U.S. Congress. Congressional Record. J.N. 1-466.

# Appendix

## The Shape of the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL**
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am taking the liberty of inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address made by the Honorable Frank D. O'Connor, district attorney of Queens County, N.Y., at a social science forum at Siena College in Albany, N.Y., on December 5, 1962.

After reading this speech, I certainly want to commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

The address follows:

THE SHAPE OF THE FUTURE

(An address by Queens District Attorney Frank D. O'Connor at a social science forum at Siena College, Albany, N.Y., on Wednesday, December 5, 1962)

The shape of the future is in every young generation. Like every young generation you have ideals and hopes and dreams. You have places to go and promises to keep and many miles to go before you sleep, to paraphrase Robert Frost badly.

There are people who suggest that you are the worst generation which has ever come down the pike—they are few but vocal.

There are others who suggest that you are the best and these are many and they are not vocal enough.

In a sense, both of them are looking not at you now so much as at what you are exposed to and what they think you can become. And in that sense they are both right.

The situation is complicated by the fact that you are being rushed to maturity by a group of forces never present before in human history from early dating, driving, drinking, the service, to TV, to space, to atomic energy, to the cold war, yes even to the twist. You are taller and faster and brighter and fresher, perhaps, than anything that has come before. You are also less patriotic if the polls are correct and having some experience with polls recently, I would not take that authority as absolutely final.

You are going to live longer, perhaps work less and earn more and you have it in your power to change this world or destroy it as never before. More than anyone else you are both the new future or the dead end of humanity and you better be prepared for the future or you'll be consigned to that end.

In that future you have a better chance than ever before.

You can aspire to high position in government and business without personally sacrificing your religion. And you will have to play a greater part in your church as laymen.

The point of this talk is that you have a choice not only about what you want to be and how good at it you will be, but where you will stand philosophically or more especially politically in the broad sense.

In an oversimplified but nonetheless real sense, you have two broad philosophical or political paths stretching before you in achieving this great future or this dead end—one is liberal and the other is conservative. Oh, there are variations of both and a road in between called moderate but that road is seldom walked without tending one way or the other at one time or other.

There are some observers who profess to seeing a danger that your generation—perhaps the best—educated lay generation in history—may pull against the growing trend toward what has been loosely described as liberalism in the church here and abroad.

There are others inside and outside the church of which you are members that contend that you cannot be a liberal now or ever and be a Catholic; that the two concepts are mutually exclusive. To hear Mr. BUCKLEY or Mr. GOLDWATER talk, Catholics are not alone in being committed to conservatism. To hear them speak, and both of them are impressive, there is a huge, irreversible ever-increasing wave of conservatism rising out of the colleges ready to crash upon the shores of America's, indeed, the world's economic, religious, political, etc., life.

And to hear the conservatives talk it's going to be the wave that will bring peace and security and a better life to these troubled times. In foreign policy they feel that President Kennedy merely stole their thunder on Cuba just as he should on several other problems; that it is conservatism, not liberalism that has a clearer view not only of communism but of life in general.

Now I neither have the wit nor the learning nor the gall to take such worthy adversaries on together on this general proposition. But I do have some experience and it tells me that I seem to recall hearing pretty much the same claim laid by the Communists and the ultra-Socialists a generation ago.

It tells me too that much of history is like a pendulum swing sometimes in larger and larger arcs and sometimes in smaller and smaller ones depending on the push, once liberal, once conservative, and that the wave of the future may be the opposite of the past in some ways but never too opposite.

Experience tells us something else. Man individually may not live on, but some of his works do. And while all change, few of them die.

What, then, can the shape of the future be when there is a premium on change and its effects, when much of recent history in the West has been a liberal triumph?

Granted, as of today, the future seems mixed. Our strong stand on Cuba may well usher in a new era in the cold war. At home, however, Mr. Nixon has lost, and with him has gone an era that is itself a curious contradiction in American life marked by internal suspicion and external trust or, at least, reluctance to face up to the many challenges to our way of life in the hope that some would change or go away.

Mrs. Roosevelt has died, and with her has gone a still older era in American life, an era of great crisis and great recovery, of great war and great victory, of social change and social progress, but with a difference; the rhythms of the age of Roosevelt will occur and reoccur, at least domestically.

On the other hand, a conservative force of considerable personal, intellectual, and even emotional attractiveness has come into more respect if not more power.

With all of this, internal suspicion has yielded place to a relatively friendly but nonetheless heated debate; giving some suggestion of a different era from the one immediately previous, an era to be marked by greater internal trust and a growing realism abroad in international action.

Could it be that BUCKLEY and GOLDWATER are mistaking this stronger line in Cuba, this quieter and more confident dialog within America—this acceptance of a specifically emergent conservatism, as a trend?

Even if it were, are there many who would want to roll back the waves of time and discover the old shores before social security, the SEC, the Bank Act, the Marshall plan, the integration decisions, etc?

These and their effects are here to stay and be expanded. What hopes can conservatives have? There are indeed some areas of dispute like education, medicare, prayer in the schools, Sunday laws, gambling, birth control laws, and there are many others where there is a growing clash of opinion—but not only between liberals and conservatives but among the two camps themselves.

And regardless of the differences among liberals on some of these questions, conservatism has not shown that impact on domestic issues it may claim on communism and it hasn't much time before there may be a new liberal resurgence.

Granted, the future may seem mixed now and that sometimes the answer to a specific problem can be claimed by either liberal or conservative.

Indeed, Mr. Rockefeller built part of his campaign on that chance, on the theme that it really did not matter if you were a liberal or a conservative you could vote for him because he was presumably both on occasion. It was interesting that both the New York Post and the conservative party disagreed with him. It is also interesting that he won but not by quite as large a margin as before.

Granted that victory is not on one side all the time or goodness or the best of commonsense, along which path does the future lie—Where are we going?

What will the shape of the future be? I for one believe that it will be more liberal than conservative, more liberal in the true sense, however, than in a specious sense.

Indeed the very emergence of a new conservatism may help liberalism define itself with more clarity and realism.

Let us begin by admitting one thing—the image of the conservative has been very bad until quite recently. A conservative evoked the image of a man dressed in a high starched collar and a ramrod posture who regarded the past as sacred and the future secure only when it closely resembled the past—a man one wag described as willing to move America—indeed the whole world—smartly back into the 19th century.

The liberal? Even the word is a little better; although his image gyrated crazily between a beatnik and a retired ad man neither of whom have any great feeling for the past or for its institutions. The difference was and is between the rigid and the relaxed.

Of course, these were only images but they really had an impact and they did reflect a certain truth about the more substantial differences which existed in reality.

While the conservative, in a word, stands for the status quo and the liberal stands for change, a really more basic difference seems



AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

to be the degree that they care about individuals; what happens to them as individuals and why. Their concepts of the individual differ in many respects.

Now admittedly some of the following illustrations will be overdrawn but they are made more to stress than to prove a point. The conservative often seems to look at people less fortunate than himself and says, "I got where I am without too much help, certainly not from any government; why can't they?"

The liberal seems more liable to say, "There but for a better chance go I, let us give of what we have."

The conservative is against big government; the liberal is for it, in most instances as a way of helping the individual.

The conservative accents responsibility; the liberal pushes the heavy pedal for freedom from things like poverty, prejudice, fear, et cetera, as well as for things.

Yet there are many contradictions and some misconceptions that both share.

Liberty and responsibility are often but one side of the same coin.

And the conservative, not the liberal, may stand for freedom of big business, that is, and say in effect with the steel companies, we will be responsible if you let us alone in a free market. In this instance, the liberals retort in effect * * * everyone will be protected and free if the people through the government help you stay responsible. And big business may retort with some justification, "Yes, but why cannot you be as tough with big labor?"

Welfare and foreign aid are other examples where the differences between conservative and liberal can be seen, perhaps, too easily in caricature.

Does not the conservative often talk as if a goodly number, if not an overwhelming majority, of those on welfare rolls were freeloaders without giving too much thought to whether this has been proven or not, or whether any of these people have been given a real chance at getting a job?

The liberal on the other hand may err the other way (toward charity?) by asking that they be given every opportunity to prove themselves before branding them "lazy" or "frauds."

The liberal may be too trusting, perhaps, naive on occasion; but the conservative is often not trusting enough.

On foreign aid, the conservative has usually leaned to the attitude: let me live and I'll let them live.

The liberal toward the attitude: we shall not only let them live, we shall help them live.

This is not meant to be an indictment of the conservative and a paean of praise for the liberal for this would be an oversimplification of the problem.

But it is to indicate that being a liberal is not new and difficult for a Catholic.

It should not have to take the President differing with the church on Federal aid to education or the spectacle of cardinals differing with each other on almost every topic at the council to disturb the false equation that has been set up between Catholicism and conservatism.

Catholics are not machine-tooled conservatives. The recent history of the church in America is proof alone of that. The litany of Cardinal Gibbons, Monsignor Ryan who worked so closely with President Roosevelt, Senator Eugene McCarthy, Dorothy Day, Father LaFarge, S.J., Courtney Murray, America, Commonwealth, and Cardinals Mundelein and Cushing testify to a strong liberal current in the Catholic Church in America.

And I suggest that this current is not new to the church. It is as old as the church itself and what's more, I suggest it is closer to the spirit of the church than critics outside and inside realize. The real question is how strong it has been and will be in the future.

The grave misconception that Catholicism from top to bottom is equatable with conservatism has arisen historically from a consideration of the church as a material institution not a spiritual force; this despite a great body of evidence that would incline one to the belief that the saints were the very opposite of conservative, that they were liberal reformers in the realistic sense not in the specious and unrealistic sense.

Saints were true liberals and reformers who reformed themselves first and then tried to do something with the world about them.

They did not start first with the world about them for they knew that was the long way around.

Unfortunately, the saints were often voices crying in the wilderness, ignored by the main stream of humanity and history clogged as they are by mediocre men and outright knaves—who misrepresented institutions, including the church, and used them often for their own ends.

St. Francis himself who is probably the most popular saint of the church to those outside, indeed a saint for Christian unity and world cooperation, was a revolutionary. He saw the status quo of his time leading to the defeat not only of the church but of all mankind.

His prayer, a universal favorite, was incidentally Eleanor Roosevelt's favorite prayer: "Lord, let me be an instrument of Thy peace," etc. This is the mission of the Catholic, indeed, of all mankind in the politics of this age.

It is not an easy politics no more than it is an easy moral or religious road to follow. For we have many angry men, young and old; and even those of us who are not angry by nature or avocation can be aroused by the injustice and misunderstanding of our time.

Why else does the conservative who often has religious roots judge so harshly on occasion while the liberal who often has no religious roots may judge more humanely?

Is it because the conservative whose central preoccupation has been communism in all its shapes regards the liberal for a fool, while the liberal who sees communism as only one of many problems and perhaps too trustingly regarded it until recently as being exaggerated, sees the conservative as a fanatic?

Is it because men like Buckley can often make a good case out for the indefiniteness of liberal thinking, its seeming failure to be able to follow through logically?

I suggest that one of our basic troubles has been that the self-appointed and sometimes shallow guardians of liberal orthodoxy have often excluded their potential friends and repelled overly much their enemies who could be more friendly and trusting.

And I think there are two reasons for this tension between the exclusive liberal who may be unrealistic at times and his more realistic friends and enemies. The unrealistic liberal sees the challenges of our times often in terms of comfort, convenience, and security, at one time economic, at another time political, etc., while the more realistic liberal sees the challenge of our times as essentially moral, involving man's free will qualified by temperament, experience, environment, and training but free, nonetheless.

There is another difference. While the unrealistic liberal often holds for freedom as much as possible, his position on occasion involves a restriction of freedom, not alone in terms of big government but as regards an individual's complete freedom. This may be true in terms of Federal aid to the education of all youth. But it is another topic for another time.

Suffice it to say that I really did not come here to try to convert you to voting Democratic from top to bottom.

I hope you are not that easy to convince.

Your education as American Catholics is not designed broadly to turn you out as liberals or conservatives in overwhelming numbers, but to have you think behind the labels that liberal and conservative often are and to think deeply, to know there is a choice, to make it not in anger but in love; not for a program but a philosophy, not for a label but for life.

That is the spirit of St. Francis, the spirit of John XXIII, the spirit of the new age of Christian unity and religious understanding and international cooperation, which will lead man not back but forward to a promised land, if not now or soon, at least someday in that future for which all of us were created and which the mind of God and man seek at all times to realize; a future where we shall not be afraid of our differences for being surer of our basic agreement, where we shall transmute the accidentals of color and nationality into a universal essential of respect and love of the many-faceted creation of which we are all small but important parts.

But the future will not belong to American democracy or to a new religious understanding, in short, to free associations of freemen who may differ but cooperate, unless these men are informed, discriminating, educated and disciplined, unless they are, in short, responsible. "To thine ownself be true and * * * thou canst not be false to any man."

You must draw the line for yourselves now, just as surely as the President drew the line in Cuba for the Communists.

Drawing the line means to seek the truth, to speak the truth, to live the truth, and spread the truth with understanding, with respect, with love. In this connection, have any of you thought about the Peace Corps?

You cannot live in a ghetto religiously, intellectually, politically, economically, socially, or racially.

You must, in turn, insist on truth and justice in your society; in the papers you read, in the TV, movies, and radio you see and hear; in the schools you attend; in the businesses you work for and in the government you elect.

You must seek the truth and live it confident with Christopher Dawson that it is the essence of your faith as Americans and Catholics to find new answers to new questions.

But you must also seek the truth and live it knowing with Arthur Miller in this month's Harper's that "the world in which comfort rules is a delusion."

## Patriotic Public Affairs Broadcasting Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in support of the Federal Communications Commission's desire to encourage all radio and television networks to feature more public affairs programing of a positive, stimulating nature, I include the following remarks concerning the well qualified American Freedom Network:

Back in the days when television made its first appearance on the American

scene, the major radio networks understandably focused attention on this new and important communications medium.

Unfortunately, with the concentration on TV, the radio networks suffered, but that, happily, is being corrected. America's AM and FM stations are rapidly regaining lost ground as many discerning broadcasters concentrate their efforts on strong, stimulating, public affairs programing. This is in keeping with FCC admonitions to feature more presentations of this nature.

While serving my former—30th—Congressional District, I was extremely pleased to accept an invitation to serve as a member of the advisory council of the recently formed American Freedom Network—America's independent, nonprofit, nonpolitical, but informational public affairs broadcasting service.

This is an organization—staffed by dedicated, veteran broadcasters—who believe, in the words of Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes, that our Nation's security is nothing at all unless we "have an uncorrupted public opinion to give life to our Constitution, to give vitality to our statutes, and to make efficient our Government machinery."

The American Freedom Network—not associated with any other group or organization—was founded more than 6 months ago in Bonita, Calif.

I have known Morris C. Allen, chairman of the American Freedom Network's board of directors, for many years. At 73, he remains active as a Bonita real estate broker, as well as in civic and patriotic affairs.

For more than three-quarters of a century, the Allens have been a prominent and highly respected family in San Diego County, tracing their history to the Bradfords of *Mayflower* fame. A Bonita elementary school is named after Mr. Allen's mother—Ella Bradford Allen.

In discussing his participation in the American Freedom Network, Mr. Allen has stated:

> I have watched my sons grow into manhood; we have been blessed with eight grandchildren * * * and it is for them, and for all of America's young people, tomorrow's leaders, that I count it a privilege to have been instrumental in making this informational service a reality.

"A little bit of information can be a dangerous thing, and I trust you will concur that Americans must be informed and kept abreast of all sides of important public opinion. I am convinced that radio is the most effective instrument in achieving this end."

I would add there are few Americans like Morris Allen. A man without great financial means, he has mortgaged everything he owns to get this essential project underway. I believe the American Freedom Network is deserving of financial support from all interested citizens.

In addition to Mr. Allen, others associated with the American Freedom Network are—

Jonathon Kirby, vice president and executive director, who founded the organization. Mr. Kirby is an experienced radio-TV news commentator with more than 15 years of service in the broadcasting field. Only recently, Mr. Kirby was the recipient of the American Legion's Americanism Award and Silver Medal "in recognition of his constant efforts to preserve America and our way of life for future Americans."

Richard Lewis Venturino, director of programing and production, whose long experience in the programing and production aspect of broadcasting, assures the network of a high professional standard for its taped presentations.

Serving on the American Freedom Network's board of directors, in addition to Messrs. Allen and Kirby, are William R. Richards, well-known San Diego attorney; H. L. Michael, Jr., Bonita real estate broker; and James S. Duberg, city attorney for Chula Vista, Calif.

The American Freedom Network, for a minimal charge, provides a complete, varied informational service to America's broadcasters offering, whenever possible, both sides of an issue, in keeping with the FCC's "doctrine of fairness."

In its dedication to the radio industry, the American Freedom Network supplies its member stations with the "tools" to assist them in earning their FCC public affairs credits.

Every week, subscribing stations receive dynamic taped programs and features designed to enhance listener interest. This taped service consists of provocative talks, discussions, interviews, debates, and commentaries by prominent personalities in the various fields of politics, science, business, and entertainment.

The policy of the American Freedom Network follows a positive approach, as opposed to irresponsible denunciations.

In addition to serving commercial radio stations, American Freedom Network programs are made available, upon request, without charge, to college and university radio stations, as well as to schools, both public and private, and to all service, civic clubs, and church groups throughout America.

In these days, when charges of mismanagement of news in high Government circles are being made, I am delighted to publicly commend the American Freedom Network to wish it Godspeed in its determination to present both sides of all issues—free speech in a free country—and I urge all of our fellow citizens to get behind this effort to further enlighten our people concerning America's precious heritage, and to the problems facing our Nation and the free world.

## U.N. Intervention in the Congo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, many words are being written today of the continuing atrocities in the Congo. Outstanding among these reports is the column of William S. White as it appeared in the Washington Star of January 7, 1963:

U.N. INTERVENTION IS CONDEMNED

(By William S. White)

The United Nations has assumed a frightful responsibility before history—assuming that history will not be rewritten to suit the wishes of its ruling Afro-Asian clique as current facts already have been a hundred times suppressed or distorted—in the Congo.

For the first time in an organization supposedly devoted to peace, United Nations troops and tanks and bombers have moved with crushing military force to settle an internal dispute in a supposedly independent country. This is the unarguable meaning of the United Nations offensive to drive the breakaway province of Katanga back into the central Congo government and to destroy that province's elected leader, Moise Tshombe.

No less terrible a responsibility has been assumed by the United States of America. For against the advice of our three best allies—Britain, France, and Belgium—we have directly assisted this military adventure by a United Nations whose imperious Asian leader, Secretary General U Thant, may yet disturb even our own most eager apologists for this fatefully crude thrust in power politics.

For if the United Nations without the slightest right except the sanction of force backed by a massive propaganda, can intervene in the internal affairs of the Congo today, it can intervene tomorrow in the internal affairs of any country in this world—in theory not excluding the United States.

SOVIET ROLE QUESTIONED

In some other time and in some other atmosphere of whipped up emotionalism, any other state or province can be described as secessionist, and U.N. troops can go in there, too, so long as the power of effective resistance is absent.

Repeatedly, the motivation of the United States in this wretched affair has been described in the State Department as a desire to force Katanga's return to the Central Congo Government to strengthen it against a possible Soviet takeover.

Men who really do not enjoy feeling that their own Government has taken up an indefensible policy have tried to accept this explanation. If it is true it could at least help justify by way of harsh expediency what cannot possibly be justified on any higher ground.

But even the argument of expediency is open to grave question. At the very moment the State Department was speaking of its fears of Soviet intrusion in the Congo, our Ambassador to the U.N., Adlai Stevenson, was casting great doubt on that line. On December 21 Stevenson—who is surely no enemy of the Afro-Asian clique—was thus quoted by United Press International: "As to Soviet interference, or intervention, in the Congo, so far as I know at the moment there isn't any whatever. I hope I am properly informed on that subject."

