

Editorial Page

Hard Look At Trade In Order

A new look at United States relations with Europe may be in the making. Its major elements are economic—trade, tariffs, foreign investments and balance of payments.

But back of these strictly business issues is seen a need for reappraisal of political and military ties. It looks toward a more equitable sharing of all free world defense costs, including foreign aid for the developing countries.

This prospect is emphasized by the White House Conference on Export Expansion, which drew over 200 top business leaders to Washington.

This conference concentrated on enlarging America's already favorable surplus of exports over imports. But this is seen as only one element in the much larger problem of bringing all U.S. international relations into better balance.

European business and political leaders have a much different view of this complicated world situation than do American leaders, says Dr. N. R. Danelian, president of International Economic Policy Assn. This is a private research organization servicing a number of American corporations in foreign trade and investment.

"Even if the United States could solve its balance of payment deficit by increasing exports," says Danelian, "many Europeans feel the result would be depression for them. They believe that any increase in U.S. exports would make them lose business at home, or it would take away European export markets in third countries."

An important factor in this situation is the growing desire—led by President Charles de Gaulle of France—to make Europe more self-sufficient economically and militarily.

The American plan for a North Atlantic Treaty Organization nuclear defense force under U.S. leadership is dead, says Danelian, because Europe would not buy it and pay its share of the costs.

Similarly, he reports that Europeans have no intention of reducing their existing tariffs against American automobiles and agricultural products in which U.S. exporters believe they have the best chance to increase trade with Europe.

If this report is accurate, it does not augur

well for success of the so-called "Kennedy round" of tariff reduction negotiations scheduled to begin next spring with "trade czar" Christian A. Herter as chief U.S. bargainer.

If the United States cannot increase its exports to Europe, perhaps the next best opportunity for reducing the American balance of payments deficit may be found in increasing foreign investments. Their earnings could be brought back to this country as profits.

Europeans, however, are afraid of the competition from American investments overseas and would like to curtail them.

At the same time, Europeans oppose any curbs on their investments in the United States. They help the Europeans earn dollars on which they can demand payment in gold.

This is a constant threat to the American gold reserve and another major point of difference on economic policies of the two continents.

The final and most troublesome difference is over foreign aid. The United States wants Europe to bear an increasing share of the aid program for developing countries as another means of reducing America's balance of payments deficit.

The European justification for not doing more in this field is that the United States, with the highest living standard in the world, can best afford to give foreign economic and military aid and should continue to do so as its duty.

Europe spends less than 6 per cent of its gross national product for defense, compared to the U.S. 11 per cent. Germany pays a share of the European NATO defense costs by buying considerable military equipment from the United States.

The other NATO countries pay back nothing, but bask in the collective security of American nuclear protection.

If the United States was to suggest that it would have to reduce its military aid outlays, a loud scream probably would be heard. But as a bargaining point in seeking a new arrangement for more equitably sharing such costs, such a suggestion might be justified.

'Hey, Guess What - People From China Have Been Escaping To My Country'



By HERBLOCK THE WASHINGTON POST

WASHINGTON REPORT . . .

Left-Winger Doles Kennedy Patronage



By FULTON LEWIS JR. WASHINGTON—Paul J. Corbin has been called many things in a stormy political career. Civil is not one of them.

A protégé of Robert Kennedy's, Corbin dispenses patronage in a vital post at the Democratic National Committee. Modestly, he calls himself the "guy who sits at Bobby Kennedy's right hand."

There have been reports for the last several weeks that Corbin, a key operative in the Wisconsin Democratic Party, had "sponsored" the nomination of Postmaster General John Gronouski.

No one should know better than Corbin, reasoned my associate, Bill Schulz. A telephone call to Corbin didn't shed much light on the situation.

"Drop dead, you creep," advised a voice on the phone. "And you can go to hell, too," he said. My reporter never did get his answer from Corbin, a former aide to ex-Rep. Gerald Flynn.

