

Editorial Page

Weyerhaeuser Story

Weyerhaeuser Company in 1964 enjoyed "in almost all respects the finest year" in the firm's history.

So states Norton Clapp, president, in the company's annual report to 23,000 shareholders.

It should be of great interest to residents of the Klamath Falls area to know that its largest industrial operation has helped compile such an outstanding mark.

Clapp noted Weyerhaeuser "produced more, sold more and invested more in the future than in any single year in our history."

What the 23,000 shareholders were anxious to see in the beautifully edited and printed annual report was this:

The net income of the company for 1964 was \$67,627,000 as compared with a previous high of \$64,767,000 in 1963.

Last year net income was \$44,167,000 which illustrates what a great year the company had in comparing it with 1963.

The report notes some other important things. During the next three years the company plans to invest more than \$275 million, \$120 million of this in 1965 alone. A \$9

million plywood plant is slated for Coos Bay and a \$3 million particleboard plant for Springfield.

In spite of automation and greatly improved equipment and techniques, Weyerhaeuser had a record number of employees on the 1964 payroll, 31,515 to be specific. In 1955—ten years ago—there were only 20,000.

The excellent record enjoyed by the company not only in 1964 but in previous years reflects the high type of personnel and management employed in the far-flung operations under the Weyerhaeuser mantle. All of them, including the people employed in the woods, the lumber mill and in the flake-board plant have something to toot their horn about.

Mr. Clapp makes this assertion at the conclusion of his report to stockholders: "From a standpoint of progress and growth we are confident that the year 1964 is, in the long range view, simply the beginning. We are on the threshold of a promising future."

What better news could we get here today than this story about our good neighbors?



RALPH de TOLEDANO ...

Fallacies Of Budget

When I was a boy in school, I learned that matter can neither be created nor destroyed. Today, students are taught theories about an ever-expanding universe, but they haven't proved it to me—or to those scientists worth their degrees.

Physical laws apply to economics, though you would have a hard time knowing this from reading the reports of the Keynesian economists on the President's Council of Economic Advisors. Those deep thinkers believe that if you distribute nothing enough people, it becomes something. Or they tell you that there is no need to worry about the astronomical Federal debt since we "only owe it to ourselves."

This again is nonsense. The government owes it to us—and can't pay it. If I said to the Internal Revenue Service: "On a per capita basis the national debt you owe me some 6,000 bucks; I'll just deduct that from my income tax payments." I'd end up in Lewisburg Penitentiary. If the landlord owes me \$50 I can deduct it legally from my rent.

All of this is preamble to a pamphlet I received in the morning's mail. That good and noble American, General Albert C. Wedemeyer, sent it to me; otherwise I might have just put it aside and forgotten about it. The little folder is published by the American Economic Foundation (51 East 42nd Street, New York City) and is entitled "The Ten Pillars of Economic Wisdom."

Note that I said "published" and not "written." The language in the Foundation's economic decalogue was gleaned from the thousands of letters it received over the years—letters from troubled Americans. Some of those who unknowingly contributed the phrases and ideas may never have studied Newtonian physics or college economics. But they were endorsed by their Creator as a sense of logic.

I was struck immediately by the first "pillar" or formula:

"Nothing in our material world can come from nowhere or go nowhere, nor can it be free; everything in our economic life has a source, a destination, and a cost that must be paid."

Would the Harvard Keynesians accept this? It seems obvious to me.

But let me move on to the second pillar:

"Government is never a source of production. Everything produced by the people, and everything that government gives to the people, is first taken from the people."

Added up, they say with Sir Isaac Newton, "Matter can neither be created nor destroyed." Neither can other earthly goods.

The same principle, taught everywhere in high schools except in economics courses, applies to the third pillar:

"The only valuable money that government has to spend is that money taxed or borrowed out of the people's earnings. When government decides to spend more than it has received, that extra unearned money is created out of thin air through the banks and, when spent, takes on value only by reducing the value of all "savings, and insurance."

In other words, if you have just so much whiskey in the jug, adding water will give you

more volume but less alcohol per ounce. Bartenders who water their whiskey get into bad trouble, but a government that waters its money calls itself a Welfare State. In this country, the New Deal and the New Frontier have watered the dollar until it is worth less than half of what it was 30 years ago in purchasing power.

It's not necessary to go on with the economic decalogue. If you are interested, the American Economic Foundation will, I am sure, be happy to send you a copy. The point I have been leading up to is this: Economic laws apply to Federal budgets.

