NEW SCARE—"MEDICARE"

An Editorial

With the beginning of the new year in Congress, President Kennedy announced his intentions of lowering income taxes to promote more spending and thus increase the Nation's economic growth. His plans also included the use of many more millions of the Taxpayers in increased government spending.

Now he has taken the "wraps" off another one of his favorite projects and is presenting it in a somewhat changed and expanded form.

This was one of the hottest, and bitterest controversies in the last Congress and pertained to the problem of medical care for the elderly. The Administration's proposal—"Medicare"—was a plan under which everyone drawing social security would have been eligible for a variety of government-paid medical services.

An impressive bill of particulars against Medicare was drawn up by its opponents, who held that it would mark a long step toward government domination of medicine; that it did not take adequate account of the actual need of the individual, but, rather, took a shotgun approach to a certain selected group; that it would not cover millions of elderly people who are not within the social security system; that the costs would be enormous, and, probably far beyond Administration estimates, and that it would result in the concentration of federal power and authority at the expense of local government.

Last year we opposed this plan Editorially since we do not believe in Socialized Medicine! Many Democrats joined with Republicans and were successful in defeating the proposal—Medicare got nowhere!

Now it is back again in a slightly changed and widened version. Here again it is somewhat of a "carte-blanche" idea without too much regard for the taxpayers who are going to have to pay for such a plan.

How can politicians keep on trying to delude the people into thinking that the Government has a lot of free money to give away—and still get away with it.

The only money that the Government has to spend —is that which is taken away from the people in the form of taxes—or fees! There is no such thing as "Free Money"!

From the taxpayers point of view which agency collects his taxes, or what way it does it; is of comparatively small importance. The total tax bite is the big thing, for that determines what he has left in his pay envelope to spend, save or invest.

This pinpoints an aspect of proposed federal income tax reductions that deserve a great deal more attention than they have so far received.

This year, for instance, the social security tax was increased again! The tax has collected more than $100 billion in the 26 years since the program began, according to Oregon Tax Research. In the next six years alone, it will take in its second $100 billion. Practically every State is looking for more revenue, to be gained from sales taxes, excise taxes, income taxes, property taxes, business taxes, hunting and fishing taxes, and even taxes under the guise of other names such as fees!

You name a tax—and someone, somewhere, is advocating it. The same thing is true of the other government prototypes — municipalities, towns, counties, school districts, etc.

The moral, certainly, is plain. A cut in federal income taxes will do little or nothing to stimulate investment and consumption if it is largely offset by increases in taxes—or fees—elsewhere!

We, The People—The Taxpayers—must demand that our politicans slash Government expenditures—stop giveaway programs—truly economize in the budget and halt this deficit spending!

It appears that the public has been successful in their opposition to the "fee" increase on the State level —now lets lower the boom on the latest Federal "Medicare" proposal so that the rise in Social Security deductions from our pay envelopes won't be greater than a possible reduction in our income taxes.

THE ANDOVER NEWS
Published Weekly by
The News Printing House
Jeanne Backus Allen and Ralph A. Allen, Owners
Entered as Second Class Mail Matter at the Post Office at Andover, N. Y., under the Act of Congress, March 3, 1879.
Subscription Price $3.50 a year

Turning Back The Pages of Andover History

(Taken from the Files of The Andover News)

50 YEARS AGO

Feb. 21, 1913

J. H. Backus, Publisher

Miss Phebe Burdick, 85, died at the home of her niece, Mrs. D. L. Langworthy, February 15th.

Over 70 Odd Fellows' and Rebekahs tendered Mr. and Mrs. George Beebe a surprise visit Monday evening. The occasion being their 50th wedding annivresray.

Mr. and Mrs. Archie Yoemans are the parents of a daughter, born February 8th.

Mr. and Mrs. E. V. Greene are the parents of a son, born February 15th.

Morris Crandall was home from Rochester over the week-end to attend the funeral of his uncle, Dr. G. W. Witter of Wellsville.

Miss Marguerite Earley returned Wednesday from Muncie, Ind., where she has been attending business school and has accepted a position with the Andover Silk Co.

E. D. Baker, A. R. Baker, D. K. Porter and James Dougherty are attending the Retail Hardware Dealers Convention in Buffalo this week.

Miss Anna O'Leary returned to her home in Dunkirk Friday after passing a week with Andover relatives.

40 YEARS AGO

Feb. 16, 1923

J. H. Backus & Son, Publishers

Newell Baker, 84, died at the Baker Homestead, two miles West of Andover, February 9, 1923. Eleven children and a sister survive.

Mary Campbell Baker, 74, died at her home on Barney Street, February 14. A daughter and a brother survive.

Mrs. Martha Davidson, mother of Mrs. Henry Livermore, died at Nile, February 6, 1923. Six children and a sister survive.

Mr. and Mrs. J. D. Cheesman have received announcement of the birth of a daughter, February 8th to Mr. and Mrs. Glenn Cheesman of Elkhart, Ind.

Dr. C. W. O'Donnell had the misfortune to fall on the icy walk last Friday fracturing a bone in his right wrist.

Floyd Christ has accepted a position in the Perry Knife Shop and will move his family there.