U.N. DECEIT CHARGED

The ugly truth is that deceit and evasiveness and incredible arrogance have marked the U.N.'s course in the Congo, from first to last. Men of good will toward the U.N. have been compelled to conclude, long since, that its word in this affair could not be trusted. A few illustrations:

Impartial war correspondents have formally protested the U.N. "censorship and duplicity" in the field. A score of U.N. disavowals of any intention to force the military submission of Katanga have been followed by the use of force for just such a submis-

sion. Heated U.N. denials of atrocities by U.N. troops have been proved false by the eyewitness testimony of independent correspondents.

Thant, in an ultimatum to Katanga on December 31, implied that attacking U.N. forces would halt after seizing Elisabethville to give Tshombe time to submit decently. Instead, on the U.N.'s own account, they went forward to assault another town, Jadotville. This was explained by the U.N. as a "breakdown in coordination." So sorry, we'll investigate.

Maybe a victory has been won. But not all the power of the U.N. to force conformity can hide the dark implications, for the future, of this campaign.

## A Reminder of Grassroots Sentiment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, since the time that has passed since the sine die adjournment of the 87th Congress, events have continued to move in a rapid and complicated manner.

It has been my consistent belief that we in positions of responsibility in government have an obligation to provide leadership based on sound American concepts that have been the basis for the development of our Nation's greatness.

Grassroots public opinion and the inherent commonsense of the American public are too often disregarded by Government bureaucracy. Good, old-fashioned American horsesense is completely ignored by the present administration.

As a reminder of grassroots sentiment, under unanimous consent I insert into the RECORD three editorials, dealing with a variety of subjects, which appeared in community newspapers in my district.

The editorials follow:

[From the Chicago Heights Star, Dec. 2, 1962]

AS WE SEE IT: FOR HALL OF FREE ENTERPRISE

Proposed for the New York World's Fair of 1964–65 is a hall of free enterprise. It would, according to the American Economic Foundation, contain graphic examples of what free enterprise accomplishes.

It is a sound plan, not only for the New York World's Fair, but for continuing display to persons throughout the country.

Since 1932, says a spokesman for the Economic Foundation, "witch doctors" have been prophesying the death of the free enterprise system.

You can expect the prophecies, and the attacks on the system, to continue, despite the fact that even Russia is now taking a look at capitalism in hope that an incentive here and an incentive there will help cure her economic ills.

To be sure, you can expect no great frontal assault; that would be too much for even the most naive to digest. Instead there will continue the sniping at the system's limbs. It may be fine, the welfare state advocates will say in effect, but each of its component parts is bad and has to go.

This is not to say that actual faults of our way of life or any other should be ignored. We have many agencies charged with the responsibility of seeing to it that they are not ignored.

There is room for fair criticism, too, but we must insist on keeping it fair, lest we chance losing not only the system but the right to criticize.

The hall of free enterprise idea is a good one. It might serve to correct a natural tendency to overstress the faults while taking the myriad virtues for granted.

---

[From the Palos Regional, Jan. 3, 1963]

GOVERNMENT MANIPULATION OF NEWS

The continual attack of newspapers on the Federal Government's use of the news mediums as "weaponry" is based on the premise that newspapers are not weapons of the Government.

They are independent sources of information and opinion. Their existence is dependent upon the confidence of readers in their ability to report accurately events as they occur. Any attempt to misinform reporters or to withhold news must be regarded as an attempt to undermine the public's confidence in the press and as a threat to its existence.

If the Government is given the right to manipulate news, for whatever purpose, the freedom of the press—the people's right to know what their representatives are doing—will be extinguished.

Although the outcry against the Federal Government was intensified during the Cuban crisis, the shout has been heard since the first American newspaper was published in the 17th century. It has been directed at officials on all levels of government.

At the Federal level, secrecy has become increasingly popular under the guise of executive privilege. Congressional committees, as well as reporters, have been confronted with executive department officials who refused to divulge information. By claiming executive privilege, they have been able to leave unanswered the questions of Congressmen and reporters on the expenditure of billions of dollars. Executive privilege is a term devised by the executive branch and there is no law or court decision which governs its use. In practice its use is almost unlimited.

Executive session is the phrase which arouses the ire of reporters covering government on the local level. It is the euphemism applied to a secret session of a city council or school board. It sometimes is discarded for the pretentious term, "meeting of the committee of the whole."

It is at these sessions that debate on issues is held, a debate which will never reach the public. The decision is made before the public meeting, where the formal vote will be taken.

In theory there should be no reason for secrecy in government. Both the press and the government represent the public. Each has a responsibility toward the other—the government to allow the press to report those decisions and events objectively.

If either ignores its responsibility, one aspect of democracy has been threatened.

---

[From the Chicago Tribune, Dec. 29, 1962]

CUBANS TO HONOR KENNEDY

The title of this editorial is copied from the banner headline over our final edition yesterday. The story related that President Kennedy is to be honored today by the Cuban prisoners recently released. He is to review their brigade and to receive from them, as a mark of their gratitude, the flag they carried into the unfortunate engagement at the Bay of Pigs.

There has been the usual crop of preposterous events in 1962 but we submit this is the prize item.

Of course, you can't blame the freed Cubans for feeling grateful to someone. They spent many long months in semi-starvation in Castro's miserable jails and now are at liberty in the United States. American money ransomed them. Mr. Kennedy has become the symbol to them of their liberation.

Mr. Kennedy is not the symbol but the very man who got them into trouble in the first place. He gave the go-ahead for their descent on the Bay of Pigs and then, at the last minute, withheld the air cover that they needed to secure their beachhead.

What President Kennedy may have done or may not have done to arrange the ransom is in dispute. Mr. Donovan, who unquestionably was the negotiator who closed the deal with Castro, says the President's brother, Attorney General Robert Kennedy, had almost nothing to do with it. On the other hand there have been circumstantial accounts of the tax interpretations that were put forward by the Internal Revenue Service and the Attorney General with a view to persuading drug manufacturers and others to come across. Mr. Donovan could hardly have made these commitments without going to one Kennedy or another, and probably both. Did the Kennedys promise to stop feuding with the drug industry? Did they pledge to muzzle Senator KEFAUVER?

There is no need and no justification for secrecy in these matters. Congress should get the facts. While they are about it, the investigating committee might also look into the allegation by one of the Cubans that all the missile sites have not been dismantled. The statement was made to our correspondent in Miami, Jules Dubois, together with a good deal of circumstantial detail.

The Dubois interview raises once again the question whether Castro's refusal to permit inspection of the missile sites from the ground constitutes a menace to American safety. The Russians agreed to a thorough-going verification on the spot but Castro has refused to cooperate.

Congress has the means to confirm these charges or disprove them. The sooner the inquiry is begun the better.

## Our American Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, Mr. James B. DeMasters, of Overland Park, Kans., is an able commentator on our American heritage. He has written patriotic and informative pieces to help illustrate the significance of much of our history and tradition. In the last session I inserted in the RECORD his article, "The Story on the One Dollar Bill."

Some time ago Mr. DeMasters became aware of the need for a brief interpretation of our American flag. On the basis of research and consultation with authorities on the subject of the flag, Mr. DeMasters has devised an interpretation which, under the leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD:

OUR AMERICAN FLAG

(By James B. DeMasters)

The stars are States, united in our Nation.
The stripes represent the Thirteen States.
The Red signifies blood, shed by our brave.
The white denotes virtue, forever our aim.
The blue is our faith—in God we trust.

## A Peace Corps Volunteer in Malaya

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN**
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a letter written by Miss Margaret M. Balfe, a Peace Corps volunteer in Malaya, to her aunt and uncle, Mr. and Mrs. Robert N. Angus, of New York City. Miss Balfe is the daughter of Mrs. Lydia Balfe and the late Fergus A. Balfe of 109 Ridgewood Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

I think her letter is a fascinating description of the kind of work being done by individual Peace Corps members under difficult conditions.

In her letter, which was written in early December, she said that she would like to have some surgical gloves and hemostats for Christmas to use in her work. I think it should be noted that she got her wish. Her request came to the attention of the American Hospital Supply Corp. of Evanston, Ill. The firm immediately dispatched a shipment of surgical gloves, hemostats, and other items for Miss Balfe's use in the village where she serves as a nurse. She went to Malaya last September and was assigned to work in the rural health clinic in the village of Remban, about 200 miles north of Singapore. As she notes in her letter, she is the only American who has ever been in the village of some 350 persons.

Miss Balfe typifies the work of the fine young people who have volunteered for Peace Corps duty abroad. She is, as I am sure most Members of this body know, one of nearly 3,500 Peace Corps volunteers working in 38 countries at this time. She was trained for the Peace Corps at Northern Illinois University in De Kalb, Ill. She is a graduate of the Mercy Hospital School of Nursing in Pittsburgh, and before going to Malaya worked in the Washington, D.C., Hospital Center. Miss Balfe is 24 years old.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to bring her letter to the attention of my colleagues:

REMBAN, *December 2, 1962.*

DEAR AUNT SHEILA AND BOB: Thank you for your letter and for the birthday card. Probably the only one I'll get this time.

I'm living in the village of Remban about 200 miles north of Singapore. The population is 350, the town is surrounded by lush green padi fields and palm trees. There are buffalos, goats, and chickens everywhere, including right outside my door and occasionally in my living room. In the not too distant horizon (about 10 miles) we can see the hills rising, covered with jungle. After a good rain the haze rises out of those hills like steam, colored here and there by rainbows.

I'm writing this by kerosene lamp (we have electricity but only dim ceiling lights—no outlets) and I cook on a kerosene stove. I'm the first American and the only one to ever live here.

I work in a rural health clinic and know enough Malay now—however poorly—to run the clinic, see all the patients, examine and assess the children as to growth and development, and advise as to diet, etc. We travel 3 days a week to subcenters, really in the "Ulee" just on the edge of the jungle, and set up our little clinic. We see a good bit of malaria and plenty of deficiency diseases—bleeding gums and night blindness. Also most of them have worms. We stop at lunch time and drink tea out of a flask and eat rice off banana leaves (our plates) with our fingers. The other days of the week we visit kampong homes (like the ones you've seen in pictures—up on stilts). The most delightful ones are way, way, back in. We take the van (a gift from UNICEF) as far as we can over dirt roads just wide enough between the padi fields which are full of water. Then we get out and walk along footpaths among the palm trees, fern bushes, and cocoanut trees. There are beautiful streams which we cross (over logs) that are filled with algae (the greenest green you've ever seen) and trees growing out of the water. Here and there, there are waterfalls. All the trees have vegetation growing up and down the bark and vines hanging from them. The women are washing clothes, dressed in sarongs, barefooted. Young boys are fishing in the streams, catching the fish with their hands. There are all kinds of animals running around, including monkeys swinging through the trees. When we reach the house we go up (not in; they're on stilts). It's most difficult to walk on the bamboo poles that make up their floors, while barefoot; they're round and poorly tied together and roll under your feet. Then we sit and just visit, while observing their health status. Then when we go back the next time, we venture to advise.

Last week I delivered a baby in a kampong house—the mother lying on the floor and I in a squat position.

Today I went to a Malay wedding. A grand affair, the like of which one doesn't see often. They carried out age-old rituals that are fast dying out. There were 1,000 guests. I was on the reception committee and wore Malay dress—the only non-Malayan there.

I know this is sketchy, but I hope it will give you some kind of an idea of my world. I feel as though I've been reincarnated into a different planet.

You asked what I would like for Christmas. If you could get your hands on some surgical gloves and hemostats, that would make a most useful gift. Not expensive ones because they will probably get some rough treatment.

Hope this finds you both well and happy.
Love and God bless you.

MARGIE.

## Tax Rate Reforms for Growth and Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.**
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by the gentleman from Tennessee, HOWARD H. BAKER, and myself, upon introduction of new bills for reform of personal and corporate income tax rates:

TAX RATE REFORM FOR GROWTH AND JOBS

(Statement of Hon. A. S. HERLONG, Jr., Democrat, of Florida and Hon. HOWARD H. BAKER, Republican, of Tennessee, January 10, 1963)

It is our hope that 1963 will witness the reversal of Federal tax policy which for so long has been stacked against capital formation, economic growth, and job creation. To this end, we have introduced new bills for reform of personal and corporate income tax rates over a 5-year period. The principle that lower tax rates mean more vigor and growth in the private economy is generally recognized by the average citizen. While this principle provides the basic guidance for reforming a rate structure, there are complex fiscal problems and sophisticated economic questions which tax specialists and policymakers, including Members of the Congress, must consider before agreement on specific legislation. To make it useful in policy deliberations, this statement in explanation and support of our bills is more of a technical than a popular exposition.

This legislative program is not designed to apportion tax relief among disputing claimants, but to serve the general public interest in greater growth and more jobs.

It is not designed to stimulate an inherently weak economy, but to release the world's strongest economy from the tax rates which bind it.

The critical test which we believe should be applied to any tax program at this time is not how much economic activity it might stir up in the next year or two, but is how much economic growth it will give us by the end of the decade. We believe our program meets this test; that it would produce maximum results in growth and jobs with a minimum of inflationary danger.

This is the third Congress in which we have proposed such legislation. Since the tax rate drags on the economy became a top public issue last summer, there has been a tremendous surge of interest in the key procedure of our bills; namely, spaced-out rate reform. Many new voices have been raised in support of our bills as a whole. Some others, however, seem to view the rate reform goals which we have set as unrealistic. Assuming that the purpose of tax action is to release the economy for optimum achievement in long-term growth and jobs, and without quibbling over negotiable details, we believe our bills encompass the only workable, realistic and adequate program now in being.

RATE REFORMS

This legislative program places the great emphasis on reduction of the range of graduation of the personal tax. The graduated rates now top out at 91 percent and reach 53 percent at the $18,000 to $20,000 bracket of taxable income.

Over a 5-year period, our bills would reduce the top rate of personal tax to 42 percent, and the 53-percent rate to 24 percent, with other graduated rates lowered in a consistent pattern. The first bracket rate of 20 percent would be lowered to 15 percent, assuring a minimum reduction of 25 percent to every personal taxpayer. The graduated rates from 22 to 34 percent would be reduced to a new range of 16 to 19 percent. The 38-percent rate would come down to 20 percent (see tables I and II).

The rate of withholding on wages and salaries would come down from the present 18 percent to 13.5 percent at the end of 5 years.

The combined top rate of corporate tax would be reduced from 52 to 42 percent over the 5-year period (see table III). The new top rate of 42 percent would still be more than 10 percent higher than the 38-percent top rate of corporate tax between World War II and the Korean war.

Our earlier bills contemplated that all rates would be put into effect as of January 1, with enactment coming in advance of the date for the first scheduled rate cuts. The current bills contemplate enactment

after January, but in time to make the first reduction in the withholding rate effective July 1, 1963.

Because taxpayer returns are on a calendar year basis, the actual 1963 tax rate cuts apply to the entire year, i.e., be effective as of January 1, but the percentage amount is only one-half of that which would have resulted from enactment in advance of January 1. The reduced withholding rate however, from July to December, is the same as it would have been if it had been effective from January 1 to reflect tax cuts for a full year. As regards the average taxpayer whose tax liability is satisfied by withholding, the practical effect is tax reduction beginning as of July 1.

This procedure enables a further reduction in the withholding rate effective January 1, 1964, as the second year's tax rate cuts go into effect on that date. There would be telescoped into these cuts the one-half year's cuts which were not made effective in 1963. Consistently, the corporate cut for 1963 is held to 1 percentage point, with the deferred percentage point added to the annual reduction of 2 percentage points effective January 1, 1964.

TAX SAVINGS, REVENUE EFFECT AND REVENUE GAIN FROM ECONOMIC GROWTH

The average annual tax savings under our bills would be approximately $3.85 billion. These savings relate to the calendar year of tax liability. Of the average annual savings, $2.85 billion would go to individuals and $1 billion to corporations. Over the life of the legislation, the personal tax cuts would provide approximately $14.25 billion in tax savings and the corporate cuts $5 billion, or a total of $19.25 billion. These data are based on 1962 income levels, because it would unnecessarily complicate this statement to assign different values to the tax cuts applying to the separate years.

Of the personal tax savings, about $6.15 billion, or 43.1 percent of the total, would result from the cut to 15 percent of the 20-percent rate now applying to the first bracket of taxable income; $2.1 billion, or 15.1 percent of the total, would result from the cut to 16 percent of the 22-percent graduate rate now applying to the second bracket of taxable income. The remaining tax savings, $6 billion, or 41.8 percent of the total, would result from the cuts in the graduated rates which now range from 26 percent upward, but only 14.3 percent, or $2.04 billion, from reducing the graduated rates now over 50 percent, ranging from 53 to 91 percent at the top. (See table IV.)

While tax savings are computed for calendar or taxpaying years, the Government calculates the effect on revenue of tax cuts to accord with its fiscal year (June 30) budget. The delay of cut in the 1963 withholding rate until July 1 means that the only revenue effect in fiscal year 1963 would come from revised declarations and payments of estimated tax and would involve only a nominal sum. The remaining revenue effect of the legislation would be spread over the 5 fiscal years ending with June 30, 1968. Because of the overlap of fiscal and calendar years, there is some bunching of revenue effect (as contrasted to calendar year tax savings) in fiscal years 1964 and 1965.

Because of this bunching, the revenue effect in fiscal 1964 would be $4.81 billion, followed by an additional $4.81 billion in fiscal 1965, or a total for the 2 years of $9.6 billion. The additional revenue effect would be $3.85 billion in each of the fiscal years 1966 and 1967, followed by $1.93 billion in fiscal year 1968, when the total for the 5 years would correspond to the total tax savings of $19.25 billion. None of these data take into account the return flow of revenue from a better performing and growing economy.

There is an alternate procedure for putting into effect tax cuts over a series of years which would eliminate the bunching of revenue effect in the early years. An explanation of how the procedure would work is given in the final section of this statement.

At this point, the critical question is: To what extent would the revenue gain from economic growth compensate for the revenue effects of the tax cuts? Administration reports and statements, and other material which will be presented in the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, may throw light on this subject which is not available to us at this writing. However, in addition to laying the basis for an adequate long-term growth rate (in the range of 4 percent as compared with the average of about 2½ percent over recent years), it is generally agreed that a goal of tax rate reform or reduction is to make up for the gap created by the past inadequate performance of the economy (7 to 8 percent of gross national product, or about $40 billion). If the loss were to be made up over a 5-year period, an average growth rate of about 5½ percent would be required.

For purposes of illustration, it is assumed—if our proposed legislation is enacted—that after a growth build-up in the first year, the average growth rate throughout the decade would be in the order of 5 percent annually; and that such a growth rate would produce annual additions to revenues in the order of $4.5 billion—computed on the basis of 1962 income levels. These assumptions are incorporated in the following table, showing the calendar year of tax cuts under our bills, the estimated annual and cumulative revenue effect in the ensuing fiscal years, and the estimated gain in revenue from economic growth—annual and cumulative—for the same fiscal years:

[In billions]

| Calendar year | Steps in cuts | Revenue effect, fiscal years ending June 30 | | Revenue gains from economic growth, years ending June 30 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Annual | Cumulative | Annual | Cumulative |
| 1963 | 1st ½ | (1) | (1) | | |
| 1964 | 2d 1½ | $4.81 | $4.81 | $3.5 | $3.5 |
| 1965 | 3d 1 | 4.81 | 9.62 | 4.5 | 8.0 |
| 1966 | 4th 1 | 3.85 | 13.47 | 4.5 | 12.5 |
| 1967 | 5th 1 | 3.85 | 17.32 | 4.5 | 17.0 |
| 1968 | | 1.93 | 19.25 | 4.5 | 21.5 |
| 1969 | | | 19.25 | 4.5 | 26.0 |

[1] Nominal.

In considering the implications of this table, the impact of the rate of growth on Government spending must be kept in mind. In the absence of an average growth rate in the order of 5 percent until the lost growth is recovered, economists generally agree that unemployment will not be brought down to reasonable levels. Contemporary attitudes do not admit of Government inactivity in face of excessive unemployment levels.