The Congress is busily enacting into law the Johnson Administration's budget, and paying with good intentions the road to the Great Society. But

every program for which it appropriates large sums adds to the national debt and waters the dollar. Every measure that ignores the physical and economic laws contributes to the nation's difficulties. The more welfareism we have, the sadder grows the plight of the permanently unemployed.

Right now, the Johnson Administration, trying to find a way to subsidize standard agriculture, is seriously considering plans which will raise the price of bread a penny a loaf. Farms which cannot be self-supporting, no matter what, are being kept in operation by taxing the food of those who can ill afford it.

Nothing in our material world can come from nowhere, but just try to tell that to the Congress. I wish you would.

Solon Plans Attack On Wasteful Spending

WASHINGTON—Louisiana Congressman Otto Passman, chairman of the House Foreign Operations Subcommittee, has served notice on Washington bureaucrats that he will again expose the "gratuitous waste" of the administration's foreign aid program.

Passman will shortly open hearings on a Presidential request for \$3.4 billion to finance the overseas aid program during fiscal 1966. The veteran budget slasher has cut at least \$1 billion from the Administration's "rock-bottom" figure.

"The foreign aid program is not in reality a Presidential program, although it is submitted to the President in his name," Passman last week wrote to colleagues. "It is a bureaucratic program. The President has too much to do to be able to familiarize himself with the many ramifications, misrepresentations and claims of accomplishment by the paid bureaucrats, government lobbyists, spenders and recipients."

Investigation by Passman disclosed that foreign aid bureaucrats this year had more than \$1 billion at their disposal, 89 nations and nine territories. Only a tiny share of this aid was actually authorized in the aid appropriation act for fiscal 1965 and Passman says that aid officials will, unless checked, spend far more than \$1 billion in the coming year.

To Passman, the present aid program is "uncontrolled and unaccountably unaccountable." There are at present 71,416 individuals on the foreign aid payroll and he blames them for the nation's serious gold outflow.

On December 31, 1957, the country's gold stockpile amounted to \$2.8 billion. Six years later, on December 31, 1963, that stockpile had dwindled to \$1.1 billion. During that period, 57 States received \$12.4 billion in U.S. aid, and purchased \$7 billion in U.S. gold.

Figures on the gold outflow for the calendar year 1964 are not yet available, but Passman predicts that they will indicate the situation to be even more serious.

Note: Passman will cite the closed-door testimony of Comptroller General Joseph Campbell to buttress his claims of waste and inefficiency in the aid program.

In a recent appearance before the House Foreign Relations Committee, Campbell disclosed that aid officials had lost \$7 million in Nationalist China because they made no effort to get the government to pay interest on U.S. holdings.

In many cases, Campbell said, the United States has provided aid "beyond the capability or willingness of the recipient country" to use it. He cited Turkey and the Philippines.

A Democratic Congressman, Don Edwards of California, joins as the next National Chairman of the ultra-liberal Americans for Democratic Action. Edwards, a militant foe of the House UnAmerican Activities Committee, would succeed the retiring chairman, Prof. John Roche. Another Congressman, Missouri Republican, Durward Hall, is a candidate for the presidency of the American Medical Association.

Oregon Sen. Wayne Morse will demand of State Secretary Dean Rusk an explanation for the reported "iceberg fixing" of State Department officials. The department is reported last year to have interceded with the local police and "adjusted" more than 4,000 traffic tickets issued to foreign diplomats stationed in Washington.

A political party listed by the Attorney General as "subversive and Communist" will run candidates this year for the office of Mayor in three of the nation's largest cities. Candidates of the Socialist Workers Party will seek the mayoralty in Detroit, Los Angeles, and New York. None is given any chance for victory.

The most interesting of the three candidates is Clifton Deberry, a Negro housepainter who the party's nominee in New York. Deberry carried the party's banner in the Presidential election last fall, polling less than 40,000 votes across the nation.

Zellerbach Report

One of our friends in Crown Zellerbach has just sent the annual report for that corporation. Being a user of considerable amounts of their newsprint we were interested in knowing how this company fared for the year 1964. For the year ended in December, Crown showed a net income of \$46,589,000, about \$3,500,000 more than in 1963.

The company's sales were highest on record.

As a result of the good earnings record

the corporation approved a 20-cent increase in the annual dividend effective with the quarterly dividend paid last October. This has pushed the common stock from \$1.00 per share to \$2.

Crown has a number of major operations in Oregon and sizable holdings in this general area. It is a good, solid operation and we are fortunate to have such a topnotch company in our state. And if you ask a Crown executive he will tell you the firm is happy to be in Oregon.

