## Your Right to Know Is the Key to All Your Liberities

## EDITORIALS
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THOUGHT FOR TODAY - I can recall only two
federal programs that have been abolished since I was
first elected to Congress: Uncle Sam no longer stables
stallions for breeding cavalry horses, and is now out
of the rum-distilling business in the Virgin Islands.

- Representative Charles E. Bennett.
1959-- A Great Year
A hasty glance around Torrance points up emphatically In almost any section of town you might want to stand, you can look up and down the street and see evi-
dence of new construction, new streets, stores, industries, and many, many more people.

The year 1959 will be put down by future chroniclers
our times as the year the city attained its first 100,000 mark on the population scale
It will be put down as the year that the huge Del Amo Shopping Center opened ... the shopping centers
shaw Blvd. and Pacific Cosst Hwy shaw Blvd. and Pacific Corst Hwy, mushroomed out o vacant fields. . . a huse neviv industrial tract at
and Crenshaw began to cinve the city's skyline.

Although building permis will not reach the peak
tablished in the city's lush home building years, the 1959 established in the city's lush home building years, the 1959
construction will have a great impact on the future of the city. ${ }^{\text {Permits issued during the year include those for such }}$ Permits issuedions to the city's family as Magnavox,
"Blue Chip" addition Stel, Beiond Indu trics, Datran, Kentile, Columbia Van Lines, and many othe

Changes in the downtown Torr
y the sale of the old ciy hall and construction which was
at Cravens and Engracia
Construction and dedication of the 150 bed Little Company of Mary Hospital, construction of the huge Del Amo down the length of Hawthorne Ave. changed the complex n of Torrance in 1959
the "threshhold

## A New Double Standard

## ed the federal government with setting itself up as "a cen- sor of advertising, which is the life blood of the American

 economic system."Mr. Brooks was referring to the controversial rul Ings of the Internal Revenue Service and the Federal Pow-
er Commission that the cost of private industry advertising er Commission that the cost of private industry advertising
intended to inform the public on legislation and to present
industry's industry's case against the socialistic encroachment of pub-
lic power, is not an ordinary business expense and is there fore not tax deductible or germaine to the establishment FPC of having knuckled under to "forces in and out of Con gress whi
business."
Although the government does not prohibit the ad
vertising in question, the element of censorship certainly vertising in question, the element of censorship certainly
is there. By denying tax deductibility to one type of adver is there. By denying tax deductibiiity to one type of adver
tising it doubles its cost - certainly a heavy deterrent, i tising it doubles its cost - certainly a heavy deterrent,
not an outright prohibition. And since, as Mr. Brooks pointed out, "the history of our government has been that once
government assumes some regulatory power in a new area, gove power always increases," there is the distinct threa
that broader regulation of adyertising that broader regulation of advertising will follow. up a double standard of competition - one for private in dustry, another for itself. Through anti-trust laws it fosters competition within private industry. But through the tax
deductibility ruling it stacks the cards against any industry with which it has gone into competition - especially the power industry over which it already holds regulatory pow-
ers. This double standard is a dangerous precedent, and
an encroachment on the economic welfare of the hundreds of thousands of private citizens who through their inves Opinions of Others

Industry's lead in productivity is the reason why American workers have been able to earn considerably more than workers in other countrles
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Heavy Pressure Exerted To Kill Vote on Senate
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## Insured Must Show Interest



it. You must own it, have an and had helped to bringequity in it, or have lent about the child's death.
some money on it. In short of course, the aunt got noyou must stand to lose if it insurance money.
is destroyed or damaged.
In life insurance, you must a
reasonably expect to benefit and no dependence or bene-
from that life. No one can
just insure a stranger's life.
This would encourage murThe insurable stake in
someone's life or health mustexist when the company sellshe policy, though it need notexist later on in illness or
.B interest in property insurd both when the policyought and when the losstakes place.
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It is a serious ..... stroy pro
ance. And
a life. ..... stroy pro
ance. And
a life. ..... stroy pro
ance. And
a life. ..... stroy pro
ance. And
a life. ..... stroy pro
ance. And
a life. ..... you have a stake. ..... you have a stake. ..... you have a stake. ..... you have a stake. ..... you have a stake.
aunt-in-law who later mur-
dered the child for the insur-
ance. The child's father sued
aunt-in-law who later mur-
dered the child for the insur-
ance. The child's father sued
aunt-in-law who later mur-
dered the child for the insur-
ance. The child's father sued
aunt-in-law who later mur-
dered the child for the insur-
ance. The child's father sued
aunt-in-law who later mur-
dered the child for the insur-
ance. The child's father sued
insurance company for no
checking the aunt's interest.
insurance company for no
checking the aunt's interest.
insurance company for no
checking the aunt's interest.
insurance company for no
checking the aunt's interest.
insurance company for no
checking the aunt's interest.
insurance company for no
checking the aunt's interest.

someone you would gain to the policy, though it need not
have live on.
exist later on in illness or
$\qquad$
$\qquad$worse - which no court canyour own life or that of aassociate, employee, etc. Any-
one in whose continued living