The options are clear. Either the Government provides the private economy through tax-rate reform with the opportunity to resolve the chronic unemployment problem, or the Government will compound the fiscal crisis caused by too much spending and too little revenue. The option of tax-rate reform offers promise of a stronger and freer America and in the long term, enough revenue to cover all necessary spending of the Government.

The option of more domestic programs and spending to solve the unemployment problem is a barren one. It inevitably would mean larger deficits carrying with them the possibility of a new, serious inflationary surge.

THE ECONOMICS OF TAX CUTTING

There are strong, respected dissenting voices mingled with what seems to be majority agreement on the economic need for tax cutting. By and large dissent is based on the proposal of tax cuts without expenditure reduction or control. Opposition is inflamed by loose statements attributing virtue to deficits. Question is raised as to the credibility of the general statement that lower taxes mean more revenue.

Unfortunately, among those who give full or qualified support to tax cutting, there is wide disagreement as to what tax rates should be cut, how much, and how tax cuts would bring about desirable economic results. Some place the great emphasis on removal or modification of the deterrent or drag effect of the present steeply graduated rates of personal tax, and the high combined rate of corporate tax, on capital formation, greater growth, and more jobs. Others place the emphasis on using tax-cut dollars for stimulation of private consumption, relying on secondary effects for greater capital formation and long-term growth. Some walk down the middle, giving credence to both approaches.

Our bills are oriented to the release of investment funds and incentives. Nevertheless, our estimate is that only about one-half of the tax savings under our bills would be employed as new capital, with the remaining one-half being used for current consumption spending. We believe it would be a serious economic mistake to enact legislation designed to channel the bulk of the tax savings into current consumption. This is a question which should be resolved on the basis of how tax cutting at different income levels affects the economy, and not on the basis of who gets the direct tax relief. The following explanations may be helpful in this respect.

The release of tax rate deterrents or drags. All taxation takes out of the private economy some income which otherwise would have been transformed into capital for growth. Large amounts of such income are taken by the steeply graduated rates of personal tax, and the excessive top rate of corporate tax. These rates also reduce the incentives of individuals to earn additional income, and to invest in risk-taking ventures, and the incentives of business to expand existing plant and the production of existing products and services, to add new products and services, and to employ more people.

In short, it is these uneconomic tax rates which restrict economic growth, limit the number of new jobs, and provide too little revenue for the support of government. Removal or modification of these tax rate deterrents or drags not only would be good business for the country; it also would be good business for the government. A chronically, artifically repressed economy simply cannot be relied upon to provide the revenues to meet the needs of contemporary government.

Tax cutting to stimulate consumption. There is a significant contrast between tax rate reform for the purpose of removing tax rate drags and disincentives, and the conception of tax cutting as a form of government help or aid designed to stimulate the economy. Tax cutting which would increase private consumption without corresponding reduction in government spending would fall in the latter category.

When the Government takes and spends income which otherwise would have been used for private consumption, there is no direct effect on the rate of economic activity or of economic growth. The Government, including its employees and the beneficiaries of its programs, simply spends more, and unsubsidized private citizens spend less. Conversely, when the Government reduces its spending and its taxes bearing on consumption in equal amount, private citizens spend more while the Government, and its employees and beneficiaries, spend less. There

is no direct effect on the rate of economic activity.

Thus, the stimulation of private consumption through tax cutting comes about only when the cutting is not matched by a comparable reduction in Government expenditures. In this situation, tax cutting creates $2 of income where only $1 existed before, because in effect, the Government borrows and spends an amount equivalent to the tax cuts.

An increase of private consumption through this means will add to the current rate of economic activity, and provide some return revenue flow. It is questionable, however, whether this process would have much significance for economic growth. The improvement in business volume would result in some increase in profits, and some increase in savings from personal incomes. As a general proposition, however, it would seem grossly inefficient to attempt to influence investment for growth and jobs in this roundabout manner. For any given number of tax reduction dollars, it is certain that a much greater result would be achieved by cutting the steeply graduated personal tax rates and the top corporate rate.

Moreover, whatever the immediate effect on private consumption of tax cuts financed by deficits, there would be no effect whatsoever as regards either total economic activity or economic growth when and if the budget is brought into balance. From that time on, the process would be substitution of private consumption, in itself highly desirable, for consumption brought about by government spending. It seems like an economic contradiction therefore to associate tax cutting to stimulate private consumption with long-term economic growth and job creation.

EASIER TAXES VERSUS TIGHTER MONEY AND CREDIT

In current discussions on tax cutting to increase private consumption, it is sometimes stated or implied that there may have to be a tightening up of the use of money and credit in the private economy to prevent the tax cuts from having inflationary effect.

Such a prospect seems wholly inconsistent with the goal of improved long-term growth and job creation. The inadequate growth of recent years has been accompanied by inadequate expansion in private use of money and credit. More growth inevitably will increase the private demand for money and credit. In fact, a fundamental purpose of tax rate reform is to improve the business climate, which in and of itself would create greater private demand for money and credit. It would be a most unfortunate thing if this demand went unsatisfied because too much tax cutting to increase private consumption had built up potential inflationary pressures.

A program of rate reform oriented to releasing capital and incentives for growth and making healthy but not excessive tax cuts over a number of years, would provide the best set of conditions for a much-needed expansion of money and credit without inflationary consequences. By contrast, any tax cutting program involving substantial revenue effect, and heavily oriented to the increase of private consumption instead of releasing savings for investment and growth, would carry grave danger of a return to tight control on the use of money and credit in the private economy.

HOW MUCH TAX CUTTING?

We believe our bills incorporate a program which is balanced from the standpoint of the fiscal realities and of the economic goals of tax rate reform. Economists generally agree that the key factor in the lag in growth and employment over the past 5 years has been the failure of business investment spending to expand. As set forth in the statement appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 6, 1962, pages A7377–A7378, business expenditures for plant and equipment, in constant 1961 dollars, are some $12 billion short of the level which would have been achieved under an average annual growth rate of 4 percent since 1951. We assume that about one-half of the tax savings under our bills, or $9 to $10 billion, would be saved and invested, instead of being used for current consumption. This would be on the short side of the indicated deficiency in business capital spending. Moreover, as new family formation moves up sharply after the mid-1960's, a considerable volume of new savings will be channeled into residential buildings, thus reducing the new savings available for use in business expansion. An offsetting factor, however, will be the business savings released by the depreciation reforms put into effect by the administration in 1962, and the investment tax credit enacted as part of the Revenue Act of 1962—the two together valued by the administration at approximately $2.5 billion annually. To some extent these savings are nullified by provisions of the 1962 act which directly or indirectly reduce business or personal savings or adversely affect incentives. Relating all of these factors, it would be difficult to see how anyone could argue that our bills would release more income for capital formation, residential and business, than will be needed in the 1960's and beyond.

Nevertheless, our program involves a substantially larger total of tax cuts, over its proposed legislative life, than is contemplated by other programs under contemporary discussion. There is a tendency in many quarters to rely on the simple principle that tax cutting means more business and more revenues in the short future without facing up to the question of what is needed to turn our economy loose for optimum performance over the long term.

As a frame of reference in regard to size of tax cuts, it may be well to recall the aggregate tax reductions of 1954 which—at income levels then existing—involved tax savings estimated at about $7.5 billion. Except for repeal of the Korean war excess profits tax, and the inauguration of the 4-percent dividend credit and $50 exclusion, the 1954 cuts were not especially oriented toward capital formation and economic growth. The depreciation reforms provided in the 1954 act were of major importance, but in terms of depreciation speedup they did not provide for major key industries as much relief as had been available under the Korean war rapid amortization provision.

After the 1954 reductions, business activity expanded sharply in 1955 and 1956, with revenues increasing to the point of transforming deficits of $3.1 billion in fiscal 1954 and $4.2 billion in fiscal 1955 into surpluses of $1.6 billion in both fiscal years 1956 and 1957. Thereafter, however, the economy turned downward and into the period of too slow growth and too much chronic unemployment resulting in repetitive Federal deficits.

To us, the moral of this experience is that the tax rate reform necessary to pull down the blocks to adequate long-term growth and jobs must be more sweeping than other tax cuts in our history.

The economy is still laboring under a tax rate philosophy and structure which was conceived in the gloom of the 1930 depression and implemented by the revenue requirements of World War II and subsequent years. Only a sweeping reform of rates can reverse this philosophy and change the tax structure so that capital formation and business and human incentives can play their full role in creating a stronger and more bountiful economy.

If further evidence is needed in support of a program cutting and reforming taxes as deeply as our bills would, it is provided by the fact that the 1954 tax cuts, related to 1962 income levels, would have a current value in the order of $12 billion. If we are to serve the objectives of growth and employment to which all groups and persons in our Nation are committed, it seems apparent that a much larger tax cutting package, much better distributed from the standpoint of capital formation, must be enacted in 1963.

After substantial tax cuts have been enacted in 1963, it is not likely that there will be further significant tax cutting in this decade or at least before the end of it. This means that if the purposes of growth and jobs in this decade are to be served by tax rate reform, the 1963 legislation must do the job.

Any question of doubt as to distribution of tax cuts, or as to total amount, should be resolved on the side of turning the economy loose from capital incentive destroying tax rates.

Looking ahead for a number of years, the prospect for further tax cutting will certainly depend on how fast the economy grows, unless there is a real easing of the cold war. From this benchmark, what is done now in cutting the growth-retarding rates will determine whether there can be future tax cuts to serve any purpose. By contrast, emphasis now on cutting taxes to stimulate consumption would leave little prospect of further tax cutting for any purpose in the foreseeable future.

THE MOST CRITICAL TAX RATES

While we are convinced of the economic necessity for enactment of legislation incorporating at least the full sweep of rate reform of our bills, we cannot ignore the fact of current proposals involving much smaller total tax cuts. In considering these less sweeping programs, we believe it important that the priorities in terms of long-range growth and jobs be recognized.

As against the potential for growth of a fully free economy, we believe that the steeply graduated rates of personal tax, as much through the middle brackets as beyond, constitute the most inhibiting and retarding force. Here are the rates which strike most directly at incentives, both business and personal. These steeply climbing rates discourage risk-taking, choke off venture capital at its source, curtail business starts and expansion, and thus prevent the creation of new jobs. They are the bane of small business and of the man on the ladder. In placing stiff penalties on hard work and long hours, such rates are a contradiction of the compensation principle of extra reward for extra effort and achievement.

It is these baneful effects of graduation which led us to the conclusion that, under a reformed tax rate structure, no unincorporated business or other individual should be required to pay a higher rate of tax than a corporation. Proposals for higher top rates of tax inevitably carry with them higher rates through the critical middle brackets. Similar top rates of personal tax would—

1. Give the unincorporated business roughly the same opportunity as a corporation to retain earnings for growth.

2. Relieve greatly the burden of double taxation on corporate income which is paid out in dividends.

3. Minimize the tax penalty on hard work, long hours, and achievement.

4. Maximize the release of incentives for venturesome investment, the creation of new products and services, the starting of new businesses, and the expansion of old.

Despite these objectives which would so well serve the general public interest, we recognize there is a reluctance to release from tax as much income of wealthy people as would result from our bills. We do not share this reluctance, because similar top

rates of tax would mean the most in growth and jobs in the future. However, we recognize the difference in economic consequences to be expected from maximum moderation in rates which may be generally associated with the earned income potential of unincorporated business and other personal endeavor as compared with very large incomes derived from large aggregations of wealth. The greatest tragedy of our present tax rate structure is that those with high earned income potential, on whom we depend the most for economic building for the future, have so little opportunity to accumulate savings out of their current incomes. Our bills would release incentives to men and women with the greatest capacity for personal contribution to the Nation's economic future, and also the capital which would free them to make the maximum contribution. For a free, dynamic economy, these are inseparable attributes.

A top personal tax rate similar to the top corporate tax rate would be a small concession to make in order to turn our high-powered people loose to lead the way to high-level growth. However, too much damage would not be done as regards the "earned income" group if one or two higher rates of tax were set at very high income levels. Such higher rates of tax could not be justified at any income levels from the economic standpoint, but they would not be as growth-retarding as such rates applied within the existing taxable income brackets. Above all, however, the No. 1 priority in tax rate reform is to minimize the tax restraint on the energetic, creative, and far-sighted people who must accumulate their capital out of current income, and who inevitably would use the capital so accumulated—plus savings of others in much greater amount—to lead the way in building for the Nation's future.

Below the priority which should be given in any tax legislation to reforming the middle-through-high graduated rates of tax, we believe that the following priorities—in serving the objective of growth and jobs—should be recognized:

Second priority—lower graduated rates.

Third priority—top 5 percentage points of corporate tax.

Fourth priority—next 5 percentage points of corporate tax.

Fifth priority—base rate of personal tax.

We are hopeful that this statement of priorities will influence those who have espoused tax cutting programs less sweeping than the rate reforms of our bills to reconsider their stand. Actually, substantial reduction in the first rate of personal tax can be afforded at this time only if it is part of a rate reform program promising increase in growth and income totals which could be expected to so expand the tax base as to lead to a balanced budget in the not too distant future. We believe that the first rate should be reduced as provided in our bills, it is obvious that reduction in this area should not be traded against the rate reforms which would assure dynamic growth over the years ahead.

RATE REFORM VERSUS RATE REDUCTION

Although the general pattern of spaced-out rate reform provided in our bills is well known, the significance of our use of the words rate reform as contrasted to the words rate reduction may not be. The effects of the personal tax in restricting economic growth and employment result largely from steeply graduated rates and not from the basic rate. Our bills are designed to drastically reduce the range of graduation, thus internally changing or reforming the rates in relation to each other. In a lesser sense, the corporate tax cuts provided in our bills would constitute reform, in changing the relation of the normal and surtax rates to each other.

Personal tax rate reform is fiscally feasible because the entire graduated superstructure provides only about 15 percent of the revenue from the tax, or $6.7 billion out of a total of $45.3 billion. The remaining 85 percent, or $38.6 billion, comes from the basic 20 percent rate on the first bracket of taxable income and the first 20 percentage points of all the graduated rates. The lack of revenue productivity of the present graduation is further indicated by the fact that a flat rate of 22.4 percent would produce as much revenue as the present rates.

In contrast with rate reform, rate reduction has no particular implication in regard to the pattern of reduction. However, for comparative purposes it will be assumed here that rate reduction means a uniform percentage cut in rates, generally known as an across-the-board cut.

A valid question is: How much reduction in the most critical graduated rates, and how much potential high-velocity venture capital, would be lost if an across-the-board or uniform cut were substituted for reform of rates as provided in our bills?

The personal tax savings under our bills of $14.25 billion equal 31.4 percent of revenue from the tax, based on 1962 income levels. If there should be a uniform cut of 31.4 percent in all rates, the rate cuts in the middle-through-higher brackets would be substantially less than under rate reform, without very significant increase in the first bracket cut. For example, there would be a loss of 20.4 percentage points in rate reduction as regards the present top rate of 91 percent, and a top loss of 23.7 percentage points as regards the present 87 percent rate. But there would be a gain of only 1.3 percentage points of reduction in the first bracket rate. In addition, the present 22 percent first graduated rate would be reduced more, by 9 percentage points, under a uniform cut as compared with rate reform. All higher graduated rates would be reduced more under rate reform.

In terms of tax savings, the substitution of a 31.4 percent uniform cut for the rate reforms provided in our bills would transfer about $1.9 billion from the taxable income brackets now carrying graduated rates from 26 percent upwards to the first two brackets. The rate reductions and tax savings effects from a uniform cut, as compared with rate reform, are set forth below for the same tax rate groupings which appear at the bottom of table IV:

| Present rates | New rates | | | Tax savings (millions) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Rate reform | Uniform cut | Point differences | Rate reform | Uniform cut | Differences | |
| *Percent* | *Percent* | *Percent* | *Percent* | *Dollars* | *Dollars* | *Dollars* | *Percent* |
| 20 | 15 | 13.7 | −1.3 | 6,145 | 7,729 | 1,584 | +25.6 |
| 22 | 16 | 15.1 | −.9 | 2,416 | 2,474 | 328 | +15.1 |
| 26–34 | 17–19 | 17.8–23.3 | +.8–4.3 | 2,351 | 1,945 | 406 | −17.4 |
| 38–50 | 20–23 | 26.1–34.3 | +6.1–11.3 | 1,567 | 967 | 600 | −38.4 |
| 53–91 | 24–42 | 36.4–62.4 | [1] +12.4–20.4 | 2,039 | 1,133 | 906 | −44.5 |
| Total | | | | 14,248 | 14,248 | | |

[1] The percentage point differences regarding present rates from 78 to 90 percent would be greater than 20.4.

In relation to consumption totals, $1.9 billion in tax savings has little significance for the present or the future.

But, $1.9 billion of tax savings used as "lead" money—the dynamic, venture capital which pulls in other savings—would provide an ever increasing return in growth and jobs.

Some of the $1.9 billion, if diverted to tax relief in the low taxable brackets, would be saved and invested. Some of it, if granted as tax relief in the middle-through-high brackets, would be used for current consumption.

On balance, however, distributing the $1.9 billion through tax rate reform would reflect a decision to maximize economic growth and new job opportunities. To distribute it through a uniform cut would reflect a decision to maximize current economic activity at the expense of long-term growth and jobs.

POSTPONEMENT AND THE TAX CLIMATE

Unfortunately, widespread recognition of the need for tax rate reform did not come until lagging growth and revenue, and too much domestic spending, had put the budget in the red by some $8 billion. Our military and space commitments require further increase in spending in these areas during the next fiscal year.

In our earlier bills, a provision required postponement of prescheduled rate reductions, after the first reduction, when the budget was out of balance. The provision included procedure by use of which Congress could limit postponements to 6 months without disturbing future reductions. However, if the postponement procedure were used fully, it would have meant that the reductions would have been spread out over 9 instead of 5 years.

This postponement provision was developed at a time when inflationary pressures were very great, when the budget was in balance, and when the twin problems of a lagging rate of economic growth and chronic unemployment, though foreseeable, had not yet emerged. The problem now is how to adapt this provision in light of current and prospective conditions.

In forward scheduling tax cuts, a major objective is to improve the business climate and the public psychology, creating optimism for the future; to induce forward business planning in anticipation of steady relief from growth-retarding income tax rates. Such an environment inevitably would be accompanied by greater private use of money and credit, multiplying the benefits of the tax cuts in the early years. Over the long pull, of course, money and credit serve only as the lubricant of the economic system. The economy as a whole can prosper and grow without inflation only as current savings of business and individuals are adequate to the task. But, until the economy has recouped the ground lost during the inadequate growth of the past 5 years, expansion in private use of money and credit must be greater than would be appropriate thereafter. If such expansion does not take place in the private sector of the economy, we may be sure that it will take place through greater Federal spending and larger deficits.

To serve the purpose of expenditure control, without thwarting the objective of permitting forward planning on the basis of regularly scheduled lower tax rates, we have made two changes in the postponement provision:

The first change is to make postponement effective only as regards the rate cuts scheduled for the third and later years under our bills, as contrasted to the second and later years under earlier versions of our bills.

The second change is to add to the test of budget unbalance a new test, in regard to

expenditure control. Postponement would be applied only if the budget is out of balance and if what we call subordinate expenditures are higher in the current fiscal year than in the preceding year. Subordinate expenditures are defined as all expenditures of the Government except those related to military preparedness, space research and technology, and interest on the public debt. As a general positive description, subordinate expenditures cover those generally known as domestic spending programs and foreign economic assistance.

We believe that this addition to the postponement procedure makes our program entirely realistic, not just for enactment, but for expected effectuation over the 5 years. We are convinced that the executive branch and the Congress working in harmony can control the total of domestic spending without harm to any vital public program or segment of the public. Groups who are the beneficiaries of separate Federal spending programs also share the common general public interest in greater economic growth and economic strength. Actually, the unemployed and the underemployed, and the sections of the country which lag behind national economic achievements, will benefit the most from the release of capital and incentives under our bills. It makes much more human, as well as economic sense, to let the private economy provide new and greater opportunities to these people and sections of the country than to rely further on "dole-type" spending programs.