GM Scholarships

Another annual report was delivered to us this week by one of Klamath Falls leading automobile dealers. This one had more to do with General Motors' program of providing educational opportunities rather than its financial highlights for 1964. It noted for instance that since 1955 when GM broadened their scholarship program more than 200 colleges and universities will award nearly 400 four-year GM scholarships. The University of Oregon is one of the participating schools.

How does a student apply for one of these scholarships?

Write the director of admissions and apply well before the close of school this spring. In fact right now. A total of 21

youngsters have profited in Oregon from the program.

Since 1955 GM has made annual grants to state associations of colleges—private colleges and universities. These include the Oregon Colleges Foundation.

General Motors and many other free enterprise concerns make tremendous contributions to education on all levels but especially to higher education. Students seeking help should inquire at his school to determine if they might qualify. It's not always necessary to be a four-point student or in the upper two per cent of the class. In any event there is plenty of information on scholarships if a high school student will take the time and effort to investigate.

OUR READERS WRITE ...

Letters To The Editor

Public Welfare

I recently read an article in the Oregon Social Welfare Association bulletin which outlined arguments for purchase of care as opposed to state aid for privately supported children's agencies.

I consider that the arguments for purchase of care are biased and inappropriate to the problem.

As stated in the article, state aid is not sufficient to meet the cost of care and we certainly do need to move "in the direction of payment of full cost, periodically determined through appropriate fiscal methods."

I would like to stress the word "appropriate" in the above quote from the article.

The arguments for "purchase" are arguments for purchase of care by the Public Welfare Department, and "the idea that both public and private agencies are accountable to the general public presumes that the private agencies should be accountable to the general public via public welfare."

Public welfare sets standards and licenses private agencies, but now who sets standards for and licenses public welfare?

Public welfare is accountable to no one for standards of service. There used to be federal reviews of county welfare departments but now the state is autonomous and the agency does not require a license nor

is it accountable to anyone but itself.

I certainly would agree that "whether the service is provided by a public or by a private agency, equal and appropriate standards should apply." I ask, when will public welfare be required to meet a defined standard of service and who will decide that they are "providing needed services at a suitable standard?"

The article goes on to say, "The public agency should be free to purchase services using public money on the basis of its own decision regarding the appropriateness of the service for the child." I don't believe that public welfare is qualified to make all decisions about how tax money will be spent. The half of children who are dependent on public support, I don't believe that decisions about what is good for dependent children should be left entirely to the discretion of an agency as unprepared for public welfare and that it assume some responsibility as is public welfare.

I don't believe that the services given by private agencies should be available to dependent children only at the whim of an untrained caseworker in public welfare and that is what purchase of care via public welfare would mean. The article states that public welfare "would control the conditions under which it would pay for the care of a child by a private agency," and implicit in

the decision to purchase is the decision as to which child shall receive service and when for how long. I don't believe that public welfare should have complete autonomy in the making of such decisions for dependent children.

This proposal would mean that no private agencies would receive money from public welfare. As a taxpayer I would like to see some of my money go to support private agencies and not all of it go to an agency as inefficiently operated as is the Public Welfare Department.

Mrs. Jack J. Mayer, 3205 S.W. Marigold, Portland 19, Ore.

Thanks From OTI

We of the OTI student body wish to thank Klamath Falls merchants who gave gifts and cooperation to our annual Sweetheart Ball. These people have shown great interest in developing college-community relationships. Maybe this is a sign of an increasing interest in our college.

John Houser, Sweetheart Ball Chairman.

Anyone in the community who is not genuinely interested in OTI has missed the boat but it isn't too late yet to get on board.—Editor.

RAY CROMLEY ...



WASHINGTON—(NEA)—Top military men have advocated the discreet use of nondeady gas in South Viet Nam.

There are three reasons for this:

1. Incapacitating gas can disable a man long enough to capture him. Artillery, napalm or other conventional weapons cannot leave the Reds dead or able to run away.

2. In hide-and-seek guerrilla war, prisoners are 10 times as valuable as dead enemy troops. This is because military intelligence (much of which comes from prisoners) is the difference between a simple number of government troops into Viet Cong territory and finding nothing, or capturing the Reds flat-footed.

3. It's the difference between a Red's Pleiku airfield attack that destroys a sizable number of our planes and one in which the Red infiltration is nipped in the bud.

It's the difference, too, between the Reds ambushing a South Vietnamese government column of troops and the government troops ambushing the ambushers.

For some time, U.S. and South Vietnamese forces have sought to find some way to attack Viet Cong guerrillas hiding in farmers' houses, without killing everyone in the infested villages.