After Flynn received derogatory FBI reports on Corbin's background, he "gave him the alternative of either resigning or being fired," according to the Congressman.

After leaving Flynn's employ, Corbin returned home to jump aboard the Kennedy for President bandwagon then en route to the Wisconsin Presidential primary.

When Kennedy won, Corbin came to Washington, over the anguished cries of many Wisconsin Democrats, including Rep. Clement Zablocki. The Milwaukee Journal, a liberal newspaper, dug into Corbin's background and revealed he had been closely associated with top-ranking mid-West Communists during the 1940s.

The House Un-American Activities Committee opened a closed-door investigation into Corbin's past. Called as a witness was Fred Bassett Blair, who had been a Communist wheelhorse during the time Corbin was associating

with party members. Blair was asked if Corbin had been a Communist. His answer: "I shall have to refuse to answer that question under the Fifth Amendment."

Another witness called was Kenneth Born, who in 1943 had run for public office on the Communist ticket. He was asked if Corbin, then a personal friend, had been a Communist. He took the Fifth Amendment.

Corbin denied any Communist ties. He was contradicted by an old friend, Joseph C. Kennedy, who was admittedly a member of the Communist Party in the early 1940s. He testified Corbin had been a member of the Young Communist League who sold subscriptions to the Daily Worker.

Committee investigators learned that a Communist Party transfer card had been issued for Paul Corbin and his second wife, Gertrude Cox Corbin, when they moved from Milwaukee to San Francisco in 1948. Investigators discovered, too, that Corbin's party dues were paid for March, 1948.

Mrs. Esther Wickstrom, secretary of the Wisconsin Communist Party at that time, was called to testify. An uncooperative witness, she refused to answer many questions but said she had no knowledge of Corbin's party membership.

Corbin swore under oath that all charges of Communist sympathies were untrue. He continued in his job at the Democratic National Committee, worked actively for (and contributed heavily to) Wisconsin's Gaylord Nelson, successful candidate last fall for the U.S. Senate.

Little more was heard about Corbin until earlier this month, when reports were rife that he had engineered the selection of John Gronouski as Postmaster General.



WILLIAM S. WHITE . . .

Congress Under Attack

By WILLIAM S. WHITE WASHINGTON — The country could one day face nothing less than a constitutional crisis in the incessant degrading now going on of Congress as an institution expressly charged by the Constitution to go its independent way.

This curiously uninformed and almost hysterical attack upon Congress has, of course, been going on for some years. Almost invariably it comes from left-wing so-called intellectuals and "political scientists" who seem not to have the faintest notion that that thing up in Capitol Hill was deliberately set up to be no President's stooge but every President's check rein.

Still, none of the past howling from these quarters has been remotely comparable to its present shrill volume. Members of Congress from either party who dare go onto some television panels must be prepared actually to apologize for the fact that Congress is performing its constitutional function.

They must actively defend the gail of the place in refusing to abdicate its sworn duties by giving automatic—and instant—assent to whatever is asked of it by the Administration. Careful inquiry into this or that bill or proposal, which is the root reason for Congress' very being, is presented by eager critics as blind and irresponsible "obstructionism." Final and outright Congressional refusal of this or that program is described as hardly short of treason to "the people's welfare."

Sometimes, indeed, the attitude of the interrogator suggests that a member of Congress is in the dock on a criminal charge: Explain at once—as soon as you have quit hitting your grandmother with that spade—what ugly motive has caused Congress not to do such and such. Is it true that Congress is full of louts and conspirators against the good life?

Fundits and professors fill the egghead magazines, and don't

wholly neglect the daily press, with automatic assumptions that Congress is invariably wrong or stupid, or perhaps actually evil, in any contest with a President—so long as he is a "liberal" President.

It is only fair to say, parenthetically, that the present President, John F. Kennedy, far from welcoming such juvenile "support," He has read the Constitution and is satisfied with it the way it is.