Lynn Hammond returned home this week from Alabama where he has been working.

Mr. and Mrs. Harold Emery were in Rochester the first of the week. Mr. Emery being called there by the Government Medical Board.

The Flu epidemic hit Andover this week, with a case in nearly every home, 17 cases of Pneumonia are reported.

30 YEARS AGO

Feb. 17, 1933

J. H. Backus & Son, Publishers

Mr. and Mrs. John Monahan welcome a son, February 9, 1933 at their home on Pixley Hill.

Mr. and Mrs. Denzil Baker are the parents of a daughter, born Monday evening, February 13th.

Mr. and Mrs. S. W. Clark and Mr. and Mrs. Carl Passel are attending Farmers' Week at Cornell University this week.

Edward Cable has returned from Buffalo where he has been under treatment.

Mrs. Carrie L. Walden died Feb. 14th at the home of her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Mahlon Mitchell. Her husband, Clifford Walden, an infant daughter and her parents, survive.

Leo Snyder was a business visiter in Lakewood several days last week.

Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence Teribury and family of Angelica spent Sunday at the home of his mother, Mr. and Mrs. George Calhoun.

Mrs. Richard Harder and Mrs. Erwin Baker motored to Rochester Monday. Mrs. Baker remaining for the week at the home of her brother, Carroll Tucker.

P. D. Perrone visited his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Dominic Perrone of Johnsburg, Pa., over the week-end.

Albany Report

By Barber B. Conable, Jr.
State Senator, 53rd District

From every income tax dollar you pay the State of New York, nearly fifty cents is expended by the State Department of Education.

The average taxpayer believes his school taxes pay for his local school, but in our own area the school tax bill we pay every September covers only about 30% of the actual cost of operating our schools. The remaining 70% comes from the State as part of the funds that are called "local assistance". In education, as in everything else, the man who pays the bill is going to hold the control.

It isn't enough for us to say in our area that the money comes from us anyway. Most of our districts are classified poor as far as ability to support schools is concerned. So the State gives us a lot more money than it gives wealthy districts where state aid may amount to as little as 36%

The increase in state aid for schools from under seven hundred million dollars in 1957 to one billion dollars this year is the main reason why Governor Rockefeller and the Legislature are locked in a cost squeeze today. But if the pressure wasn't on the Governor, it would be on our local school board members who would have had to pay for the rising educational expense by doubling, tripling or even quadrupling our local school taxes.

This condition has a direct bearing on the so called Master Plan for School Reorganization, which is causing such havoc among our small rural school districts. The State Education Department feels that economy in the distribution of one billion dollars of local school aid requires certain minimum standards of high school size if teachers are not to be wasted and if enough variety in courses is to be available for the needs of every student. The experts say no high school should have fewer than a total of seven hundred pupils in grades ten, eleven and twelve.

Thus if a school is so small that only five or six pupils take French, the teacher must be paid just as much as one who teaches a class of fifteen or twenty. Putting two or three schools together, then, saves the cost of a French teacher or two.

The trouble with this reasoning is that it fails to take other factors into account. Two schools can't be consolidated, for example, without a big increase in transportation costs. And frequently a larger school might save the expense of one French teacher, but under existing standards it would add the cost of a Spanish teacher, two guidance counselors and three more physical education instructors. So no economy would result and the resulting program enrichment might appear modest to us no-nonsense country folk.

Senator Keating Reports

My seat companion on a recent flight to New York was a delightful, keen-minded gentleman in his late sixties. "Whatever happened to the old-fashioned policy of respecting a man's years", he asked. "And the Federal government is as bad as some relatives," he went on. "They seem to think that we oldsters never earned anything in our lives—that we just sprang full bloom into dependency with our hands outstretched for charity."

There is truth in what the gentleman said. Take Social Security, for instance. This money isn't a gift or alms handed out to our older citizens from the goodness of the government's heart. It has been earned and paid for over the years by individual contributions. It is, indeed, a form of insurance.

Yet, under our existing laws a person under 72 years of age cannot receive his full Social Security benefits if he earns over $1200 a year. He, in fact, loses 50 cents in benefits for every dollar he earns over $1200. If he earns over $1700, he must give up a dollar for every dollar over that figure.

This law says, in effect, that if you are a recipient and remain ambitious, energetic and useful, you must be penalized. The penalty is even greater when it involves the citizen who must go out and work part time after retirement just to make ends meet. And, in these inflationary times, that is often the case.

For many years I have opposed this provision and have introduced legislation to amend it. This week I will once again offer a bill to completely remove this discriminatory earnings limitation, and allow our older citizens to earn a living wage. I hope that the majority of the Congress will agree with me.

The government can, of course, help the senior citizen in many ways but this does not mean that we should reverse our American tradition and not allow him also to help himself and make him totally dependent on the Federal government.

In the health care for the aged bill which I sponsored last week with four of my colleagues, we were careful to provide a choice under which our citizens would have the option of receiving hospital benefit programs through approved private plans rather than through the Federal govenment if they so desire. Our bill also provides for the use of approved private organizations and States in the administration of the program.

Our elderly have for many long years borne their burden in behalf of society. They are entitled to every consideration of their individual rights in their retirement years.