

The Goldwater department stores have practiced no discrimination in hiring as far back as any company official can remember—which is about 25 years. All employees eat in the same cafeteria—whether they are white, Negro, or Indian (also the target of discrimination in the Southwest).

Senator Goldwater's sincerity is being assailed because he refused to implement integration by force. Criticism is mounting because he will not vote to end Senate debate if the "public accommodations" bill comes up. But like many Senators, both Democratic and Republican, Northern and Southern, he feels that using the "interstate commerce clause" of the Constitution as a device to open public accommodations to the Negro is a dangerous precedent which can allow the federal government to interfere in every activity of every citizen—right down to the shoeshine boy.

Cloture remains the only way to prevent passage of a measure whose implications can live to plague us—particularly since the Fourteenth Amendment offers abundant groundwork.

I suspect, though I have no way of knowing, that if Senator Goldwater were pressed to the wall, he might justify his position on current civil rights measures by noting that all the freedom in the world will avail us naught if the country is pulverized by a bomb as a result of faulty foreign policies.

In any case, the proponents of civil rights can argue with Senator Goldwater's way of solving the problem. But they cannot accuse him of being indifferent to it—or in any way anti-Negro. The implication that he is, now being carefully nurtured, can backfire badly.

STRICTLY PERSONAL



By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

"To do the opposite," remarked a German wit two centuries ago, "is also a form of imitation."

I was reminded of this comment at a college recently, when I was approached by an angry young student writer with a sheaf of manuscripts. He asked me to look through and evaluate his work.

As kindly as possible, I tried to point out to him that everything he showed me was written in the spirit of contradiction. And contradiction, which seems to be independence, is always a form of subservience.

He was puzzled by this seeming paradox. Yet it is absolutely true that the writer or thinker whose aim is to be "unlike others" is really getting his cue from them: He lets popularity decide which attitude he will take—and to be always against the popular is to be always with the popular.

Aristotle said that both the master and the slave are tied to different ends of the same chain—and so it is with the

chronic contradiator: Mass taste determines what he will be against, and he cannot be original because he is only reacting to other people. What he mistakes for his "independence" is really a great dependence on society.

Somewhere in his fine book of reflections, published more than 30 years ago, "Life and the Student," Charles Horton Cooley observes: "It is the mark of a rarely stable mind that antagonism cannot drive it to extremes."

The angry young writer, antagonized by what he conceives as the stupidity or hypocrisy or apathy of the social order around him, is driven to the extreme of contradicting everything, of disagreeing with all—which makes his position as ridiculous as that of the most placid conformist. Any philosophy based on a negative, on being the opposite, has given up its essential freedom.

Real changes are effected in society not by the contradiators and opposers, but by those who are able to synthesize what is best out of the old and the new. A revolution that simply turns over the past is doomed to make the same terrible mistakes, only in an upside-down position. And what was uniquely remarkable about the American Revolution was its willingness to retain the positive aspects of English common law and merely modify the traditions it broke with politically.

Most of us define ourselves by what we are against—the banker no less than the beatnik. And thus we are, in a way, the captives of our antagonists. Only great men are truly free, for they alone define themselves by eternal standards, and not by social ones.

Almanac

By United Press International

Today is Tuesday, July 16, the 197th day of 1963 with 183 to follow.

The moon is approaching its new phase.

The morning stars are Jupiter and Saturn.

The evening star is Mars.

On this day in history:

In 1790, Congress established the District of Columbia on the Potomac.

EDSON IN WASHINGTON ...



Asks Strict Auditing Of Spending By House

By PETER EDSON

Washington Correspondent

Newspaper Enterprise Assn.

WASHINGTON (NEA)—A proposal by Rep. Oliver P. Bolton, R-Ohio, to let U.S. Comptroller General Joseph Campbell and the General Accounting Office which he heads audit the accounts of all House committees and Architect of the Capitol J. George Stewart is something new in Washington.

No one has ever had the courage to suggest that before. But in view of all this year's agitation for congressional reform and reorganization, it has possibilities.

There has been a lot of cringing at Congress this session for loose handling of the taxpayers' money. First it was for little things like spending half a million dollars of the Treasury's foreign funds on expense accounts for overseas junkies. Then it got into big money to finish the \$70 million third House office building, complete with swimming pool.

