

## Congressman Fountain Sees Many Flaws in President Nixon's Guaranteed-Income Welfare Plan

by Congressman L. H. Fountain  
As appealing as it sounds, a guaranteed annual wage by the Federal Government is something this country doesn't need and can't afford — materially, morally or spiritually.

I have always strongly felt that — individually and collectively — we have an absolute moral and spiritual responsibility to help those in need — the sick, the blind, the disabled. We simply must look after the helpless. This is the American Way. But, in my opinion, the deceptively attractive "Family Assistance Act of 1970" is just too much of a giant step toward an eventual guaranteed annual wage by the Federal Government for millions of Americans.

Much of the Act has merit — including the increase in cash

payments to the aged, blind and disabled from \$68 to \$110 monthly for individuals; but, in my opinion, the Act's guaranteed income for certain categories of people would simply clear the way for later, more serious developments; such as periodic increases in the guarantee.

Within my lifetime we may see 30-40 million Americans drawing from the Federal Treasury under this program. At the very outset the Act would cost us \$4 to \$5 billion extra each year for welfare.

I don't like to be a prophet of doom, especially when it looks like this proposal is going to become law, but I have grave fears that the Act would erode away the vitality of our free enterprise system by destroying the incentive of mil-

lions of responsible American citizens to work.

In addition, it seems apparent that the states, which now spend huge sums of their own money on welfare, would lose control of their own programs through increased red tape and even more rigid, centralized control from Washington.

The most radical change under the Act, which, regrettably, has passed the House and been sent to the Senate, is the program to replace Aid for Dependent Children (AFDC), under which financial assistance is now provided to needy families where there is no father in the house.

The Administration - proposed bill would broaden eligibility requirements to include all those described as "working poor" — families with fully employed fathers and an income below the so-called poverty level.

Over two million families (totaling over ten million people) would be placed on welfare, in addition to the present rapidly growing AFDC rolls of 1.8 million families (7.1 million people).

If the Act secures final passage, the tax burden to support the costs of welfare will double. In all probability, it would soon require a new and permanent 10 per cent income tax sur-

charge. I hope I'm wrong.

Under the Act, a family would get \$500 each for the first two members and \$300 for each additional member. To illustrate, a family of four would get \$1,600 a year and a family of ten, \$3,400. Any money earned by the family would cut down on Federal benefits at the rate of about 50c on the dollar, starting after the first \$720 earned. But a large family would still draw down \$760 a year in welfare money even if it had an income of \$6,000 annually. And the food stamp program continues for millions of the same people.

In short, the Act would:

— Federalize our public welfare program.

— institutionalize poverty, not eliminate it

— destroy responsible pride and initiative for millions

— cause an upward spiral of taxes

— create a new Federal bureaucracy to administer it

— still be welfare, not "workfare," rising in cost with each national election

— have hidden costs, impossible now to even approximate

Beyond any doubt, our present welfare system should be soundly and properly reformed. This we should try first before even considering such a purely socialistic step as this.

We should not go off the deep end and endanger our basic economic structure and our private free enterprise system with the "Family Assistance Act of 1970."

### Other Editors Say

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

### The Douglas Issue

One must conclude that there is responsible reason for a House of Representatives inquiry into the fitness of Justice William O. Douglas to continue serving on the Supreme Court. This investigation should not be vindictively motivated — a retaliation for the Senate's rejection of the presidential nomination of Judges Carswell and Haynesworth. It would need to be a bipartisan move, to carry weight in public opinion. But if handled with a strong sense of national responsibility, the inquiry could be a protection to the Supreme Court.

Justice Douglas has had a long tenure on the high bench. He has written powerful opinions, for the majority and in dissent.


His liberal advocacies have helped carry the court into its controversial remaking of American institutions. His travels in faroff lands have displayed a lively interest in mankind. But recent statements and viewpoints of his, uttered off the bench, raise serious questions of both ethical and judicial propriety.

Justice Douglas' latest book, "Points of Rebellion," in effect approves if it does not advocate violence as "the only effective response" to the nation's ills. It is totally irresponsible for a member of the Supreme Court to seem to condone the often senseless violence disrupting the nation — a violence which, as manifested in the courtroom, was denounced within the month by the Supreme Court. And it only adds to the impropriety for Justice Douglas to have permitted the pertinent excerpts from his book to appear in the Evergreen Review with its content of eroticism.

Again, Justice Douglas in a recent law school talk behaved like a left-wing pamphleteer in declaring that "Our greatest contributions abroad — apart from expeditionary forces — have been Coca Cola and comic books." Add in the Justice's earlier acceptance of income from the Farvin Foundation with its relation to La Vegas operations, and the record builds.

It is a long and grave distance from a House investigation to actual impeachment, which requires a two-thirds Senate vote. In these divisive times, an impeachment case, pitting labor and liberal defenses against

the South and other conservatives, could stir national emotions anew. But there is nothing to prevent Justice Douglas from taking heed, if the bill of complaints mounts, and deciding as no doubt Justice Fortas did, that his resignation would indeed serve to protect the Supreme Court from its detractors.



**Farm and Home Requirements  
Of Petroleum Products**

---

**HODGES-BELL OIL CO., INC.**

Phone JA 3-2338 P. O. Box 666  
U. S. 70 East of Kinston, N. C.

## Frosty Morn Meats Inc.

"Helping to build a better Livestock  
Market for Eastern North Carolina"

### Top prices paid for Hogs & Cattle Daily

**No Commission Charge  
No Waiting**

**Phone JA 3-5103 Kinston, N. C.**

## What Is A Good Judge?

- A GOOD JUDGE is one who believes in God and puts his belief to work in his life and his profession.
- A GOOD JUDGE should be so informed of the law that he can preside whereby the court may function in such a manner as to insure the rights of citizens and preserve the life of our society and State.
- A GOOD JUDGE should realize that a court proceeding is a search for the truth.
- A GOOD JUDGE should have the courage to pass judgment without evading justice, realizing it is his duty to serve the best interest of the citizens of the State.
- A GOOD JUDGE brings respect and dignity to the Court.
- A GOOD JUDGE should ever be aware that he is a product of the people and duty bound to be their servant.

**Walter P. Henderson**  
District Court Judge