NEW WORKERS AND JOB OPPORTUNITIES

In addition to the problem of the currently underemployed and unemployed, during the remainder of the 1960's there will be an accelerating buildup in our working force—or of the number of young people who will need and want work, and who will expect good work opportunities. Over recent years, the "labor force" as it is technically known has increased by an average of only about 800,000 annually. Over the last 5 years of this decade, the average increase is expected to reach close to 1.5 million annually.

The excessive use of tax cutting at this time to increase consumption of people now fully employed is not going to solve the problem of good jobs for these new workers who are just around the corner in point of time. It will take a rebirth of business and individual incentives, and tremendous amounts of new capital, to provide those jobs.

EXPANSION OF THE TAX BASE

Our bills do not contemplate incorporation therein of structural tax reforms associated with base broadening. We believe that the objectives of tax rate reform are too important to be submerged and obscured, and further delayed, by time-consuming discussion over what if any provisions of the tax law should be eliminated, modified, or revised. Moreover, whatever may be the merit of individual reforms or the overall case for structural reform of the tax law, we do not believe that this is a significantly productive route to broadening the base for taxation. On any extensive basis, such reform inevitably would reduce the potential of business and private savings, and thus tend to offset the release of incentives and capital formation provided by rate reform.

This is not to deny the need for base broadening. Aside from the system of exemptions, credits, exclusions, and deductions of general value to all taxpayers, the too small tax base of the current period is a product of inadequate growth over the past 5 years. Stated differently, if the economy had grown adequately over the past 5 years, the Federal tax base would be large enough to support all necessary spending out of current revenue. Looking ahead, the greatest opportunity for expansion of the tax base is found not in structural reform but in the enlargement of the economy which provides the tax base.

As a specific illustration, if the economy should not grow any more rapidly on the average over the remainder of this decade than it has over the past 5 years, the personal tax base under the law as it now stands would only be about $259 billion in 1970, as compared to about $193 billion in 1962. On the other hand, if the economy should grow at an average of 5 percent over the years ahead, the personal tax base in 1970 would be about $337 billion. An $80 billion addition to the personal tax base would be much greater than could be expected from any impact on base broadening of structural tax reform.

THE BOUNTY FROM GREATER GROWTH

The return from greater growth (5 percent as compared with the recent average of 2½ percent) over the remainder of this decade is indicated for gross national product, personal income, and personal income per capita, in table V, attached hereto. Regardless of judgment as to whether such goals will be achieved, we believe the Government has the obligation to adjust its policies to provide the best promise of achievement. Experience provides ample documentation that more Government spending will hurt rather than help accomplish such goals. In our opinion, a "mixed" policy of somewhat more spending, and somewhat less taxing, would offer little promise of much improvement over recent history. We believe the time is here when the Government must turn the private economy loose from an oppressive tax rate structure; to let it develop its own head of steam and find out where it will take us. Halfway measures at the best can be expected to produce no more than halfway results. At the worst, they could keep the door open to return to the barren philosophy of greater growth in Government spending. The opportunity is present for a national decision for greater growth in the private economy over more growth in Federal spending (except as may be required for our military security and space effort). A positive declaration that our Nation is committed to restoring the full vitality and potential of our free economy, and the corroboration of that commitment through greater growth starting in 1963, could soon pave the way to forcing the Communist world to recognize that it had better collaborate in reducing the burden of military preparation so that it too can do more toward improving the everyday life of its citizens.

ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURE FOR SPACING OUT RATE REFORMS

If the one-half year's personal tax cut for 1963 provided in our bills were followed by only a one-half year cut as of January 1964, there would be no bunching of revenue effect in fiscal year 1964. Specifically, the revenue effect would be $2.85 billion compared with $4.31 billion under our bills as drafted.

If this process were repeated over 5 years—reduction in the withholding rate as of July 1 for a one-half year's tax cut, followed by another automatic one-half year's cut as of next January 1—there would be equal revenue effect, $2.85 billion, in each of the 5 fiscal years. Combined with a 2 percentage point cut in the top corporate rate each calendar year, the annual revenue effect in each fiscal year would be $3.85 billion.

This procedure might have further attraction as regards the working of a postponement provision. It would permit the provision to become an inherent part of the President's budget submitted to Congress each January covering the next fiscal year. The provision would, if the postponement test required, hold in abeyance the next sequence of tax cuts beginning with reduction in the withholding rate on July 1 for the first half year's cut and completed by another half year's cut on January 1 following. The Congress could put the sequence back into effect if it so decided in time to reduce the withholding rate on July 1. If Congress failed to act, the sequence would be postponed 1 year, thus moving ahead all following sequences provided in the legislation. The corporate tax cuts for the current calendar year would be held in abeyance, and then put back into effect or postponed for 1 year, by the same series of events.

TABLE I.—*Reform of individual tax rates*

| Taxable income bracket [1] (thousands) | Present rates | Original rates Jan. 1, 1963 | Amended actual rates Jan. 1, 1963 | Jan. 1, 1964 | Jan. 1, 1965 | Jan. 1, 1966 | Jan. 1, 1967 | Taxable income bracket [1] (thousands) | Present rates | Original rates Jan. 1, 1963 | Amended actual rates Jan. 1, 1963 | Jan. 1, 1964 | Jan. 1, 1965 | Jan. 1, 1966 | Jan. 1, 1967 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $0 to $2 | 20 | 19.0 | 19.5 | 18.0 | 17.0 | 16.0 | 15 | $26 to $32 | 62 | 55.0 | 58.5 | 48.0 | 41.0 | 34.0 | 27 |
| $2 to $4 | 22 | 20.5 | 21.25 | 19.5 | 18.5 | 17.5 | 16 | $32 to $38 | 65 | 58.0 | 61.5 | 51.0 | 43.0 | 36.0 | 28 |
| $4 to $6 | 26 | 24.5 | 25.25 | 23.0 | 21.5 | 20.0 | 17 | $38 to $44 | 69 | 61.0 | 65.0 | 53.0 | 45.0 | 37.0 | 29 |
| $6 to $8 | 30 | 28.0 | 29 | 26.0 | 24.0 | 21.0 | 18 | $44 to $50 | 72 | 64.0 | 68.0 | 56.0 | 47.0 | 38.0 | 30 |
| $8 to $10 | 34 | 31.0 | 32.5 | 28.0 | 25.0 | 22.0 | 19 | $50 to $60 | 75 | 66.0 | 70.5 | 57.0 | 48.0 | 39.0 | 31 |
| $10 to $12 | 38 | 35.0 | 36.5 | 32.0 | 28.0 | 24.0 | 20 | $60 to $70 | 78 | 69.0 | 73.5 | 60.0 | 51.0 | 40.0 | 32 |
| $12 to $14 | 43 | 39.0 | 41 | 35.0 | 31.0 | 26.0 | 21 | $70 to $80 | 81 | 71.0 | 76.0 | 62.0 | 52.0 | 41.0 | 33 |
| $14 to $16 | 47 | 42.0 | 44.5 | 37.0 | 32.0 | 27.0 | 22 | $80 to $90 | 84 | 74.0 | 79.0 | 64.0 | 54.0 | 44.0 | 34 |
| $16 to $18 | 50 | 45.0 | 47.5 | 40.0 | 35.0 | 29.0 | 23 | $90 to $100 | 87 | 76.0 | 82.0 | 66.0 | 56.0 | 46.0 | 36 |
| $18 to $20 | 53 | 48.0 | 50.5 | 42.0 | 36.0 | 30.0 | 24 | $100 to $150 | 89 | 78.0 | 83.5 | 68.0 | 58.0 | 48.0 | 38 |
| $20 to $22 | 56 | 50.0 | 53 | 44.0 | 38.0 | 32.0 | 25 | $150 to $200 | 90 | 80.0 | 85.0 | 70.0 | 60.0 | 50.0 | 40 |
| $22 to $26 | 59 | 53.0 | 56 | 47.0 | 40.0 | 33.0 | 26 | $200 and over | 91 | 82.0 | 86.5 | 72.0 | 62.0 | 52.0 | 42 |

[1] After deductions and exemptions. Applies to single persons, married persons filing separate returns, and "split income" of husbands and wives filing joint returns.

TABLE II.—*Tax computation table—Individuals*

| If the taxable income [1] is: Not over $2,000 | | The tax: Is: Present Law 20% of the taxable income | | The tax: Would be: Year 1967 15% of the taxable income | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Over* | *But not over* | *Of excess over* | | *Of excess over* | |
| $2,000 | $4,000 | $400 plus 22% | $2,000 | $300 plus 16% | $2,000 |
| $4,000 | $6,000 | $840 plus 26% | 4,000 | $620 plus 17% | 4,000 |
| $6,000 | $8,000 | $1,360 plus 30% | 6,000 | $960 plus 18% | 6,000 |
| $8,000 | $10,000 | $1,960 plus 34% | 8,000 | $1,320 plus 19% | 8,000 |
| $10,000 | $12,000 | $2,640 plus 38% | 10,000 | $1,700 plus 20% | 10,000 |
| $12,000 | $14,000 | $3,400 plus 43% | 12,000 | $2,100 plus 21% | 12,000 |
| $14,000 | $16,000 | $4,260 plus 47% | 14,000 | $2,520 plus 22% | 14,000 |
| $16,000 | $18,000 | $5,200 plus 50% | 16,000 | $2,960 plus 23% | 16,000 |
| $18,000 | $20,000 | $6,200 plus 53% | 18,000 | $3,420 plus 24% | 18,000 |
| $20,000 | $22,000 | $7,260 plus 56% | 20,000 | $3,900 plus 25% | 20,000 |
| $22,000 | $26,000 | $8,380 plus 59% | 22,000 | $4,400 plus 26% | 22,000 |
| $26,000 | $32,000 | $10,740 plus 62% | 26,000 | $5,440 plus 27% | 26,000 |
| $32,000 | $38,000 | $14,460 plus 65% | 32,000 | $7,060 plus 28% | 32,000 |
| $38,000 | $44,000 | $18,360 plus 69% | 38,000 | $8,740 plus 29% | 38,000 |
| $44,000 | $50,000 | $22,500 plus 72% | 44,000 | $10,480 plus 30% | 44,000 |
| $50,000 | $60,000 | $26,820 plus 75% | 50,000 | $12,280 plus 31% | 50,000 |
| $60,000 | $70,000 | $34,320 plus 78% | 60,000 | $15,380 plus 32% | 60,000 |
| $70,000 | $80,000 | $42,120 plus 81% | 70,000 | $18,580 plus 33% | 70,000 |
| $80,000 | $90,000 | $50,220 plus 84% | 80,000 | $21,880 plus 34% | 80,000 |
| $90,000 | $100,000 | $58,620 plus 87% | 90,000 | $25,280 plus 36% | 90,000 |
| $100,000 | $150,000 | $67,320 plus 89% | 100,000 | $28,880 plus 38% | 100,000 |
| $150,000 | $200,000 | $111,820 plus 90% | 150,000 | $47,880 plus 40% | 150,000 |
| $200,000 and over | | $156,820 plus 91% | 200,000 | $67,880 plus 42% | 200,000 |

[1] After deductions and exemptions. Applies to single persons, and married persons filing separate returns. Joint return taxpayers can find their tax savings by taking the tax on half their taxable income and multiplying by 2.

TABLE III.—*Corporate tax rate reductions*

| | Present rates | Jan. 1, 1963 | Jan. 1, 1964 | Jan. 1, 1965 | Jan. 1, 1966 | Jan. 1, 1967 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Normal tax [1] | 30 | 29 | 26 | 24 | 23 | 21 |
| Surtax [2] | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 21 | 21 |
| Combined tax rate [3] | 52 | 51 | 48 | 46 | 44 | 42 |

[1] On all net income.
[2] On net income exceeding $25,000.

TABLE IV

TAX SAVINGS BY TAXABLE BRACKETS BASED ON 1962 INCOME LEVELS

| Taxable income brackets | Taxable income | Present rates | Tax under present rates | Rates under Herlong-Baker end of 5 years | Tax under Herlong Baker rates | Tax savings | Tax saving percent of total savings |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Millions* | *Percent* | *Millions* | *Percent* | *Millions* | *Millions* | |
| 0 to $2,000 | $122,889 | 20 | $24,578 | 15 | $18,433 | $6,145 | 43.1 |
| $2,000 to $4,000 | 35,759 | 22 | 7,867 | 16 | 5,721 | 2,146 | 15.1 |
| $4,000 to $6,000 | 12,262 | 26 | 3,188 | 17 | 2,085 | 1,103 | 7.7 |
| $6,000 to $8,000 | 5,976 | 30 | 1,793 | 18 | 1,076 | 717 | 5.0 |
| $8,000 to $10,000 | 3,545 | 34 | 1,205 | 19 | 674 | 531 | 3.7 |
| $10,000 to $12,000 | 2,549 | 38 | 969 | 20 | 510 | 459 | 3.2 |
| $12,000 to $14,000 | 1,952 | 43 | 839 | 21 | 410 | 429 | 3.0 |
| $14,000 to $16,000 | 1,470 | 47 | 691 | 22 | 323 | 368 | 2.6 |
| $16,000 to $18,000 | 1,151 | 50 | 576 | 23 | 265 | 311 | 2.2 |
| $18,000 to $20,000 | 784 | 53 | 416 | 24 | 188 | 228 | 1.6 |
| $20,000 to $22,000 | 627 | 56 | 351 | 25 | 157 | 194 | 1.4 |
| $22,000 to $26,000 | 935 | 59 | 552 | 26 | 243 | 309 | 2.2 |
| $26,000 to $32,000 | 913 | 62 | 566 | 27 | 247 | 319 | 2.2 |
| $32,000 to $38,000 | 560 | 65 | 364 | 28 | 157 | 207 | 1.5 |
| $38,000 to $44,000 | 361 | 69 | 249 | 29 | 105 | 144 | 1.0 |
| $44,000 to $50,000 | 255 | 72 | 184 | 30 | 76 | 108 | .8 |
| $50,000 to $60,000 | 282 | 75 | 212 | 31 | 87 | 125 | .9 |
| $60,000 to $70,000 | 164 | 78 | 128 | 32 | 52 | 76 | .5 |
| $70,000 to $80,000 | 116 | 81 | 94 | 33 | 38 | 56 | .4 |
| $80,000 to $90,000 | 79 | 84 | 66 | 34 | 27 | 39 | .3 |
| $90,000 to $100,000 | 55 | 87 | 48 | 36 | 20 | 28 | .2 |
| $100,000 to $150,000 | 152 | 89 | 135 | 38 | 58 | 77 | .5 |
| $150,000 to $200,000 | 67 | 90 | 60 | 40 | 27 | 33 | .2 |
| $200,000 and over | 196 | 91 | 178 | 42 | 82 | 96 | .7 |
| Total | 193,100 | | 45,309 | | 31,061 | 14,248 | 100.0 |

TABLE IV—Continued

TAX SAVINGS BY TAX RATE GROUPS

| Taxable income brackets | Present rates | Herlong-Baker rates | Tax savings | Percent of total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Percent* | *Percent* | *Millions* | |
| $18,000 to $200,000 and over | 53–91 | 24–42 | $2,039 | 14.3 |
| $10,000 to $18,000 | 38–50 | 20–23 | 1,567 | 11.0 |
| $4,000 to $10,000 | 26–34 | 17–19 | 2,351 | 16.5 |
| $2,000 to $4,000 | 22 | 16 | 2,146 | 15.1 |
| 0 to $2,000 | 20 | 15 | 6,145 | 43.1 |

TABLE V

GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT

[In billions of dollars]

| | Calendar years | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1963 | 1964 | 1965 | 1966 | 1967 | 1968 | 1969 | 1970 |
| From 5-percent growth | 575 | 604 | 634 | 665 | 699 | 734 | 770 | 809 |
| From 2½-percent growth | 568 | 582 | 597 | 612 | 627 | 643 | 659 | 675 |
| Additional GNP | 7 | 22 | 37 | 53 | 72 | 91 | 111 | 134 |
| Cumulative additional GNP | 7 | 29 | 66 | 119 | 191 | 282 | 393 | 527 |

PERSONAL INCOME

[In billions of dollars]

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| From 5-percent growth | 452 | 475 | 499 | 524 | 550 | 577 | 606 | 637 |
| From 2½-percent growth | 447 | 458 | 470 | 481 | 493 | 506 | 518 | 531 |
| Additional personal income | 5 | 17 | 29 | 43 | 57 | 71 | 88 | 106 |
| Cumulative additional personal income | 5 | 22 | 51 | 94 | 151 | 222 | 310 | 416 |

PERSONAL INCOME PER CAPITA

[Dollars]

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| From 5-percent growth | 2,385 | 2,468 | 2,552 | 2,638 | 2,725 | 2,815 | 2,909 | 3,012 |
| From 2½-percent growth | 2,359 | 2,379 | 2,404 | 2,422 | 2,443 | 2,468 | 2,487 | 2,511 |
| Additional personal income per capita | 26 | 89 | 148 | 216 | 282 | 347 | 422 | 501 |
| Cumulative additional personal income per capita | 26 | 115 | 263 | 479 | 761 | 1,108 | 1,530 | 2,031 |

## My Brother Made a Mistake—Not Again?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Henry J. Taylor:

MY BROTHER MADE A MISTAKE—NOT AGAIN?

(By Henry J. Taylor)

The yellow mountain of morphine Premier Castro demanded for his prisoner ransom deal dealt our fine Narcotics Bureau heroes an unspoken reverse.

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER'S Crime Committee long ago identified Cuba as an international hub in the fiendish traffic. Much of this free delivery to Castro, highest quality, will come right smack back to the dope peddlers in the United States.

Shortly before I left Switzerland our American Embassy, in cooperation with the superb Swiss police, impounded more than $2 million in morphine in transit, carried in a single suitcase. This is how morphine money multiplies in the cut form Castro will cut it.

The whole ransom affair typifies Washington's news manipulation, culminating even in the President's Miami eulogy to the survivors themselves on December 29. Speaking there, not only words were used as weaponry, hearts were used as well.

President Kennedy repeatedly stated, "This is being done by a private committee," while our Government was as much in it as in the Bay of Pigs affair itself. This is now a secret everybody knows.

But inside his office the determined Attorney General had—from the beginning—what he called the wish list from Castro.

The Cuban drew up a crazy compilation. In totaling it to $53 million he used mostly obsolete drug house catalogs. He specified some drugs unobtainable here, many scientifically obsolete, and even dreamed up others that never existed. His morphine feature, however, was the final clincher Castro demanded in his American blackmail. The Attorney General's opening explanation in soliciting each contribution was: "My brother made a mistake."

Why didn't our public servants simply perform on the straightforward basis required by their official position?

Congress specifically prohibited the use of taxpayers' money for ransom during the tractors-for-prisoners uproar.

To date the administration has even refused a list of items, quantities, and costs, making all assessment by our public impossible. Congress should at least expose the tax gimmicks and inside bait authorized overnight after the Attorney General's reported, "Fella, get busy," word to Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon, by a Government which is about to challenge every citizen's nickel and Christmas cigar.

Moreover, impeccable Cuban underground sources as close to Castro as his beard (for Castro's inner circle has been well penetrated) insist Castro's real win was not the $53 million ransom at all. His eye was entirely on a reaffirmation of a noninvasion pledge.

Knowing negotiator James B. Donovan spoke for President Kennedy and his brother, Castro required and received this pledge as the basic requirment before allowing the invasion prisoners to leave. Castro asked Donovan, "What if President Kennedy repudiates you?" Donovan replied, "He won't.".

In short, Castro has achieved his ambition as the Communist leader of Latin America under a U.S. guarantee not to molest, or permit any neighbor to molest, Red Cuba's sovereignty.

This reaffirmed President Kennedy's guarantee through U.N. Secretary General U Thant if the missiles were removed, still never admitted by Washington but extracted from the secret U.N. minutes of the initial U Thant-Castro meeting in Havana which U Thant's office confirmed to me as accurate.