A plan to build a two-deck underground garage for the congressmen at a cost of \$8 million has been sidetracked, but it will be back.

It was all this tomfoolery which gave young Bolton his idea for having a closer check of congressional spending. The General Accounting Office is, of course, the watchdog of Congress.

Last year Campbell sent Congress over 800 audits after investigating charges of waste and inefficiency in agencies of the executive branch of government. This resulted in savings of over \$160 million.

Incidentally, this is almost as much as it costs to run Congress—\$140 million for the House and \$23 million for the Senate in the new fiscal year that began July 1. This is an increase of \$22 million over last year.

On request, GAO in the past has audited some of the routine housekeeping accounts of the Capitol—the restaurants, barber-shops, custodial and police services. These reports have been

sent to the clerk of the House or the Secretary of the Senate. But they have never been made public. And congressional committee financial reports have been approved only by chairmen.

To get all this out in the open, Bolton went to the General Accounting Office for help. GAO's general counsel Robert F. Keller gave informal guidance on how to proceed in drafting the bill, without taking any position on its merits or demerits.

The bill has now been referred to House Government Operations Committee under Chairman William L. Dawson, D-Ill.

On request from this committee, says Campbell, GAO will review how the legislation would operate and its costs.

Preliminary estimates are that an audit of House committees and Capitol architect's office accounts would require the full-time services of only one or two auditors. The cost would be \$10,000 to \$15,000 a year, plus the cost of printing public reports, which would be several thousand more.

Bolton's bill would grant to the comptroller general "the right and privilege to audit all public accounts of the House of Representatives, as well as all expenditures of the Capitol architect."

The Senate is excluded from this bill because one house of Congress never legislates on the other. But the assumption is that if House accounts are put under General Accounting Office audit, the Senate would follow suit.

"Enactment of this bill," Bolton believes, "would grant to the entire press corps facts which are now held confidential. An open accounting would help re-establish public trust and confidence in Congress."

Bolton also has under study a proposal to establish a congressional Committee on Ethics. It would be patterned after the American Bar Association Committee on Ethics which has done much to raise standards of the legal profession.

WASHINGTON REPORT ...



Foreign-Aid Program Is Three-Ring Circus

By FULTON LEWIS JR.

Midway through the campaign that was to carry him up Pennsylvania Avenue to the White House, John Fitzgerald Kennedy aimed some of his most bitter salvos not at Richard Nixon but big-city slums, instead.

To be sure, Nixon was the scapegoat. He had voted against urban renewal. He had opposed in 1949 the National Housing Act and in 1952 had sponsored an amendment to end public housing in Los Angeles.

Slums, declared candidate Kennedy, were the shame of the nation. Forty million Americans, he continued, were forced to live in sub-standard housing. There was the financial cost of slums: crime, delinquency and disease. And the "social cost: For millions of children, the slums are an asphalt jungle, a mockery of the American way of life."

He pledged an end to all of this. He proposed a five-point, 10-year plan that would turn slums into parks and punks into gentlemen.

Soon after his election, the President asked for and got increased appropriations for urban renewal. A press release, dated June 25, explains one of the more ingenious programs of the Urban Renewal Administration:

A 300,000 attempt to turn the deserted marshlands of southeast New Jersey into a state park and

"wild bird refuge." The area is represented in Congress by Rep. Milton Glenn (R.), who is unable to fathom how or why it can qualify for federal funds under the urban renewal program.

There are no residents in the "urban" area Washington wants to "renew." There is nothing but sandhills, and Indiana grass and sea gulls, according to Rep. Glenn.

The gift of Federal money is deplored by municipal officers of Ocean City, N.J., as the funds will be used to acquire private property, taking tax ratables from the city.

There is no need for a State Park, says the Congressman, who points to 14 seashore resorts in the immediate vicinity. Their existence, he continues, is now threatened by a State Park—financed by federal funds—that nobody, save some faceless bureaucrats, seems to want.

As for the "wild bird refuge," Rep. Glenn says it is a flagrant misuse of the taxpayer's dough.