The Viet Cong often move into a hamlet and deliberately let everyone know they're there so government forces will attack.

When the hamlet is bombed with artillery or napalm, the Reds "help" the villagers defend themselves—dig trenches, tend the wounded. With women, children, babies and old people killed and injured by government troops, the Reds find

Using Nondeady Gas Justified

it easy to make converts.

One Viet Cong corporal told me some time back in a Cambodian border village "It's a bombings by South Vietnamese" critics of the Communists than our propagandists ever could."

Gas that incapacitates people temporarily, but does not cause permanent harm, solves this problem. Troops can move in after the gas attack, separate Viet from nonambush villagers.

3. Since many VC guerrillas are closely related to loyal Viet citizens, we'll get more cooperation from non-Red villagers if they know we're out to capture rather than kill their sons, husbands and brothers.

The presently used gases are understood to be varieties of tear gas, which cause the best of gassing conditions, troops must move in quickly and with precision before the effects wear off.

who's voluntarily been gassed with one of these chemicals. It's afterward there are no ill effects at all."

Another incapacitating gas that could be used causes the most who are gassed to be so happy and unconcerned that they don't care whether a war is going on or not. One-hundred soldiers will fool around and wander aimlessly in circles.

These gases are highly effective in suppressing riots. They are tricky to use in war. A gas of wind can blow the gas away; friendly troops, who may or may not have sufficient gas masks or adequate training in their use.

Unless terrain and weather are just right, the gases dissipate quickly. Even under the best of gassing conditions, troops must move in quickly and with precision before the effects wear off.

WILLIAM S. WHITE ...

WASHINGTON—A profound alteration in the focus of Republican power in the urban East is now moving below the surface.

These heavy suburban shifts and muted rumblings appear to be cutting the ground from beneath Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York as a 1968 Republican Presidential possibility. Collaterally, they tend to throw up a powerful barrier to the rise of a candidate against the all but open efforts of Former Vice President Richard Nixon, a transplanted New Yorker, to seize the Presidential nomination for himself.

The major new force rising in all this is Sen. Jacob K. Javits of New York. Rep. John V. Lindsay of New York is a less than major but larger than minor secondary force. That these two liberal Republicans are sharply on the outs with the leader of the party, Rockefeller, has already been made abundantly clear in public.

There was, for illustration, the governor's snappy open criticism of them both for play-

Revolt By Eastern GOPs

ing, in his view, a far from pally game toward him in the matter of finding an effective G.O.P. candidate for mayor of New York City. They wanted no part of this task; and as he saw it, they also unnecessarily complicated the party's high necessity to find a good man for the job.

Far more important, what is now strongly indicated is that Javits has become fast-titled in the extreme by the fact that he is now a loyal lieutenant of Rockefeller and is clearly interested in becoming the top man in the Republican politics of New York, which is to say of all the East.

It is an understandable ambition. For Javits for years has really been No. 1 so far as the Republican voters are concerned. If he now seeks to claim the leadership in title as well as in fact—as it certainly is doing—he is violating none of the rules of the trade.

For he has unarguably given to the governor a long stint of effective, and to a degree even self-denying, assistance. Be-

yond all this and more to the present point, however, is the circumstance that Rockefeller has not managed to improve his position nationally but has in fact progressively lost stature on that measure.

Javits, to the contrary, has gone up and not down on this same measure. His extraordinary voter strength in New York has consistently risen; Rockefeller's has fallen with equal consistency. And there is no fact that Javits has now lost the highly parochial aura that used to envelop him as a member of the Senate. He has become something of a solid national figure.

For a long time the observer could confidently expect him to come forward with proposals more suitable to a meeting of the New York City Council than to the United States Senate. This cannot be said of him any longer.

He has simply had the progressively rewarding opportunity to move in a national forum where there to learn much, even if sometimes against his own best interests. Rockefeller has a

had to sweat it out in the regional bear pit of New York State affairs.

The Javits people could thus be forgiven if they had reached the conclusion that the governor had shot his bolt nationally and ought now to give up on an other liberal a chance.

Finally, the wing of the GOP in which Javits has become the dominant voice in the Senate is deeply committed to the proposition that the party should not merely meet but actually far outbid the Democrats in the next Presidential election. In advanced civil rights legislation and in deference to minorities generally.

This wing will do its very best to root the same in memory of any old G.O.P. aviator to Southern conservatives. There is no reason to suppose that Rockefeller would not wish to do the same, there is reason to doubt that he could. It is dominant a Republican convention as to bring off such a plan. As to Nixon, his stolid stance as a moderate Republican was plainly just not do for the Javits people.