Nevertheless, the news manipulation continues unabashed. What did the President pledge in Miami, December 29, that brought the vast, tear-ladened cheers from the very hearts and souls of the Cuban refugees? Accepting the banner of the Bay of Pigs survivors, Mr. Kennedy stated, "I can assure you this flag will be returned to your brigade in a free Cuba." How?

The blockade has been lifted, the dependents sent back to Guantanamo, and, to top it off, the Justice Department is in the process of arresting freedom fighters bound for Cuba for sabotage. The Attorney General claims the mere attempt violates our neutrality act. In addition, all suspected freedom fighters' boats, and even many of their personal automobiles, are being impounded in Florida.

First our President, then his brother, gave the nonmolestation guarantee to Castro himself, as well as to Khrushchev. That's the fact; all the rest, including the Miami speech, belongs to the moon and to the realm of manipulated news.

## From the San Francisco Chronicle, Columns by Arthur Hoppe

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, to bring the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD readers up to date on the columns written by Arthur Hoppe in the San Francisco Chronicle, I insert, under unanimous consent, his articles which appeared on December 5, 6, 7, and 12, 1962:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Dec. 5, 1962]

NO NUDES IS BAD NUDES

(By Arthur Hoppe)

We're going to have a $30 million National Cultural Center in Washington. Thanks to the warm support of Mr. and Mrs. Kennedy, Mr. and Mrs. Eisenhower, and all the little defense contractors everywhere. If they know what's good for them. I'm against it.

I know Mr. Kennedy says we need one because of the Russians. "Of course, we do not have to point to them to indicate the importance of this work," he said, "but it is of significance that they have made a major effort in this field." So I'm against it.

Look where it got the Russians. Mr. Khrushchev says let's have a little freedom of expression around here. And all the artists happily dash off to splatter up their canvases. Mr. Khrushchev views the results and blows his stack. "Such pictures," he snorts. "You cannot tell if they have been painted by a man or have been daubed by the tail of a donkey."

And the artists, says Moscow radio, warmly thanked Mr. Khrushchev for his "valuable advice and critical comments." Honest.

Now I know, as Mr. Kennedy implies, that we've got to have more national culture than the Russians to win the cold war. But, frankly, I don't think we've got the right kind of artists.

Take J. Artimedes Springbourne, a neo-abstract Dadaist with inner cubistic leanings. He is just proudly hanging his latest work, "Some Second Thoughts on the Aspirations of Man," in our new National Cultural Center. And along comes Senator Hogfriar (Snappin' Sam) Headbone on his annual inspection of our national culture.

"What's that, son?" says the Senator suspiciously. "I think you got it upside down."

"I can't tell you," says Mr. Springbourne, blushing with pleasure as he tries inverting his painting, "how much I appreciate your valuable advice."

"Still don't look like national culture to me, boy," says the Senator, cocking his head. "Looks more like a fried egg painted by the hind quarters of an old drunken nanny goat. With the d.t.'s. And, anyway, the yolk's busted."

"I wish to thank you warmly for your most constructive critical comments," cries Mr. Springbourne happily as he removes his work and jumps up and down on it. "I shall go home to try again."

"You do that, son. And this time get some national culture in it. Like maybe a flag. Or a little barefoot tad with freckles a-going fishing. We got a cold war to win, boy."

No sir. It's not only unbelievable, it's frightening. I figure if Washington tries to mobilize art to win the cold war, as do the Russians, we may well lose both.

Oh, I can see the catalog of our 1984 National Culture Exhibition now: 32 American flags, 16 views of the Statue of Liberty, and the blueprints of a tractor factory. With not a nude in the lot. It could destroy our will to resist.

Personally, I like our national culture just the way it is now: We haven't got any. We've got what I like and we've got what you like. And my culture is none of the Government's business. Let's keep it that way. Because, after all, culture is only a question of taste. Which, in a democracy, is what the other person hasn't got any of.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Dec. 6, 1962]

WASHINGTON, WHERE THE RITE PREVAILS

(By Arthur Hoppe)

A few people seem a mite confused by the rumpus over Mr. Adlai Stevenson. I can't see why. The facts are clear:

(1) The Saturday Evening Post says Mr. Stevenson felt the Cuba blockade might be going too far. (2) Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Stevenson both issued outraged, horrified, indignant denials of this absurd falsehood. (3) Everybody in Washington said this meant Mr. Stevenson was going to be fired.

I suppose the confusion stems from the fact a few people haven't read the book I'm not writing entitled: "Strange Native Customs in Washington and Other Savage Lands." Allow me to quote from chapter —VI, "Disagreeing With Policy as Compared to Hara-kiri Among the Japanese."

The natives of Washington, unlike other backward areas, convoke meetings only to agree with each other. This rite is called "ironing out our differences." And the rare native with differences is ironed out.

This does not mean, however, that natives summoned to high-level ironing out conferences cannot disagree with their leaders. They can. Indeed, it often earns them the title of "independent thinker." Which, within limits, is an accolade. But they must be careful to disagree only in one direction and only by the well-established ritual of "not far enoughing."

For example, should the leader of a small tribe like the Hog Advisory Board suggest advising all hogs to bathe their feet in purple ink, an independent thinker might well arise to say: "I disagree, chief. It's a great idea, but it doesn't go far enough. Let's go whole hog."

The key words are "far enough." The leader, by rejecting this extremism, earns himself a reputation for restraint and middle-of-the-roadism, a highly worshipped cult. But should the independent thinker contend that purple ink for hogs is hogwash, he will create disunity; which is awful. He is the automatically declared "not a member of the team" and stripped of his touch football. In extreme cases, he suffers banishment.

Banishment is accomplished in three steps. First, the leader leaks the story that the independent thinker is creating disunity by disagreeing the wrong way. Second, when the story hits the streets, the leader vigorously denies it. The reason he denies it is that he must stand behind his subordinates, a complex native art analyzed briefly in the next six chapters.

The denial also serves to increase the furor. This, in turn, solidifies the independent thinker's image as that of a grumbling malcontent. Evenutally, of course, the leader has no choice but to banish this grumbling malcontent "for the common good," with deep regret.

The natives themselves never protest the banishment of one of their fellows. They are far too busy guessing who will replace the man who will replace the man who will re-

place the man who was banished. This ranks as a major native sport, second only to throat cutting.

I assume this clears up the confusion. If not, do purchase my other unwritten book, "Understanding Washington." It's currently being offered as a bonus with "Six Ways to Square the Circle." I trust you will find them both equally profitable.

---

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Dec. 7, 1962]

JUST PLAIN JACK, THE HOPE OF PEACE

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Good morning, friends in televisionland. It's time for another episode of "Just Plain Jack," the heart-warming story of a young man's struggle to make a place in the world for his family. Each of them.

As we join "Just Plain Jack" today we find him in the midst of a homey family scene. He is reading "Profiles in Courage." As usual. And the Beautiful Society Girl he married is waxing her water skis while leafing through a stack of movie magazines. Between them, a 70-piece jazz combo accompanies poet Robert Freeze in a recital of his latest ode, "Democrats I have Loved." And John Junior is wailing loudly from the staircase.

JACK (irritably). Why are you crying, John Junior? We must never cry.

JOHN JUNIOR. If Uncle Teddy can have a State, why can't I have a State?

JACK. Shut up and do your pushups.

BEAUTIFUL SOCIETY GIRL (whispering). Couldn't we surprise him with one for Christmas, dear? Just a little one. Like maybe Rhode Island. Think how happy it would make him.

JACK. You'll spoil him rotten. Besides, it wouldn't help your image. And speaking of images, I see you're on the cover of "Romantic Romances" again. What's that headline? "My Secret Sex Life."

BEAUTIFUL SOCIETY GIRL. Yes; it's just too horrible.

JACK. Dammit, we'll sue. They can't print articles like that about you.

BEAUTIFUL SOCIETY GIRL. Oh, it isn't about me. It's about Bernard Baruch. I was speaking of the picture. Look how it shows up that freckle under my eye. How much shall we sue for, Bunny?

(The jazz combo hits a crescendo of dramatic dissonance as Mr. Freeze cries, "Ah, Democrats! Party of the common man!" And three dogs scramble through the melee chasing a hamster, followed by a little girl on a galloping pony.)

JACK (hands over ears). Great balls of fire.

BEAUTIFUL SOCIETY GIRL. Don't shout, dear. You must relax. After all, the only duty I care about is to provide a little warm nook in your life where you can relax from the cares of the day in the bosom of your family amidst an esthetic atmosphere.

JACK. You said that in last month's issue of Well-Groomed Ladies Companion.

BEAUTIFUL SOCIETY GIRL. Did I? That reminds me. Why can't my groom, Will, be Ambassador to England? He's been so good with the horses. And he does speak English.

Fairly well. And * * *

PORTLY PIERRE, the faithful family retainer (bursting in with a thick volume): Here it is, Chief. The first report of your new Domestic Peace Corps.

JACK (excitedly). Great. What do they recommend?

PORTLY PIERRE. Sending your entire family on a good will tour. To Cuba.

JACK (hand over heart). My only regret is that I have but one wife to give for my country.

Will the Domestic Peace Corps achieve domestic peace? Even for those of us who can't afford to send our wives abroad? Are you out of your mind?

Tune in to our next heart-warming episode. And meanwhile, as you go down the byways of life, folks, remember: when you think of man's eternal struggle for a little domestic peace, pin your hopes on just plain Jack.

---

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Dec. 12, 1962]

POPULAR MECHANICS IN THE WHITE HOUSE

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Life, the weekly magazine of news analysis for people who can't read, has issued its inside report on the Saturday Evening Post's inside report that Mr. Stevenson had independent thoughts during the Cuba crisis. A nasty charge which everybody's denied. And Life implies the whole episode was a trial balloon.

To clarify things further, I promptly began work on a piece for Popular Mechanics entitled: "How To Build a Trial Balloon With Simple Tools." To check facts, I called first on the U.S. bureau of trial balloons, a little heralded agency in the cupola of the White House.

I caught the director, Mr. John F. (Irish Jack) Mafia, huffing and puffing at a large red model on his desk. "Work, work, work," he said, pausing for breath. "I am blowing my brains out."

Busy, eh? "Under this administration," he said proudly, "we are becoming the most important agency in Washington. Nowadays, nothing's done around here without first running a trial balloon up the flagpole to see who shoots it down. Like this one to test reaction to a summit conference."

And he showed me the legend on the red one saying: "Khrushchev's Got Tertiary Psoriasis and Wants To Spend His Last Christmas in the United States." He then launched it out the window and ducked as it exploded. "You don't want to stand too close," he said, brushing himself off.

An aid hustled in, carrying a huge carton stamped: "One gross—'Adlai's usefulness is now ruined'—for immediate release."

Was that true about Adlai? "Trueshmue," said Mr. Mafia, tossing a dozen out the window in a batch. "My name's not on it. Your name's not on it. Who are people going to argue with?"

"Amazing," I said. But to business. How do you make a trial balloon? "Well, first," he said, "you got to have a leak. High-placed leaks are best. They save stooping. Luckily, this place is lousy with them. The leak inflates the balloon, usually with hot air. Then, by observing how quickly it's shot down, we know precisely how angry it makes the public. If no one shoots it down, the idea it bears aloft automatically becomes official policy."

"An ingenious system," I said. "It's not all beer and skittles," he said. "The heart-rending part comes when the public clamor is very loud and the leak must shoot down his own balloon to show he had no part in launching it."

Outside, the anti-Adlai balloons began exploding. "See?" said Mr. Mafia, shaking his head sadly. I said that was a shame. "Oh," he said, releasing another dozen, "if we send up enough, the clamor gets weaker each time. And it becomes official policy anyway. But it takes a lot more work. And we're on three shifts now."

The heck with that article. Like most devices in Washington this one's too complicated for Popular Mechanics. They'll just have to be the only magazine in the country without an inside story on the Cuba crisis.

Instead, I've decided to launch my own trial balloon. It says: "Government by Trial Balloon Is Devious, Cowardly and Undemocratic." I can't wait to see who shoots it down.

## Birmingham's Frank Brooks Yeilding Heads U.S. Savings & Loan League

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding businessmen and civic leaders in Birmingham has recently been elected president of the U.S. Savings & Loan League. He is Frank Brocks Yeilding, whose skill and business acumen have made his Jefferson Federal Savings & Loan Association the largest in the State of Alabama.

All of us in Alabama are proud of Frank Yeilding and want to share the following article about him which appeared in South on November 26, 1962.

FORMULA FOR GROWTH: SOUNDNESS AT THE TOP

In increasing numbers financial writers and business observers have been seeking to explain the unprecedented growth of the savings and loan industry. Their trail following has led them to certain more obvious factors: Heavy post-war housing demand; rising personal incomes; new office quarters and stepped-up advertising and promotion.

While all these reasons fill vital segments of the whole answer, one of the frequently overlooked but most basic clues is that in almost every major area where rapid expansion attends the savings and loan business there'll be a couple of men who are outstanding executives. They are the men who set the pace.

Such is Alabama's Frank Brooks Yeilding, Jr., this month the new president of far-reaching U.S. Savings & Loan League. Personable, easy to meet, Yeilding is president of Birmingham's Jefferson Federal Savings & Loan Association, the State's largest such enterprise and one of the top institutions in the Southeast.

Drive, determination, and persistence combined with personal warmth are a natural mixture drawn from Yeilding's family background. His grandmother was a widow a year after her ninth child was born, yet managed to run a farm and keep the family together. Her ninth child, Francis B. Yeilding, came to young Birmingham after a farm boyhood, arrived penniless, and obtained a job in a small variety store. Eventually he became part owner and then full owner, founding what is now areawide Yeilding department store chain.

Born in 1904, Frank Yeilding was the fourth son among a family of six boys and one girl, jokes that the size of his family put him in the savings and loan field. "By the time I finished college (Birmingham-Southern)," he recalls "three older brothers were already ahead of me in the family store and I doubted there was room for another brother."

His availability took a fortuitous turn through college friendship with Ervin Jackson, now one of the city's leading businessmen. Jackson's father was majority owner of Jefferson County Building & Loan Association, a stock savings and loan enterprise. The elder Jackson offered Yeilding a job and the 21-year-old began the career he's followed ever since.

In the mid-1920's the savings and loan business was surging in the throes of a real estate boom. With assets of more than $3½ million, Jefferson County Building & Loan was thriving. Interest rates were high, profits excellent. Common stock in the

business was eagerly sought because of generous dividends. Common stock was such a good investment that by 1929, the year Yeilding was given the treasurer's title to attach to secretary which he'd held since 1926, that Internal Revenue stepped in. The IRS ruling was that because stock dividends were larger than those paid to holders of optional savings accounts that the association should forfeit its tax-exempt status then permitted all savings and loan groups and pay 5 years' back taxes. IRS finally offered an alternative: Convert the association to a mutual institution. Stockholders grumbled but management accepted and common stock was paid off at par. As things turned out the stockholders got a break. Depression and losses were near.

Because of bountiful post-War II business, some are prone to forget depression. But not Yeilding, who vividly remembers the problems faced in weathering "those grim days." He was to hold the secretary-treasurer's joint responsibilities for a decade and a half. After the elder Jackson's death in 1945, Ervin Jackson became president for a year and moved up to chairman. Yeilding was elected president. The two men are also partners in an insurance agency and both have other business interests.

Because of population trends and other factors, Yeilding believes that conventional savings and loan associations are in somewhat better shape than FHA, now beginning to face the problem of disposing of repossessions. "We're in better shape because most of our borrowers have bigger equities," he says. While he doesn't delude himself into thinking his and Jefferson Federal's policies have built-in protection against mortgage losses, "We try to make good loans and we try to make sure the loans are paid on time." Company policy runs heavily to medium-priced homes loans. "Houses are a lot like autos," he observes, pointing out that medium-priced cars are more readily marketable than luxury models.

A conspicuous element of Yeilding's conservatism is his insistence for a relatively high degree of liquidity. At the end of 1961, for example, his firm's savings accounts totaled $58,360,000 and loans in process $1,020,142. Cash was at $2,213,000 and Government securities stood at $10,131,000. This figures at a ratio of 21 percent to savings, well above of the national 12 to 13 percent average. Why does his company follow this policy of higher liquidity? "Because it helps me sleep nights," he says. The Jefferson Federal enterprise now stands in the $70 million area.

In 1950, assets were nearing $6 million. By that time business was making phenomenal strides and in the next 12 years was to grow in excess of 1,000 percent. Yeilding doesn't believe that rate will continue but that future progress will be quite respectable.

Behind a calm and relaxed professional exterior, Yeilding is a man of restless energy.

## The Continuing Problem of Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in the face of America's continuing economic dynamism, the persistent high level of unemployment among this country's workers is a serious problem. Each year the American economy hits new highs; even in the slump years we achieve new records of income, gross national product and in the other economic indicators that point to great national prosperity. Yet, even in the peak years we find a disturbing percentage of our labor force out of work.

The New York Times commented on this situation editorially in its December 8 edition. Along with its comments, the editorial pointed out areas in which our country can work to help overcome this problem, expansion of our retraining programs, improved opportunities and apprenticeships for young workers just entering the labor force, reforms of the unemployment compensation program.

No area of public policy deserves closer attention by the Congress than this matter of unemployment. I commend my colleagues who have taken the lead in this field, especially in the enactment of the Manpower Retraining and Development Act of the last Congress. This is an excellent start, but more remains to be done. I shall soon offer some legislative ideas in this field which I believe will help bring our labor force into better position to overcome the unemployment problem and help America meet its potential.

The New York Times editorial follows:

THE SPECIFICS OF UNEMPLOYMENT

There is fresh disappointment in the unemployment figures. Despite a somewhat better business picture, the seasonally adjusted unemployment rate for mid-November rose to 5.8 percent of the labor force compared to 5.5 percent a month ago. The Labor Department attributes the increase to a sharper than seasonal rise in the number of teenagers joining the labor force. Last month's improvement was due to a drop in unemployed women, presumably because they had left the labor force.

Although employment has increased, the number of jobless continues to pose a major economic—and human—problem. Unemployment has hit hardest at those least able to cope with it: the unskilled, the older worker, the Negroes, those whose experience is in depressed industries (like coal mining) or caught in depressed areas, or displaced by machines. There has been only 1 month during the last 5 years when unemployment registered less than 5 percent of the work force, while at present there are almost 400,000 who are listed as hard-core unemployed, without jobs for 27 weeks or longer.

The administration has been counting on a much faster rate of economic growth to absorb the unemployed. Though deficit spending and the Federal Reserve's easy money policies have helped to provide growth, unemployment has remained high. In fact, unemployment has itself been a drag on growth.

Paradoxically, there are jobs going begging in many industries. For the most part, they require skills that the unemployed do not possess. The increasing lack of mobility in the work force makes it especially hard on those in depressed areas who for one reason or another are tied to their homes, for these are the sites least attractive to new industry.

Given these barriers, it is doubtful that resort to general economic policies, whether through deficit spending or easy money or tax reductions, can solve the unemployment problem. A faster rate of economic growth can ameliorate the situation, but specific policies are needed to deal with the specific problems of the jobless. Expanding the manpower retraining is one essential step; providing greater opportunities to the young, especially in apprenticeship programs, is another. Meanwhile, extension of unemployment benefits is essential to alleviate hardship, particularly among those who are chronically unemployed.

## "I'm Fed Up to Here"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the following address by Adm. Ben Moreell, retired, should receive widespread circulation.

That is why I insert it, under unanimous consent, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"I'M FED UP TO HERE"

(Keynote address by Adm. Ben Moreell, CEC, USN (retired) chairman, board of trustees, Americans for Constitutional Action, Fifth Human Events Political Action Conference, January 10–12, 1963, Washington, D.C.)

In the idiom of the New Frontier, I am called an ultraconservative. I accept the nomination—provided the title denotes one who tries humbly to follow the trail leading from tyranny to freedom, which was hewed through Government oppression by Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Franklin, Hamilton, and the other pioneers of our Republic. They raised a "standard to which the wise and honest can repair," a standard which retains its integrity because it is rooted deeply in religious faith and eternal principles.