"Personally, I have nothing against birds. Yet—at the risk of being accused of discriminating against our feathered friends—I maintain that when our federal government starts using urban renewal money to develop bird refuges at a time when American citizens are living in slum conditions, such muddled governmental thinking is strictly for the birds."

Ever wonder why the Administration needs more than \$4 billion to run its foreign aid shop? Consider the following, uncovered by Delaware Sen. John J. Williams.

1. Washington buys from a British firm 47 pieces of radar equipment at a total cost of \$2,156,679.

2. Washington then discovers it has no need for the stuff and asks the British firm, Cossor Radar Electronics, Ltd., to buy it back.

3. After considerable haggling, the British agree to purchase the goods as surplus for \$114,500.

4. Cossor Radar promptly turns around and sells the equipment—which is still in its original packing crates—to the Portuguese government.

5. The Portuguese, using US foreign aid funds, pay the British \$483,500. The equipment is then shipped to Portugal at US expense marked "Free Issue."

Republicans will make an all-out effort to capture the Senate seat of Democrat Edmund Muskie, one-time boy-wonder of Maine politics. Likely GOP candidate is seven-term Congressman Clifford McIntire.

BERRY'S WORLD



"There goes the congressional watchdog committee"



HOLMES ALEXANDER ...

Latin America Prelude

By HOLMES ALEXANDER
WASHINGTON, D. C. — If Congress ever "goes home," this reporter hopes to make a tour of Latin America. While he's there, of course, and when he returns, he'll be omniscient on Latino affairs.

Meanwhile, what's wrong with some becoming ignorant? So, as a welcome respite from the race issue, he goes around Washington and tries to find out from resident experts what the hassle down there is all about. He sorts the anecdotes from his notebook: "See!" says a Communist in Guatemala City as an air-conditioned car piles between the air-conditioned office and the air-conditioned apartment which house American officials, "they don't even breathe the same air that we do."

"No, I'm 'botching' it," says a German traveling salesman in Central America. "The Adenauer chancellery won't let my wife out of the country till she perfects her Spanish. I work for a private diesel oil firm, but my government has the idea that every German in Latin America, man, woman and child, is a representative of the Federal Republic."

"Let's get down to business right away," says the American salesman to the Chilean executive, who has been bred to enjoy long, pleasant conversations and

slow-growing friendships. "I've got to catch that three o'clock plane."

"Why waste my time?" snaps an American official of the Alliance For Progress to a vice president of a U. S. manufacturing firm which may invest some of its own money in Latin America. "You've got to come in here with a specific plan before we can talk."

"You ask if we have democracy here," says a Nicaraguan official in answer to an American newsmen. "Well, you have one kind of democracy in Massachusetts and another in Mississippi; one kind in California and another in Alabama. Yes, we have our kind."

"There are as many kinds of Communism as there are of democracy," says a young Dominican construction engineer. "All the Latin American leaders were Marxists in their youth. Any successful government in Latin America has got to be at least socialist."

The reporter doing a cram course on Latin American affairs remembers such succinct, heart-of-the-matter statements. It is the same when he turns to reading "I was there" reports. A "Saturday Evening Post" article makes him suddenly understand why Latinos react with hatred toward neon signs advertising American-made goods, even

though the Gringo firms bring money and creature comforts to the "other" Americans. Those blatant commercials offend the Latino's "virilidad" — his manhood. How vivid a revelation!

The cramping reporter asks a Latin friend for some other word that is crucial to our success in Latin America, and the friend says "simpatia" — sympathy. But that, of course, is an inborn quality, much less affected.

"No," he is told. "In Latin America we still think of Mr. Kennedy as trying to build himself into a beloved ex-President. Always the image — never the action."

Well, you don't become an expert on Latin America by interviewing and reading in Washington. There is no substitute for spent shoe leather. But you begin to gauge the dimensions of your own ignorance by the dimensions of the problem. You can be a little less impatient with the statesmen who still haven't checked all the wrinkles, stamped out all the Communists, raked in one hundred cents for every dollar expended there.

You haven't found anybody yet who knows how we're going to "win" in Latin America, or anybody who isn't positively certain that we cannot afford to lose.