The most exasperating thing of all, perhaps, is that this nonsense comes, with rare exceptions, from people whose actual knowledge of a single reality in Congress is as patently and absurdly limited as, say, my knowledge of nuclear physics.

A whole new meaning for words—and a whole new system of unthink—would be required to grasp their approach to public affairs. When, say, a Senator votes his convictions and proper state interests, after prolonged study of the right thing to do, he is a matchless hero if he goes with the Administration and a knuckleheaded cretin if he goes the other way.

The more time and care he puts into his decisions, the more intol-

erably wrong they are—for the screamers take a very dim view of "time-wasting debate." The higher he earned respect from among the most informed of all critics, his colleagues, the less respect he gets from the reformers—unless, of course, his record is agreeable to their notions of the moment.

And this is in fact a pointless "unless." For, as might rationally be expected, no member becomes a great man of Congress by spending all his time denying the proper independence of his own place in order to run after some President as a docile stooge.

At bottom, this business is an attack on no less a thing than representative government. This is so because Congress is the only part of the government which is literally and precisely representative in structure and character.

What the screamers, therefore, are really reaching for, whether they know it or not, is a kind of People's Republic where public policy would be exclusively in the hands of a President who, though democratically and lawfully elected, would thereafter be under no real check at all.

'I'll Trade Ya Headaches Any Time'



BRUCE SHANKS, BUFFALO EVENING NEWS

Almanac

By United Press International Today is Sunday, Oct. 13, the 286th day of 1963 with 79 to follow.

The moon is approaching its new phase.

The morning star is Jupiter. The evening stars are Jupiter and Saturn.

On this day in history: In 1775, the Continental Congress ordered construction of a naval fleet, thus originating the U. S. Navy.

In 1792, George Washington laid the cornerstone of the president's house—the first public building to be built in Washington.

In 1937, Nazi Germany promised Great Britain and France that she would not violate Belgian neutrality in case of a European war.

In 1943, Italy declared war on Germany, her former Axis partner.

A thought for the day — The Spanish author, Cervantes, said: "Can we ever have too much of a good thing?"

WASHINGTON NOTEBOOK . . .

Could Be Left Behind!



By WASHINGTON STAFF Newspaper Enterprise Assn. WASHINGTON (NEA)—Reporters who accompanied Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson and his wife Lady Bird on their latest overseas junket to Europe were charged \$838 apiece. The price included round-trip transportation, hotels and meals and was a real bargain in vacations.

But when one reporter said his paper didn't feel the trip was worth the price, he was told: "Better come along, or you might miss the boat in 1968."

Arizona's Sen. Barry Goldwater, a leading candidate for the 1964 Republican presidential nomination, runs a major Phoenix department store on the side. Democrats are now trying to make hay out of it.

Bumper stickers seen on the streets of Phoenix read: "Back to the store in '64."

Richard Aldrich, New York Gov. Rockefeller's first cousin, was considerably helped by that family tie in his successful bid for election as a New York City councilman-at-large.

Recognizing the problem, Aldrich's opponent, John Lamula, flooded the voters of New York with last-minute ads and post cards urging them to "Be MY Cousins" on election day.

When the votes were counted, Lamula was 342 "cousins" short of victory.

Responding to increasing predictions that Congress will be in session until Christmas, Sen. Karl Mundt, R-S.D., just shakes his head and notes: "With all the New Frontier spending bills still pending, this could provide Santa Claus with the toughest competition he's ever had."

When Philip M. Kaiser, U.S. ambassador to the Republics of Senegal and Mauritania, came home to announce to his family several years ago that he had been appointed assistant secretary of labor, he admits he felt rather proud of himself.

At dinner that night, Kaiser's 6-year-old son announced that

he was planning to be a doctor. A few minutes later, he changed his mind and said he had decided to become a lion tamer.

Then, looking at his father critically, he asked his mother, "Why is it that some men, like daddy, don't become anything?"

Sen. Ken Keating, R-N.Y., overheard a conversation between two young ladies on an elevator which he says "might very well be the final feminine word on the matter of automation in this modern age."