The elements of this standard are: First, man derives, directly from the Creator, his rights to life, to liberty and to the unhampered use of his honestly acquired property and, thus, he is not beholden for them to any human agency; second, to protect his rights he joins with others to establish a government, whose powers are carefully limited and clearly defined in order that they may not be used to usurp the rights they are designed to defend; and third, for man to grow in wisdom and worldly possessions, he must have freedom of choice, a free exchange for ideas as well as for material goods. These rights are to be used without hindrance, so long as the possessor does not interfere with the similar rights of others.

Transcending all is the conviction that for every God-given right there is a collateral responsibility to use that right in strict conformity with the moral law, as revealed in such statements as the Ten Commandments, the Sermon on the Mount and the Golden Rule. When man's appetites are disciplined by such inner restraints, he can establish a society which will require a minimum of external police power to maintain public order, and this, in turn, leads to a maximum of individual freedom.

On this solid foundation, our Founding Fathers erected the social order which became a haven for the oppressed and downtrodden of the earth and a beacon of hope for those who could not escape to our shores. While there was never a dearth of compassion and material help for the needy in our land, the major emphasis was always on opportunity, rather than on relief.

In this climate of freedom, our Nation became the world's cornucopia of spiritual and

material blessings. Over the years it has poured out its abundance for the needy everywhere.

But, in recent decades, our people have been subjected to an unceasing barrage of allegedly "new" ideas. With increasing frequency, and most recently by our President, we have been told that the ideals of the Founding Fathers are "outmoded," their admonitions are "incantations from the forgotten past, worn out slogans, myths and illusions." Individual moral responsibility to God and to one's neighbor has been called a "cliche of our forebears," and we are instructed that this generation must "disenthrall itself from an inheritance of truism and stereotype." We are urged to discard the accumulated wisdom of our ancestors and the time-tested traditions of Western civilization as useless impediments because the state now assumes full responsibility for the welfare of its subjects.

Unfortunately, many of us have yielded to these seductions. We have surrendered the solid substance of freedom for the illusory promise of security. In doing so, we have permitted the structure of our free society to be weakened and its foundations eroded to the point where there is grave danger of collapse.

All of us must share the blame for this debacle. Over the past 50 years we have participated in the propogation of a misplaced faith in the ability of government to accomplish any material, economic, social or moral purpose. Implementing this faith, we have thrust enormous powers on government, or we have stood by meekly while government has seized authority at an ever increasing pace and has centralized it in Washington, far removed from the control of those from whom it was obtained. Such enhancement of political power at the expense of individual rights is correctly labeled "socialism."

The tendency of citizens in all walks of life is to be complacent about government intrusion that does not encroach upon what each one believes is his own domain. We are apathetic about the general socialist drift. Frequently, we support collectivist measures which, it is claimed will "promote the general welfare," or will "stimulate the economy of the community" where we live. But we should now be aware that we are threatened by total state socialism, an ancient tyranny under a modern disguise. If we are to survive as a Nation of free men, we must oppose socialism with all our vigor wherever it appears. If our sole concern is that aspect of socialism which affects directly our own business, our own industry or our own community, we will contribute to the advance of State Socialism on other fronts by our neglect, and thus weaken the entire structure of freedom.

It is said that the people never give up their liberties except under some delusion. We have been surrendering our liberties under the delusion that government has some superior competence in the realm of economics, some magic multiplier of wealth, some ready access to a huge store of economic goods which may be had without working for them—merely by voting for them.

None of us is completely immune to these delusions or to the human passions aroused by the four horsemen of our own apocalypse, ignorance, fear, apathy and greed. Nevertheless, those who see the inevitable end of this progression are dutybound to sound the alarm. I will, therefore, present my thoughts on some specific aspects of our current situation.

The great iniquity of our times is that so many are trying to tell others how to live their lives. They ask, plaintively, "How can we do good for the people if we just let them alone?" As for me, "I'm fed up to here" woth so-called masterminds, with statesmen, clergymen, schoolmasters and politicians who, though frequently unable to administer the affairs of their own small households, have no doubt of their ability to spell out, in detail, what, when, where and how 188 million Americans and countless other millions throughout the world must do to have a more abundant life.

"I'm fed up to here" with pseudo statesmen, whose wishbones are where their backbones ought to be, who are past masters of surrender, compromise, appeasement and accommodation, who believe we can buy friends like sacks of potatoes, who fawn upon, cajole and pamper our enemies and the so-called unalined nations while they kick our time-tested friends in the teeth, who shiver and shake when "world opinion" is mentioned, who would depend upon U.N. mercenaries to protect the security of these United States, who never become surfeited with Soviet lies and deceit, who believe that the next time Khrushchev will surely honor his commitment, and who hold that the Russian Bear will soon change his claws and fangs for olive branches and rose petals.

"I'm fed up to here" with the wiser-than-thou, self-anointed oracles who insist that differences of opinion on foreign policy should stop at the water's edge and that free Americans must not criticize programs conceived and implemented by our "no-win diplomats" who, over the past 30 years, have racked up an almost unbroken string of losses to communism throughout the world; with those who would trade American lives, limbs, goods and services for Communist promises; with those who believe that the Castro Communist cançer has now been excised from the body politic of the Western Hemisphere; with those who are determined to democratize the Katangans even if necessary to kill them and destroy their property in the process; and with those who insist that we must subsidize, with massive foreign aid, arrogant Socialist and Communist governments all over the world though, while doing so, we help their dictators enslave their peoples.

"I'm fed up to here" with Robin Hood government that promises to rob the rich to pay the poor (in return for votes) and, when there are not enough rich left to pay the bills, robs both rich and poor alike to pay Robin Hood; with those who would tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect in the expectation that the day of reckoning will come after they are gone; with candidates who run on a platform of "I can get more from the Government for you," without reminder of what the Government must take from you; with officials who use defense contracts as instruments of political advantage; with politicians who think that a relief check means as much to an American as a decent job; with Government agencies which harass our industries with antitrust suits, threaten them with loss of Government contracts, dictate their economic decisions on costs and prices, resort to biased interference with their labor relations, burden them with punitive taxation and regulation, or tempt them to conform by promising lucrative contracts. What do you think Khrushchev would give to have General Motors, Dupont, General Electric, United States Steel, and Lockheed on his team?

"I'm fed up to here" with businessmen who are so busy making and selling widgets at a steadily decreasing profit, that they have no time or energy left to fight for preserving the system that makes their business possible; who do not protest Government intimidation and interference; who support socialist projects of short-range advantage to themselves; who finance foundations, schools, churches, cultural activities, news media and political parties which expound and promote socialist doctrine; or who "play ball" with the political apparatus in power when there is a potential payoff in the form of subsidies, loans or contracts.

"I'm fed up to here" with farmers who boast of their rugged individualism but demand guaranteed incomes, public power and irrigation; with doctors who oppose socialized medicine but plug for subsidized medical education, research and hospitals; with educators who profess a belief in personal responsibility as a builder of character but insist that Government aid to education is essential for national survival; with scientists who demand freedom of inquiry, but favor Government-financed (and controlled) research; and with union officials who demand special laws which exempt them from the responsibilities of other citizens and give them exclusive power to regiment their members, to dictate their political allegiance and to practice physical violence on persons and property when they deem this necessary "to conserve labor's gains."

I could go on, reciting the things we have left undone that we ought to have done and the things we have done that we ought not to have done. But I have said enough to support the charge that all of us must share the blame for our present predicament.

Where do we go from here? Perhaps the first thing each one should do is look into a mirror to see "what manner of man he is" and keep looking, until he knows the principles for which he stands and which he will not compromise. Once this is done, he can seek out those in Government who share his views, as well as others of like mind who are willing to serve in similar posts. We must sustain and support them with every resource at our command, for they are fighting our battles. And we must try with might and main to increase their numbers. This should be our target for 1963 and 1964. The hour is late. This may well be our last chance.

We can have the kind of Government we demand. Let us demand what history has taught us is right for us. Our fighting men and women in legislative halls throughout the land will win, provided we give them the support they must have to regain our lost freedoms.

---

## Let Congress Take Note

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram of January 4, 1963:

LET CONGRESS TAKE NOTE

The lobby for Federal aid to the schools is as active as ever as the time for convening Congress nears. As usual, it is pointing out how vital to the educational system such aid would be. But it is saying nothing at all about the opinion expressed in a recent testing of opinion about Federal school aid.

This poll was taken by the National School Boards Association. It showed that 55 percent of 90,000 school board members queried across the Nation were opposed to Federal aid. Only 30 percent of those replying to a questionnaire said they believed such aid was necessary.

School board members are most directly concerned with raising money with which to operate the schools. They must do the worrying when funds are not sufficient to keep the schools going. But they are un-

willing to take the easy way of relying on the Federal Government for supplementary revenues.

School board members are not only close to school operations, they are close to the people. The majority of them seem to think that if local communities ever turn over to the Federal Government the responsibility for keeping the schools open the schools will suffer. The best school systems are in communities where the citizens are interested enough to see that they have enough money to operate at a high level. If the people are relieved of this worry, they are apt to cease being concerned with what goes on in their schools. Local responsibility is the cornerstone of the American system of public education.

The new Congress should note the results of the poll of school boards on Federal aid to the school system.

## A Christmas Prayer, 1962, by Hon. Dewey Short

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. DURWARD G. HALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent permission to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I enclose herewith the "Christmas Prayer, 1962," by the Honorable Dewey Short, of Missouri.

The writer is an ordained minister and served 24 years in this House and 4 years as Assistant Secretary of the Army. Many of us recall him as the silver-tongued orator of the Ozarks. Although we received this deep-rooted and thoughtful prayer individually, it is my desire that it be preserved in the RECORD and made available to all because of its universal application and acceptability to those of us who believe in trust in Divine guidance. I commend it to all with respect and humility:

MY CHRISTMAS PRAYER, 1962

Our Heavenly Father, safely Thou hast brought us through another year. Thou hast spared us the ravages of fire, flood, and famine. Thou hast saved us from the horrors and destruction of devastating war.

For Thy countless blessings on this day and every day we give Thee our endless and sincere thanks. For the majesty of mountains, the silence of silver stars, the bountiful fruits of fields, forests, and streams, the understanding, sympathy, and help of families and friends we express our undying gratitude. Bless Thou especially those who have lost loved ones; comfort, strengthen, and sustain them which only Thy great love can do.

God of truth, beauty, and goodness, we are not worthy of Thy gifts but we want to emulate Thee and with humble minds and contrite hearts walk in Thy way. Help us, we beseech Thee, to preserve this Republic of ours, to keep it a land of freedom, opportunity, and justice and to strive constantly and untiringly to make it a kingdom of Heaven on earth.

O Lord, save us from idle gossip, from small and petty talk. May we never envy those who have more but always help those who have less. Teach us the relativity of things and give us a true sense of values. Let courtesy, consideration, kindness, and generosity rule in our hearts and guide our lives. We do not want to think of ourselves "more highly than we ought to think." Help us to keep our sense of humor and add to the sum of human joy. Let us walk with God and go about doing good.

And now, our Father God, may our faith in Thee and in one another never wane; may we hope even "when hope is out of sight," and may we love each other as Thou hast loved us, that through sacrifice and service we can bring to a wretched, distraught, and divided world a united, just, and lasting peace. May we live or even die for it as the Master did. In His name we pray. Amen.

You will always be in my thoughts and prayers. Happy New Year.

DEWEY SHORT.

## U.N. Atrocity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the two following editorials appeared in the Washington Star of January 5 and 7, respectively.

They bring to our attention the very sad state of things in the Congo and the deplorable part that both the United States and the United Nations have played in this whole catastrophe.

Atrocities have been committed by U.N. troops, but these are lightly brushed aside, and an Indian officer says:

It should never have happened.

Shades of Gandhi.

Yes, we have traveled a long way from nonresistance, and a still longer way since Great Britain submitted to it. Maybe India would still be a part of the British Empire if England had been able to call on the U.N. troops for support.

[From the Evening Star, Jan. 5, 1963]

U.N. ATROCITY

The senseless murder of two women by U.N. troops in Jadotville is a shocking thing. But it is not wholly surprising. It is, rather, a culminating horror in the U.N. war to destroy secessionist Katanga and the political power of its president, Moise Tshombe.

The U.N., of course, does not admit that it is waging war to crush Katanga's secession. On the contrary, it denies it. It says its wants peace, not war, and that it has no intention of trying to impose a political settlement on Katanga by force of arms. These sentiments were piously echoed by our own highest officials as far back as a year ago. But the facts speak for themselves.

Last week Katangese soldiers, apparently beyond Tshombe's control, started firing at U.N. forces in Elisabethville. On December 29, after his palace had been surrounded, Tshombe fled from the city, and on that same day a grim-faced U.N. official in New York said: "This time there will be no stopping short of total victory."

The trigger-happy Katangans were quickly routed in Elisabethville, and U.N. Secretary-General U Thant said on January 1 that "all firing and fighting had ceased" as of December 30. He renewed his assurance that the U.N. would not use force for political ends, and, on January 2, gave assurance that "the U.N. forces will resort to fire only when fired upon."

The U.N. troops in Katanga, however, chose to ignore all of this. Apparently in pursuit of the promised "total victory," they fought their way into Jadotville, miles away, which had been abandoned by retreating Katangese forces. And there, 2 days after Mr. U Thant's assurance, a detachment of U.N. Indian troops opened fire with machineguns and rifles on a passing Volkswagen. The driver, a cement worker who had been urged to return to Jadotville, was shot in the face. His wife and a woman companion were killed. An Indian officer on the scene said: "It should never have happened."

But it did happen. And the most dedicated apologist for the U.N. cannot deny this or attribute it to bad reporting. The memory of the bleeding, anguished husband, crouched by his bullet-shattered car with upraised hands and asking: "Why, Why, Why?", will linger on.

His answer should come from those who try to justify what has been happening in the Congo by painting Tshombe as the "bad guy" and Cyrille Adoula as the "good guy."

Our State Department officials, or at least most of them, do not offer any such simple and simple-minded justification. Nevertheless, the United States is backing the U.N. in its biased effort to do what it has repeatedly said it is not doing, and what it lacks authority to do. It may succeed in the sense that Tshombe will be destroyed. When the last chapter is written, however, we doubt that many Americans will take pride in the story.

[From the Evening Star, Jan. 7, 1963]

CONGO SETTLEMENT

Secretary of State Dean Rusk is said to believe that there is now "a real chance" for a quick settlement of the "Katangan problem." If this means that the United Nations, by force of arms, has smashed Katanga's resistance and can now proceed to impose a political settlement, it probably is correct.

The price will be high—not in a military sense, for casualties in the superior U.N. force have been insignificant. It will be expensive, however, in terms of morality. For the U.N. with our active support, is doing what it has no authority to do under its charter, and what it has repeatedly pledged that it would not do.

The rationale is that Premier Adoula of the central government in Leopoldville must be effectively supported, and that this can be done only by crushing Katanga's secession and forcing the President of that province, Moise Tshombe, to split its revenues with the national government. Unless this is done, it is argued, Adoula will fall, his successor probably would be more Communist-oriented, and the Reds would regain their foothold in the Congo. It is argued further that the "Katangan problem" must be dealt with promptly, since the Indian troops, the best combat unit in the U.N. command, soon will be withdrawn, and the U.N. funds are running low.

Even if one accepts all this as being factual, it still is an utterly cynical attempt to justify what is being done. The U Thant plan, to cite but one example, calls for adoption of a new constitution for the Congo, under which Katanga would enjoy a considerable measure of autonomy. This constitution was submitted to the Leopoldville Parliament last September, but it has never been brought up for a vote. Why not? Because Premier Adoula is afraid that his Parliament, which has been "recessed" until March, might vote down the proposed constitution and vote him out of office at the same time. So the U.N., with American support, is in the unadmirable positon of using

armed force in violation of its charter to compel Tshombe to submit to a proposed constitution which has never been voted upon and which may never be ratified.

Whatever the expedient arguments for this course, we do not think history's judgment will be flattering.

## Problem Arising From the Two-Price Cotton System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles A. Cannon, a leading textile executive of my neighboring State of North Carolina, who has plants and employees in my district, recently made a statement before the Cotton Subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee, U.S. House of Representatives.

While the testimony of Mr. Cannon will be included in the printed hearings of that subcommittee, I believe the Nation as a whole, through the medium of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, should be familiarized with his excellent summation of the problems arising from the two-price cotton system presently in effect in this country as we deal with our domestic and foreign problems in cotton textiles.

His testimony is so well prepared that any comment from others would be entirely superfluous and, under unanimous consent, I include his remarks at this point in the RECORD:

TESTIMONY OF C. A. CANNON, CHAIRMAN, COTTON POLICY COMMITTEE, AMERICAN TEXTILE MANUFACTURERS INSTITUTE, IN SUPPORT OF THE OBJECTIVE TO ELIMINATE TWO-PRICE COTTON BEFORE THE COTTON SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE, THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, DECEMBER 13, 1962

INTRODUCTION

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I wish to thank you for the privilege of appearing before this committee in support of the objective to eliminate the two-price cotton system.

I am C.A. Cannon, chairman of the board of the Cannon Mills Co., of Kannapolis, N.C. At present I am serving as chairman of the Cotton Policy Committee of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, the national trade association which represents approximately 90 percent of the spinners and weavers of textiles from cotton, man-made fibers and silk in the United States. I appear before you today in this capacity as well as in my individual capacity as a textile manufacturer interested in the elimination of the two-price cotton system.

The testimony which I will present to you has been approved and authorized by the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, and I assure you that I wholeheartedly subscribe to it personally.

A cotton policy resolution which expresses the desire of the American textile industry to have the two-price cotton system eliminated completely was adopted by the ATMI on October 12, 1962. This resolution reads in part:

"(1) As early as possible, a return to a one-price system for American cotton, whether sold at home or abroad.

"(2) The exclusion of any form of processing tax on manufactured cotton products.

"(3) Movement of cotton through normal trade channels rather than Government hands.

"(4) A fair procedure in respect to the net income position of the cotton farmer.

"(5) An increase in cotton acreage realistically geared to the increase in the demand for U.S. cotton that will result from a sound long-range cotton program."

BACKGROUND

There are two separate historical developments which bear upon this subject which I wish to summarize briefly for you: first, the import trend of cotton textiles into the United States and, second, the history of two-price cotton.

*I. The import picture*

In the past 10 years U.S. imports of foreign-made cotton products from all over the world have risen from the average cotton equivalent of 68,000 bales in 1952, to 225,000 bales in 1956, to 526,000 bales in 1960, and it now appears that imports of cotton products during 1962 will reach nearly 700,000-bale equivalents or more than 1,200 million-square-yard equivalents of cotton textiles. These imports are not only disrupting the markets for American-made textiles but they are rapidly taking away the farmers' market for American-grown cotton.

American textile mills in 1952 used approximately 150 bales of American-grown cotton for one bale equivalent of imported cotton textiles. In 1962 U.S. mills will consume only 13 bales for each imported bale equivalent. A return to a one-price cotton system can reverse this trend which, if continued, will be disasterous to the American cotton economy.

The Geneva Short-Term Cotton Textile Arrangement was designed to hold imports at the fiscal year 1961 level of 812 million-square-yard equivalents for the 12 month period ending September 30, 1962. The record is now complete and total imports for the short-term arrangement year reached 1,113-million-square-yard equivalents, an excess of 37 percent.

Preliminary figures on imports of cotton cloth alone (excluding all yarn, apparel, and other textiles) show that the October 1962 import rate of 46 million square yards is more than double the October 1961 imports of 21 million square yards. For the 10-month January-October 1962 period, these cotton cloth imports have reached 399 million square yards compared to only 198 million in the similar January–October 1961 period and 10 months at the October 1962 rate would reach 460 million square yards.

A significant factor in these excessive imports is the cost advantage that foreign textile producing nations have over domestic mills in the purchase of raw cotton.

The rising trend in imports of cotton yarn and heavy constructions of cotton cloth is clearly the result of the raw cotton cost advantage that foreign mills have over domestic mills because of the two-price cotton system. Imports of cotton yarn alone have jumped 117 times since the beginning of the two-price system in 1956—from only 865,000 square yard equivalents to an estimated 102 million square yards for 1962.

*II. History of two-price cotton*

American cotton textile mills have been prohibited by law since 1939 from buying foreign grown upland cotton in excess of about 30,000 bales a year—less than the amount of cotton consumed in 1 day by U.S. mills.

The Federal Government, to stabilize cotton production and farm income, has embraced a policy of price supports which has resulted in American cotton being priced higher than foreign grown cotton.

Since 1956, the Government has subsidized the export of American raw cotton at a rate equal to the difference between the U.S. and world prices; since August 1, 1961, by direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, this difference and subsidy has been at the rate of 8½ cents per pound, or $42.50 a bale.

The upward import trend of cotton products for the most part has occurred since 1956, when the raw cotton export subsidy program was initiated creating the two-price system.

Foreign mills have been able to buy cotton—either American or foreign grown—at prices far below those at which American mills are required to pay by law.

Obviously these conditions—all Government imposed—have created a patently unfair circumstance which serves to throttle an essential American industry and prevent it from realizing its full potential to consume cotton, to contribute to the empolyment of American labor and the Nation's economic strength.

THE PRESIDENT'S REQUEST

On September 6, 1962, the Tariff Commission, by a vote of 3 to 2 rejected the Department of Agriculture's request that an equalization fee be put on the cotton content of textile imports.

On this same day, the President in commenting upon the Tariff Commission finding, stated in part:

"Thus, the inequity of the two-price system of cotton costs remains as a unique burden upon the American textile industry for which a solution must be found in the near future.

"I am, therefore, requesting the Department of Agriculture to give immediate attention to the formulation of a domestic program that would eliminate this inequity. I am also instructing all other departments and offices of the executive branch to cooperate fully to this end."

The President observed, in addition, that because the objective undoubtedly could be achieved only through legislative action, he would ask the next session of Congress to enact legislation, "designed to remove the inequity created by the present two-price cotton system."

It is with a great deal of satisfaction that we are privileged to participate in these hearings which have been called as a consequence of this expressed desire of the President.

The domestic textile industry enthusiastically agrees with the President that "the inequity of the two-price system of cotton costs * * *" is "a unique burden upon the American textile industry * * *" and requires "immediate attention to the formulation of a domestic program that would eliminate this inequity."

It is the considered judgment of the industry that this inequity should be abolished completely and at once.

The idea has been advanced that the inequity can be eliminated by something less than a return to a clear-cut one-price system for cotton, under which the American-grown product would be available to domestic mills and for export at the same price. This idea is both irrelevant and erroneous.

It is irrelevant because the President has directed that the two-price cotton system be abolished.

It is erroneous because the idea is apparently predicated on the belief that it costs foreign mills more to take cotton from the United States and send goods back than it

costs domestic mills to bring cotton to the mill and ship goods to the consuming centers.

The differences in the cost of marketing and distribution of cotton and cotton textiles prior to 1956 before the advent of the two-price cotton system, are present today, and anything less than a complete return to a one-price system will perpetuate that portion of the inequity which is allowed to remain.

Since the advent of two-price cotton, active cotton system spindles have dropped 9.1 percent of the remaining spindles formerly running on cottons, 11.8 percent, or 2,217,000, are consuming manmade or other fibers.

Furthermore, textile employment has decreased by 180,000 workers; per capita mill consumption of cotton has dropped by 3.7 pounds; and imports of cotton textiles continue their relentless upward surge.

Beyond question the import experience of the past few years demonstrates that the devastating impact of these imports cannot and will not be brought under reasonable control until American mills can buy American cotton at the same price foreign mills can purchase it.

The difficulties encountered in the administration of the 1-year International Cotton Textile Arrangement because of the two-price cotton program are carried over into the 5-Year International Cotton Textile Arrangement (October 1, 1962–September 30, 1967), and will continue unless corrected by the establishment of one-price cotton.

To allow these imports to continue at their present rate is to cause a further deterioration in the American textile industry, with its inevitable adverse impact on the entire cotton economy and the millions dependent upon it for livelihood.

U.S. mills must use only American-grown uplands-type cotton, purchased at the U.S. Government-supported price, except for an amount equal to less than 1 day's supply per year. In the 1962–63 cotton season an estimated 34.7 million bales, produced outside the United States, will be available to foreign mills at whatever prices they can bargain for. The result is that the foreigners can and will buy 85 percent of their requirements at prices even lower than the subsidized U.S. export price.

The price of foreign cotton is to 1 to 1½ cents per pound less than the price of U.S. cotton in foreign markets. This is in spite of the requirement in section 203 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 that U.S. cotton be competitively priced abroad. Thus, the inequity for the American mill in many instances is not restricted to the current 8½-cent differential—it is in the neighborhood of 9½ to 10 cents per pound or something more. When adjustments are made for the manufacturing waste losses involved in the higher priced cotton, the inequity is even greater.

The United States is rapidly losing its position as the most important cotton-producing nation in the world. Over the years, the domestic textile industry has proven to be the principal and most dependable outlet for this production.

Notwithstanding these facts, as a nation, we have been pursuing policies which penalize our textile industry and which work against the interest of our farmers. We have been favoring our foreign competitors by making cotton available to them on more favorable terms than it is made available to domestic mills. Primarily, as a result of this policy, we have a shrinking textile industry; the domestic use of cotton is declining; the number of cotton spindles is being constantly reduced; and the incentive for investment in new plants and equipment is weakened. Under these circumstances, the cotton industry as a whole cannot contribute to the fullest extent of its capability to the Nation's economic growth.

What does this mean to American cotton farmers? What does this mean to our national economy? It means loss of markets for cotton. It means loss of employment for workers.

The system under which we have been operating is destined to destroy the American cotton farmer because it is constantly weakening the textile industry upon which the cotton farmer must depend to process and market his crop.

A bale of cotton is virtually worthless until it moves through cotton textile spindles and is further processed. Thus, except for an uncertain export market, the strength of our Nation's raw cotton economy cannot possibly be any greater than that of the industry through which the product moves to market.

A healthy expanding textile industry with maximum employment and increasing cotton consumption is important not only to millions of those engaged in producing and handling cotton, but it is also vital to the growth and strength of the U.S. economy. The loss of cotton spindles is the loss of the potential to provide a reliable market for American cotton.

The U.S. textile industry is at the forefront in the effort to modernize its plants and equipment and maintain the capacity to spin American grown cotton. In 1962 the textile industry will spend for modernization an estimated $1.78 for each $1 of allowed depreciation compared to an all manufacturing industry average of only $1.19. In 1960 the textile industry spent an average of 30 percent more, and in 1961, 29 percent more for plant modernization than did all manufacturing industries.

Since the President and the administration have recognized the existence of the undesirability of the two-price cotton system, and have resolved to abolish it, the sooner it is forthrightly and completely accomplished, the better it will be for all concerned.

Section 203 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 requires that we make cotton competitive to world prices in order to reestablish and maintain our fair historical share of the world market for cotton. The United States continues to be the residual supplier of cotton for the world market and an export of 5 million bales cannot continue to constitute a fair percentage share of a rising level of cotton production and consumption throughout the world.

Expanding cotton exports for dollars is important to cotton farmers and to the industry. It is also vital to the maintenance of a favorable international balance of payments and our gold reserves and, hence, to the maintenance of our military posture abroad and our fiscal soundness at home.

Cotton is losing markets here at home to a wide variety of competing fibers and other products. Highly detailed studies by the Department of Agriculture, the National Cotton Council, and the textile industry itself demonstrate beyond question that current price levels are destroying markets.

For example, rayon staple fiber production, with an increasing price advantage, continues to advance in the United States. From 1955, when production of rayon staple fiber was 9.9 percent of U.S. cotton consumption, it had increased to 11.6 percent in 1961. The increased production and use of other manmade fibers, not only replaces cotton at the mill door but also displaces farm jobs and related cotton processing facilities.

It is the considered judgment of textile manufacturers who consume millions of bales of cotton annually, and who are constantly exploring every conceivable market outlet, that a return to a one-price system for cotton would give cotton an opportunity to share equitably in market expansion and regain some of its losses.

Over the past decade the U.S. population has increased by nearly 30 million persons, yet cotton consumption has shown no growth and has remained relative constant.

Over and beyond the cold competitive impact involved, a forthright one-price policy would have a tremendous psychological effect on both users and competitors of cotton. To the users it would provide new hope and confidence, with consequent investment incentives, where a lack of confidence now exists; to the competitors it would serve as a warning not to develop or expand competitive products based entirely on an artificially high cotton cost.

The U.S. Government backed by a broad cross section of public opinion, apparently is committed to a policy of removing barriers and freeing trade throughout the world. Passage of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 opens the door for severe changes in trade patterns. Although the policy has not yet been applied to most major agricultural products, there is no guarantee that this situation is permanent.

Cotton enjoys (1) a supported price substantially above the world level, (2) a virtually complete embargo on competitive raw cotton imports—therefore, a monopoly on domestic consumption, and (3) a legislated provision that export sales must be subsidized to whatever extent is necessary to insure export sales abroad at historic levels.

Everything considered, raw cotton enjoys what is probably the most complete protection of any important American product, either agricultural or manufactured.

However, this preferred position is jeopardized so long as foreign mills can buy U.S. produced cotton at a price below that which U.S. mills are required to pay.

CONCLUSION

The need for a return to one-price cotton is clear. The President has recognized this need and directed that it be met by the cooperation of all relevant interests in the executive branch of Government. The cotton industry supports the decision of the President and is eager to assist in designing the most desirable method of correcting the situation.

We appear here today representing an industry that uses and knows cotton and cotton's problems but even as the cotton producer must look to us to spin his bales, we must look to the market to consume our cotton textiles.

We have a tremendous investment in plants and equipment to process cotton and the American cotton farmer has a tremendous stake in the future of cotton.

If we look ahead under the two-price system we can see the rising trend of foreign-made cotton textile imports, inactive cotton spindles, bales of cotton piling up in warehouses and domestic consumption dropping to 7 million bales annually. When domestic mill consumption of cotton falls to 7 million bales we will need only 14 million acres to produce the cotton crop.

On the other hand, we can see a return to a one-price system, fewer cotton textile imports, more spindles active on cotton, and domestic cotton consumption rising with benefits of a healthy cotton economy spread all the way from farm to consumer.

A complete return to a one-price system for cotton in the United States could mean an annual cost saving to the consuming public of a probable $600 to $800 million when the initial cotton cost reduction is carried all the way through the textile pipeline to the retail counter.

Textile markets already reflect uncertainty and hesitation attendant the timetable of carrying out the President's decision to abolish two-price cotton. Delay in getting the job done will continue to paralyze the market. Foreign mills will continue

to buy cotton at an unfair price advantage compared to American mills.

Over and beyond the considerations we have been discussing, which obviously are important to all elements of the cotton industry, is the relationship of this subject to the national security of our country.

The military cannot function in hot climates without hot weather clothing; it cannot function in cold climates without cold weather clothing.

The work force of this Nation that must support a military effort cannot function without work clothing.

In addition, there are hundreds and hundreds of items involving textile products that are absolutely essential to the success of a military operation.

In 1941 and 1942 the stocks of cotton we had on hand in this country became a tremendous blessing, a lifesaver without which our military effort would have been seriously impaired. During the Korean conflict our stocks of cotton were so low that embargoes were placed on export shipments, and prices in the rest of the world rose to 80 or 90 cents per pound.

In 1942, during the peak of World War II, we consumed 11.2 million bales of cotton in this country; for the past 5 years consumption has reached 9 million bales only once. In 1942 our cotton system spindles in place were 23,971,000; today they number 19,609,000, and for the past 3 years have been decreasing at the rate of about 40,000 monthly.

An announcement has been made that cotton acreage will be reduced by 2 million acres next year because offtake is not equalling production.

Knowing as we do the absolute essentiality of cotton products in time of a national emergency, having learned from experience that we can depend only upon our own raw cotton supplies and our own textile industry when the chips are down, it is inconceivable that we can sit here—irrespective of all other considerations—and permit a continuation of policies that are having the two-fold effect of killing off cotton markets and cotton production, and, at the same time, drying up the industry through which the raw material is transformed into items essential to the preservation of our people and our country.

Again, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I wish to thank you for the privilege of appearing before you in support of the President of the United States in his desire to abolish two-price cotton.

I thank you.

## Outlaw Political Extortion of Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have today reintroduced legislation making it a criminal offense to threaten Federal employees with the loss of their jobs in the event they do not contribute to a political party.

This legislation is made necessary by the refusal of the Justice Department to use laws now on the books to prosecute party fund solicitors who coerce Federal employees into party contributions under threat of being fired.

In the last Congress I was unable to get any action by the Justice Department in such a case involving alleged threats of a Democratic fund solicitor against postal employees in my district. By a strange interpretation of the law, the Department maintains that it is legal for anyone, who is not a Federal employee, to threaten Federal employees with job loss as a means of coercing contributions to the party in power.

It is regrettable that Congress is forced to restate a law which clearly prohibits such pernicious activity. It is regrettable that Federal employees will be without the protection of the law until Congress is able to act. It is regrettable that the civil rights of those employees can still be violated with impunity.

I urge prompt passage of the bill. It reads as follows:

Whoever, directly or indirectly, deprives, attempts to deprive, or threatens to deprive any person of any employment, position, work, compensation or other benefit provided for or made possibe by any Act of Congress, in an effort to force participation in any political activity, or support or opposition to any candidate or political party, or financial contributions to any candidate or political party, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

## Clare E. Hoffman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in 28 years Clare Hoffman is not in Congress to represent the people of the Fourth District of Michigan.

The Holland Evening Sentinal published in my congressional district but also circulating in Mr. Hoffman's former district commented on Clare's absence in an editorial Friday, January 4, 1963.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include this editorial.

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

Congressman Clare E. Hoffman has finished his career as our Congressman from the Fourth District of six counties—Allegan, Barry, Berrien, Cass, St. Joseph, and Van Buren after 28 years.

Millions of people over the country will remember Clare as a fighting Congressman and one that stood up for what he believed. There is no doubt in our mind that our country is much better for having Clare represent the Fourth District for so many years. As long as Clare wanted to represent the district in Washington we, the people, were more than glad to get out and work for him.

We have talked with lots of people who did not always agree with Clare but he was a power in Congress and was always looking for ways to save the taxpayers' dollars. He had the courage to speak out. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD holds many of his speeches defending the principles for which he stood.

Clare had the courage of his convictions and was not afraid to stand up and tell the Congress where he stood.

Twenty-eight years is a long time to represent the people of the district in Congress. We wish Clare much leisure time to reflect on the service to his country.

## Lucky America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, in the December 31 issue of U.S. News & World Report, Mr. David Lawrence, the distinguished editor of that magazine, wrote a brilliant recapitulation of the sorry sequence of events which has led us into our present, perilous position. I hope that every Member of Congress will take the time to read Mr. Lawrence's article:

LUCKY AMERICA?

(By David Lawrence)

"I think we ought to be rather pleased with ourselves this Christmas."

So spoke President Kennedy at the end of a television interview on December 17. But wouldn't it be more realistic to say that maybe it was by the grace of God the American people were saved from a horrible calamity? Indeed, the facts now show there was a dangerous delay in decisionmaking by the President.

For Mr. Kennedy has just made an unwitting confession of how a confused and risky system of policymaking preceded the action he finally took to protect the people of the United States against a nuclear attack from Soviet bases in Cuba.

The President made some amazing revelations in that interview. The full text of it is printed in 10 pages of this issue. Unfortunately, the American people heard only one side of the story, and the same TV and radio audience may never get the facts in rebuttal. Nor were the listeners reminded of certain statements made in October by the President and Secretary of Defense McNamara which have a direct bearing on the latest explanation of what happened in the Cuban crisis.

Thus, the President made a rather startling disclosure when he said: "I don't think that we expected that he [Khrushchev] would put the missiles in Cuba, because it would have seemed such an imprudent action for him to take, as it was later proved. Now, he obviously must have thought that he could do it in secret and that the United States would accept it. So that he did not judge our intentions accurately."

But did we judge Mr. Khrushchev's intentions opportunely and accurately? Or did we fumble for several weeks, and were we just lucky in the end?

Our vacillating course was revealed when the President replied to a question as to whether he was tempted to show Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko at the White House our photographs of the missile bases in Cuba. Mr. Kennedy said: "No, because our information was incomplete and we had not completely determined what our policy would be. The information came in Tuesday (October 16). Our conversation was on Thursday. We were carrying out intensive reconnaissance. We were still considering the advisability of another course of action. And therefore it would have been very unwise for us to inform him [Gromyko] in detail of what we knew. We did not want to give him the satisfaction of announcing what he was doing. I think it was very im-

portant that the United States announced it before he did."

What kind of game was being played? Who was deceiving whom? The security of the United States was at stake. Yet as late as October 18, the President had made no decision. A month earlier—on September 11—the Soviet Government had announced publicly that the military weapons being sent to Cuba were "designed exclusively for defensive purposes," and that "there is no need for the Soviet Government to shift its weapons for a retaliatory blow to any other country, for instance, Cuba."

Did the President in September really believe these statements from the Kremlin? Was there no military man in the councils of the White House able to persuade the President that you must never assume the enemy is telling the truth about his intentions or the location and nature of his weapons?

The U.S. Government knew in August, through reliable intelligence sources, that the Soviet Government had landed armament in Cuba. There were reports even then about possible missile bases. Why didn't the President impose a blockade in August so that we could see for ourselves what weapons were being carried on ships into Cuba?

Why, on September 11, did the President accept a theoretical distinction between "offensive" and "defensive" weapons instead of verifying at once what kind of weapons were being landed? Why did he wait?

In his October 22 address to the American people, the President said: "The size of this [Soviet] undertaking makes clear it has been planned for some months."

Actually, beginning in late August, warnings were given on the floor of the Senate by Republicans and Democrats that the Soviets had made Cuba a military base and that Castro was being given missiles by the Soviet Union. But the President was traveling around the country making political speeches. Even on October 19—the day after the important meeting with Gromyko—Mr. Kennedy set out for 3 days of political campaigning that would have taken him to the Pacific Coast. He spoke in Ohio and Illinois and then returned to Washington on Saturday, the 20th.

On Monday, October 22, moreover—the night of the announcement of our belated blockade—Secretary of Defense McNamara revealed in a news conference that actual photographs of the missiles in place had been given to the President on Tuesday morning, October 16. This was a few hours before Mr. Kennedy left Washington to campaign in Connecticut.

Mr. McNamara told of the IL-28 bombers which had been introduced during the previous 10 days in Cuba. He said they were capable of carrying nuclear weapons and pointed out that the range of both the bombers and the ballistic missiles covered a large part of the United States, including the city of Washington.

Do we, in a missile age, wait several days to make up our minds? Haven't we been told that decisions in this atomic era have to be made in a matter of minutes?

The President, in his December 17 interview, described the process of policymaking today in the White House, but did not explain why the decision to blockade Cuba wasn't taken 2 months earlier—before the missiles were landed. He was asked, "How does a President go about making a decision, like Cuba, for example?" In his reply, Mr. Kennedy said:

"The most recent one was hammered out, really, as policy and decision over a period of 5 or 6 days. During that period, the 15 people, more or less, who were directly consulted frequently changed their view, because whatever action we took had so many disadvantages to it, and each action we took raised the prospect that it might escalate with the Soviet Union into a nuclear war. Finally, however, I think a general consensus developed, and it certainly seemed after all alternatives were examined that the course of action that we finally adopted was the right one."