"One of them said," Keating relates, "I know that some of these machines can take the place of three men. But personally, I'd rather have the three men."

Sen. Gale McGee, D-Wyo., a

former professor at the University of Wyoming, got a left-handed compliment in the following letter on his chances for reelection next fall:

"I'm still convinced that you are the best history prof I've ever had and I'm looking forward to seeing you back on the faculty at Laramie after next fall."

A query on whether wandering camels are "natural hazards" or "casual obstacles" on an Afghanistan golf course has come into the State Department for the State-U.S. Information Agency Recreation Association's Tenth Annual World-Wide Golf Tournament.

It gets under way in the middle of September on more than 70 courses in the United States and 30 foreign countries.

BERRY'S WORLD



Over here, Madame Nhu—if your ratings are low, we drop the program!

Victim

The past year has shown a sudden awakening of the general public to items of local, state and national government importance. This column has been filled with comments, both pro and con, on such things as taxes, law enforcement, zoning, hospitals and education.

We are struggling with an overcrowded condition in our schools and attempting to come up with the best possible answer because we are all interested in improving our educational standards. Why then do we stand idly by and permit one of our outstanding educators to be victimized by a sudden transfer under a cloud of doubt, half-truths and the unspoken accusation?

I am speaking of Art Millard, who has been principal of Peterson School for 13 years and is now principal of the Chilquin Elementary School. I mean no disrespect to the Chilquin school, but I resent it being used as the Siberian salt mines of the County School Board. I realize that Mr. Millard's transfer is now a lost cause but this may help to clear his name and help the next educator whose ticket to the mines is probably now being negotiated.

The board has publicly said that this transfer was made in the best interests of the district and that no reduction in salary or demotion has been involved. This is the only public statement they have made but the following items are facts in which the public should be interested:

- 1. Art Millard has a farm in the Henley District.
- 2. Paul Fairclo is chairman of the board and is a farmer in the

Henley District.

3. Fairclo expressed dissatisfaction with Mr. Millard at a board meeting.

4. A small delegation of farmers from the Henley area appeared at the next meeting to discuss a "personnel problem."

5. The board instructed Cliff Robinson, the county school superintendent, to prepare a report on Mr. Millard's conduct. Please note that this action was not instigated by the superintendent, who has charge of all the county schools.

6. Mr. Millard had expressed his opinion on the "One County Unit" proposal which was not the opinion of the board or the most recent opinion of the superintendent.

7. Robinson gave his report and was asked to what school Mr. Millard could be transferred.

8. Mr. Millard was not informed of this action before the decision had been made.

9. The local Peterson School Committee was never consulted prior to the decision to transfer.

10. The local school committee and a large delegation of parents protested the transfer at a public meeting.

11. A motion was made by Louis Randall and seconded by Lawson Kandra to reconsider this action.

12. A secret ballot upheld the transfer by a vote of 3-2.

13. The other members of the board are Fairclo, Dick Jessup and B. M. Antle.

14. Various minor charges were implied throughout the action but these charges and Robinson's report were never entered into the board's minutes.

If the board's decision to transfer Mr. Millard was based on Robinson's report on his conduct, then it would seem that this is a

disciplinary action.

If this is true and Mr. Millard is such a problem, why transfer these problems to Chilquin?

Mr. Kandra stated in a board meeting that this action could have an adverse effect on the district and I believe that he is a wise man. Someone has to stand behind our teachers to protect them from petty charges. If the county superintendent and board cannot handle this assignment then the public must take the proper action to remedy this situation.

Lyle C. Smith, 4794 Onyx Drive.

Thin

The arguments in the letter of Name Withheld of Sept. 26 are pretty thin. Does this person think an act must "hurt" real bad before you do something about it? The cost of a few apples stolen by a youngster is a small hurt to an owner, but if parents don't want a delinquent they teach him it is wrong. A gallon of gas swiped from an auto, or a necklace lifted from the five and ten cent store is no big hurt, but it is wrong. This principle should not be forgotten by Mr. Name Withheld. He said, "zoning laws and condemnation of buildings isn't making such a hardship on us that we are hurting." This seems to me to say, "at this time and not on him." Wrong is wrong, whether it hurts a lot or a little.

And I think he should think over again some of the other things he said. Men should not compare evil and get "happy" because they have less of it than others.

H. C. Head, 2030 Erie.

Letters To The Editor

EDSON IN WASHINGTON . . .



Republican Strategy Baffles Democrats

By PETER EDSON Washington Correspondent Newspaper Enterprise Assn. WASHINGTON (NEA)—Republican strategy in opposing President Kennedy's tax bill has administration Democrats baffled.

What they say the GOP position boils down to in final analysis is a belief that opposition to anything the President proposes is good politics if it will help embarrass him and defeat him in 1964—regardless of what it does in the meantime.

Republican congressional leaders don't admit anything as crude as that for a minute.

"We're for tax cuts," says House minority leader Charles A. Halleck of Indiana.

"But," he hastens to add, "we find Mr. Kennedy's economic theories mystifying."

For evidence, Halleck points to six Kennedy votes as a congressman against tax cuts after spending had been reduced, "though," Halleck points out, "he favors a tax cut when spending has been skyrocketing."

The showdown on this big issue is now scheduled for Sept. 24-25 when the administration tax bill comes to the House floor for vote under a rule of eight hours debate.

Only one amendment will be permitted. The House Republican leadership has decided to make this a motion to recommit the bill to the Ways and Means Committee, with instructions to make the tax cuts effective only if the federal government reduces expenses enough to balance a 14 spending with the tax cut in force for this year and next.

Republican justification for this position seems to be based on polls taken by 39 GOP congressmen in 21 states. In answer to the question: "Do you favor tax cuts without spending cuts?" an average of 83 per cent said "No."

The range was from 51 per cent of those polled in Rep. John V. Lindsey's district in New York City to 93.7 per cent in Rep. Ed Foreman's district in west Texas.

This is a pretty thin sample on so vital an issue. A Sept. 2 Harris poll, conducted on a more scientific basis, showed only 41 per cent favors a tax cut delay until the budget is balanced, with

36 percent saying don't delay a tax cut.

GOP opposition to the Kennedy tax program takes other angles which formerly would have been considered most un-Republican.

The Ways and Means minority report criticizes the bill because "it would result in a \$4.4 billion windfall to big business over the next 10 years."

And Rep. John W. Byrnes of Wisconsin, chairman of the GOP Policy Committee, criticizes the 2,000-member "Business Committee for Tax Reduction" which met in Washington recently for its "retreat from fiscal responsibility."

When Republicans criticize big business and Democrats offer them tax cuts which they want, things are all mixed up.

It must be remembered, of course, that some Democrats also oppose the Kennedy tax cut bill. Judge Howard W. Smith of Virginia, chairman of the House Rules Committee, has openly criticized the bill and is known to have conferred with other Democrats of like mind.

Sen. Harry F. Byrd of Virginia, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee which will handle the tax bill after the House is finished with it, is doing nothing to speed passage.

The number of Democrats joining Republicans to vote against the administration tax bill or vote to recommit it for budget-cutting amendments will determine its fate.

House majority leader Carl Albert of Oklahoma is confident that the tax bill will be passed. Other Democrats call the Byrnes recommendation another gimmick to try to defeat the bill. If this try for the bill doesn't work, the administration will try something else. Kennedy's tax broadcast to the nation is only the first move in a concerted drive for passage this year.

There is still plenty of talk in the Senate that no tax bill can be passed this year because of the press of other legislation—civil rights, debt limit increase, foreign aid and all the other appropriation bills still to be handled.

The question is, who will the defeat of a tax cut bill hurt worse in the 1964 elections—the Democrats or the Republicans.