Is it going to take 6 days of conferences to reach a consensus on a course of action every time the Soviets initiate a military threat that could affect us directly? How many of the 15 advisers who sit in on these policymaking sessions are subject to confirmation by the Senate? What is the responsibility of such unofficial advisers directly to the American people? It is easy to say that the President has to make the final decision, but do such advisers exert undue influence on him? On this point, the President said: "So that, in my opinion, the majority came to accept the course we finally took. It made it much easier. In the Cuba of 1961, the advice of those who were brought in on the executive branch was also unanimous, and the advice was wrong. And I was responsible. So that, finally, it comes down that, no matter how many advisers you have, frequently they are divided, and the President must finally choose."

But what about the basic principle of safety first—when war threatens the security of a people? Is it a time to consult fears? Must we speculate at length on the ambiguous purposes of an enemy and guess at his course? Should we not have taken at once steps to thwart the enemy—such as ridding the Caribbean area in August and September of Soviet weapons of any kind and coincidentally imposing a blockade to keep any more weapons from being landed in Cuba?

In his December 17 interview, the President still speculates on Soviet intentions. It is to be hoped that the administration has learned a lesson and will never again confuse military security with the game of international propaganda.

Mr. Kennedy said: "I think in that speech this week he [Khrushchev] showed his awareness of the nuclear age. But, of course, the Cuban effort has made it more difficult for us to carry out any successful negotiation, because this was an effort to materially change the balance of power. It was done in secret, steps were taken really to deceive us by every means they could, and they were planning in November to open to the world the fact that they had these missiles so close to the United States; not that they were intending to fire them, because if they were going to get into a nuclear struggle, they have their own missiles in the Soviet Union.

"But it would have politically changed the balance of power. It would have appeared to, and appearances contribute to reality."

But we did gamble with our national safety. We allowed a group of 15 advisers—mostly civilians—to formulate military policy. The grim fact is that we waited while the Russians were allowed to place missiles in Cuba which an irresponsible Castro might have fired into the Southeast region of the United States. The crafty Khrushchev would have disclaimed all responsibility, thus delaying, if not frustrating, any retaliatory blow against Soviet territory.

England and France twice waited, appeased, and took the "first blow" in two world wars. We ourselves waited for the enemy to strike at Pearl Harbor. But we didn't wait to repel the sudden invasion of South Korea—for which aggression the Soviets later admitted they had supplied the armament.

Despite our public insistence on the right to make on-site inspections in Cuba, the President reveals now that he has given up that demand. Apparently we are to take a chance that no missiles have been concealed and that none will be reintroduced. Yet guns, tanks and Mig planes were still coming into Cuba last week. Several thousand Soviet troops remain there.

Maybe we should reread Mr. Kennedy's book of 1940, "While England Slept." May we hope that subsequent events do not justify a book on the fateful months of 1962 entitled "While America Slept." Let us pray that we shall continue to be a lucky America.

## Mona Lisa Cracks Her Smile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the times that try men's souls are not always those of grave international crisis nor serious domestic issue. Like the Buchwalds, the Minshalls attended the unveiling of the Mona Lisa. We can testify as to the veracity of his account of the affair in the January 10 Washington Post.

OUR FIRST OFFICIAL FUNCTION

(By Art Buchwald)

We went to our first official Washington function Tuesday night and it's something we'll remember for the rest of our lives. It was the black-tie, long-evening-dress opening of the Mona Lisa at the National Gallery, and our wife couldn't have been more excited if she had been invited to go water skiing with John Glenn at Hyannis Port.

When the invitation arrived she couldn't believe it.

She was waiting for us when we came home from the office and she threw her arms around us. "We've been invited to something," she cried. "And after only 4 months in Washington. It's hard to believe."

"What have we been invited to?"

"The unveiling of the Mona Lisa and the invitation says the President is going to be there and Andre Malraux and probably all of the Cabinet and the Supreme Court and the diplomatic corps and the Members of Congress and everything. Isn't it exciting?"

MOMENT OF WONDER

We held her close. "Our first Washington function. I wonder if we're up to it."

"I'll have to buy a new dress," she said.

"Spend, spend," we chortled. "These things don't happen every day."

"And I'll need new shoes, and gloves, and I'll have to have my hair changed and my nails done. I just don't know where to start."

"Just don't look more beautiful than Jackie," we chided. "I guess it wouldn't hurt to buy a new tuxedo. This will probably be the first of many White House functions. After all, once they put you on the list, they can hardly take you off."

"I have to call my mother," our wife said. "And my sister Pat, and my sister Joanie, and my sister Sue."

"Call, call. That is what long distance is for."

For the next 2 weeks we could talk of nothing else. Would the President speak to us? Would Malraux ask us to say a few words about the Mona Lisa? Would Vice President JOHNSON insist on introducing us to his wife?

Our wife read up on every protocol manual she could get her hands on.

"It doesn't say anything in any of them about what to do at the unveiling of a painting," she said.

"Just be yourself," we told her. "The Kennedys are not particular about protocol."

THE NIGHT OF NIGHTS

The big night finally came. Our wife had spent $500 on a dress, $30 on the hairdresser, $100 for accessories. But she could hardly have spent less for such an important social engagement. Paul Young, of the restaurant, lent us his Rolls Royce so we could arrive in style. Our new tuxedo was cut straight from the cloth of the New Frontier.

At the door of the National Gallery, U.S. marines stood at attention under a long canvas archway. It was all we had dreamed it would be. We squeezed our wife's hand as we entered the gallery.

After checking our coats, we rode up in the elevator to the second floor with two admirals, three Senators and four Ambassadors, and their wives. Both of us were starry-eyed. Then we stepped out of the elevator into the beautiful rotunda.

We couldn't see anything except a mob of people standing facing a bunch of arclights way off in the distance. We stood patiently in the crowd staring at the lights. Obviously they were going to let the crowd in all at once. A half-hour passed. We were now hemmed in from behind. Another half-hour passed. Nothing happened.

STATIC AND APPLAUSE

We heard some static over a loudspeaker and some applause. The arclights were blinding us. Another half-hour passed. Nobody moved. Bodies were pressed tightly together. Ambassadors perspired, Congressmen muttered. More static, then more applause and then suddenly everyone turned around.

"That's it," said someone.

"What's it?" we asked.

"It's all over."

"What happened?" we asked him.

"How the hell do I know?"

"What do we do now?"

"You go home."

"Where's the President?"

"He went home too."

"But we haven't even seen the Mona Lisa."

"You can see it on television tomorrow morning at 8:30."

Our wife was heartbroken and was crying in the cloakroom.

An old experienced Washington hand tried to comfort her.

"It's all right, dear," the lady said. You'll get over it. The first function is always the worst. After a while you get used to it. What a pretty dress you're wearing."

This last remark made our wife cry even more.

## Wollaston Alloys, Inc., New Foundry in Braintree, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, January 4, 1963, it was my privilege to attend the opening day ceremonies of the opening of the Wollaston Alloys, Inc., new foundry in Braintree, Mass. I wish at this time to bring to the attention of the Members of the Congress the program and also a brief history of this growing firm which is located in my congressional district:

PROGRAM

Chairman and Mrs. Edward H. Tibbetts, President and Mrs. Richard C. Tibbetts, Vice President and Mrs. E. F. Tibbetts, Mr. Richard C. Tibbetts, Jr., Mr. Binney E. Tibbetts, Mrs. Ruth A. Lescoe, Mrs. Louise V. Meredith.

Master of ceremonies: Mr. William G. Brooks, chairman, Braintree Industrial Commission.

Invocation: Rev. Francis A. Curley, St. Elizabeth Parish.

Speakers: Congressman JAMES A. BURKE, Washington, D.C.; Capt. Gerald Duffy, USN, Inspector of Naval Material, First Naval District.

GUESTS

Mr. Matthew Cushing, South Shore National Bank.

Mr. Robert H. Fay, Quincy Savings Bank.

Mr. Arthur I. Burgess, Quincy Savings Bank.

Mr. John W. Bettes, Norfolk County Trust Co.

Mr. Elmer O. Cappers, Norfolk County Trust Co.

Mr. Peter Murphy, Massachusetts Engineering Co.

Mr. William J. Richards, Quincy Steel Casting Co.

Mr. Donald Kane, Walworth Co.

Mr. Leo Darr, Quincy Motor Co., Inc.

Mr. P. F. Williams, Boston Gas Co.

Mr. James E. Coveney.

Mr. Henry W. Bosworth, Jr., Boston Traveler.

Mr. James J. Collins, Boston Globe.

Mr. Robert Plaisted, Patriot Ledger.

Mr. Donald Wilder, Patriot Ledger.

Mr. Herbert Fontaine, Radio Station WJDA.

Mr. James D. Asher, Radio Station WJDA.

Mr. Chester W. Nelson, Braintree Observer.

Mr. Donald R. Dickinson, Braintree Tab.

Mr. John C. Donahue, Jr., Braintree Sunday News.

TOWN OF BRAINTREE

Mr. Harrison T. Smiley, chairman of board of selectmen.

Mr. Fred A. Tenney, selectman.

Mr. Joseph M. Magaldi, planning board.

Mr. Warren J. Cuff, board of assessors.

Mr. Aaron P. Whitcomb, highway department.

Mr. Daniel A. Maloney, building inspector.

Mr. Harold C. Pearl, town engineer.

Mr. Carl W. Johnson, electric light board.

Mr. Alban G. Spurrell, manager—electric light.

Mr. Carl R. Johnson, Jr., town clerk and representative.

Chief John V. Polio, chief of police.

Chief Harry T. Sears, chief of fire department.

Mr. Thomas A. Matthews, water commissioner.

Mr. Donato T. Richardi, water department.

Mr. William G. Dyer, sewerage department.

Mr. Charles R. Furlong, industrial commission.

Mr. Frederick J. Klay, industrial commission.

Mr. Calvin E. Young, industrial commission.

Mr. William B. Webber, industrial commission.

Mr. John O. Holden, industrial commission.

Mr. Richard McNealy, assessor.

WOLLASTON ALLOYS, INC.—A BRIEF HISTORY

Wollaston Alloys, Inc., formerly Wollaston Brass & Aluminum Foundry, Inc., of North Quincy, Mass., is the first industrial firm to commence production at the new Braintree Industrial Plaza located at the junction of Route 128 and the Southeast Expressway in Braintree, Mass. Coincidental with the move to its modern foundry, Wollaston Alloys has changed its name to give a more accurate picture of what it has offered for the past 36 years—a variety of alloy castings, in addition to brass and aluminum.

The move to the new plant was made in order to meet the increased demand for the company's stainless steel, copper-nickel, monel, aluminum, and bronze castings. Wollaston Alloys is a pioneer in casting copper-nickel, an alloy which is continually finding new uses in industry. Some of the company's first castings were made for Regal shoe measuring machines, but today they range from measuring devices for finger holes in bowling balls to specialized castings for the Nation's newest submarines and other nuclear applications.

The firm was founded in 1926 by Mr. Edward H. Tibbetts, who is now chairman of the board of directors. Mr. Tibbetts started the business with $1,000 capital which he borrowed on his life insurance policy. The original foundry, which still stands in North Quincy, is a 20- by 40-foot structure which Mr. Tibbetts personally erected.

In contrast to eight modern electric induction furnaces at the new foundry, which have a capacity of 500 kilowatts and are capable of melting 75,000 pounds of metal per day, Mr. Tibbetts made his first castings with metal he melted in his hand-built pit furnace.

In 1926 Wollaston Brass & Aluminum Foundry was a two-man operation, Mr. Tibbetts and one helper. Today the firm employs 65 people and expects to employ over 100 within a year from opening day at its new foundry, which was January 4, 1963.

The new foundry, although a great deal more complex than the original 20- by 40-structure, was completely designed and planned by Mr. Tibbetts and his two sons, Richard C. and Frank. Richard C. Tibbetts, now president of the firm, joined his father's business in 1935 and supervised the construction of the new plant and the installation of the equipment. Frank Tibbetts, vice president, is a graduate metallurgist from MIT and joined the company in 1950. Carrying on the father-son tradition at Wollaston Alloys is Frank's son, Binney Tibbetts, quality control manager. Richard Tibbetts, Jr., will join the firm upon his graduation from Northeastern University in June 1963.

Wollaston Alloys' new foundry is the most modern and one of the largest of its type in the country. The building is situated on Wollaston's 5-acre tract of land and has 40,000 square feet devoted to production. A pattern shop occupies 3,000 square feet, and 3,000 square feet are devoted to office space.

Modern casting equipment at the new foundry includes a new shell molding department, a mechanized green sand molding system which includes a conveyor fed sand slinger for large molds, two new automatic induction furnaces, core ovens, and new cleaning equipment. Wollaston Alloys is also installing its own cobalt source and radiographic laboratory to supplement its physical testing facilities.

## Shame in Katanga

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the

Evening News of Newburg, in my congressional district, on January 7.

I have put several similar editorials from other newspapers in the RECORD, and I am adding this to that number because I believe that we should be aware of the fact that in many parts of the country today there is great indignation over the atrocities perpetrated by the United Nations, and over the fact that they have stepped way beyond the limits of their own chatter.

Incidentally, these same people are indignant that our own country is the power behind the United Nations, which is committing these offenses:

SHAME IN KATANGA

Once again the troops of the United Nations, supported by the U.S. Government, are advancing in Katanga and once again there are misgivings in the hearts of many Americans who, like Senator THOMAS DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, feel we may be on the wrong side again.

Certainly, the conduct of the soldiers of the Central Congolese Government and the United Nations was repugnant enough in the events which ended for a time last September in further negotiations. Widespread atrocities were committed, not by the Katangans and the Belgian nationals who serve the mining industry there, but by those serving under the U.N.-Congolese aegis.

The Associated Press photograph of a Belgian civilian crawling from his compact car, leaving behind the bodies of his wife and another woman passenger, cannot be a credit to the U.N. forces. These were not combatants, any more than the missionaries, nurses, and other innocent victims of last summer's atrocities. Yet the women were shot dead in what could not have been a warlike maneuver. They were innocent victims.

The U.N. may be able to crush the Tshombe regime, but it can't conceal the fact that under Tshombe the Katangan Government has been the most civilized and responsible to date in the Congo. If the Katangans chose to keep this war going by guerilla tactics, destroying the mineral production of Katanga's mines, and leaving the U.N. with a destitute Congo and a government dependent upon U.N. troops for its authority, how can we hold up our heads again? Right now there is a sense of shame and misery which must temper the enthusiasm of our strongest supporters of the United Nations as a force for peace and right.

## A Famous Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of January 3, 1963:

A FAMOUS VICTORY

"But what good came of it at last?"
Quoth little Peterkin.
"Why that I cannot tell," said he:
"But 'twas a famous victory."

In its brief lifetime the United Nations has proved no stranger to the use of force, and it is not without victories of a sort. It seems to be winning another famous one in the Congo. Little Peterkin, however, might raise the same question he asked about the Battle of Blenheim. What good will come of it?

For this kind of force is quite different from that used in other U.N. military expeditions. Though the Korean war was largely a U.S. undertaking, it was nonetheless sanctioned by the U.N. as a means of keeping the Communists from grabbing another piece of territory, and it was at least a limited victory in that it did accomplish that objective. In other cases the U.N. has intervened in an effort to make people stop shooting at each other.

But now, in its third war against the secessionist Katanga Province of the Congo, the U.N.'s objectives are the opposite. Instead of keeping peace, it is waging war to force a people into a form of unity they do not so far find acceptable. To put it another way, the U.N. is fighting to extend the rule of the Central Congo Government over an area that doesn't want it.

In an age which pays so much lipservice to self-determination, that is a remarkable set of circumstances. No less remarkable is the fact that the United States not only condones but actively supports this policy.

We are quite aware of the "good" that is supposed to come of it. According to the official reasoning, the Central Congo Government in Léopoldville may not be able to last unless it gets hold of the income from Katanga's copper resources, though why Léopoldville's financial distress is the fault of Katanga is more than a little hard to fathom.

If the Central Government falls, the reasoning continues, then the way may be opened for all sorts of new troubles, including even a Communist victory in the Congo. Whether this would in fact happen is guess, but smashing a people's attempt at independence does seem a strange way of combating world communism, which is constantly trying to do the same thing.

In a word, it is an ugly spectacle for the United States to be supporting this U.N. war. Even more disturbing is the precedent being set for the future. With or without the Communists, the world has no lack of trouble spots, and Africa alone, with the fragmentation and political weakness of many of the new states, boasts other potential Congos.

Is the U.N. to intervene everywhere it finds a situation not to its liking for whatever reason? And is the United States in effect to give it the power to do so, regardless of all the considerations of fairness and human rights which it otherwise champions?

If so, U.N. and U.S. leadership would do well to heed the warning addressed to them by Albert Schweitzer. The medical missionary, who has spent nearly half a century in tropical Africa, said that in this war without juridical foundation they risk "losing the well-deserved respect which they enjoy in the world."

The United States has just enhanced that respect with its resolute defense of vital security interests in the Caribbean—without any help from the U.N. It is a shame to risk throwing it away on this U.N. performance in the Congo.

As for the U.N., its prestige and even future may depend on the Congo precedent. That is what the U.N. leaders themselves fear, and which is why they are so eager to finish their conquest of Katanga. But victory won at the expense of principle can hardly bring lasting good.

## The American Citizen-Soldier, 1861–65

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include the speech delivered before the National Conclave of Civil War Roundtables September 16, 1962, at Hagerstown, Md., and the reenactment of the Battle of Antietam, by Dr. Richard Nunn Lanier, executive director of the Richard Kirkland Memorial Foundation:

THE AMERICAN CITIZEN-SOLDIER, 1861–65

She stood on the top steps of her father's white columned portico and kissed her sweetheart goodbye. This beautiful girl of 15 summers, Miss Susan Evilina Kirkland, was the lovely daughter of Maj. Daniel D. Kirkland, a descendant of an old colonial family who had emigrated to Kershaw County, S.C., before the Revolution and whose ancestors had fought brilliantly at the Battle of Camden. Her sweetheart was an American citizen-soldier, likened in appearance to thousands of other American citizens who had answered the call to arms in defense of their country in 1861. This young soldier led no charge, won no thrilling victory, but the men who wore the Blue and the men who wore the Gray honor his memory because, in the midst of slaughter, he dared death to bring solace to his wounded foes. The fighting men on both sides of the lines called him "The Angel of Marye's Heights." Richard Kirkland was his name.

Gen. Ulysses S. Grant, general of all the Federal Armies and the 18th President of the United States, said to his friend John Russell Young, a few years after the war, "I would like to see truthful history written. Such history will do full credit to the courage, endurance, and ability of the American citizen-soldier—no matter what section he hailed from or in what rank."

The Civil War Centennial Committee of Fredericksburg, South Carolina, and Virginia, decided not to reenact any part of the Battle of Fredericksburg, but to present to the people of the United States and all foreign countries, the American citizen-soldier, 1861–65.

We believe we chose wisely when we selected Sgt. Richard Rowland Kirkland of Company D, 2d South Carolina Volunteers as symbolizing the ideal American citizen-soldier.

The late Judge Alvin T. Embrey in his book, "Historic Fredericksburg," summaries his account of the brave and humane deed done by Sgt. Richard Kirkland in these words:

"History will record as a sublime example of that courage and faith which do honor to the human race, and evince its possession still of that spark of Fire Celestial communicated to mankind, when in the Garden of Eden, God breathed into the nostrils of Adam the Breath of Life and he became a Living Soul."

Maj. General U.S. Grant III, grandson of "the general" and chairman of the National Civil War Centennial Committee, as an Army Engineer, supervised the building of the Arlington Memorial Bridge at Washington, D.C. This bridge symbolizing the unity of the North and the South and spans the Potomac River between the Lincoln Memorial and

Gen. Robert E. Lee's home at Arlington, General Grant III, in the National Geographic, volume 119, No. 4, April 1961, had this to say:

"Cruelty is the handmaid of war, and outrages war the records of both northern and southern soldiers, but the Civil War was also replete with instances of mutual consideration, knightly courtesy, and nobility. At Fredericksburg, Confederate Sgt. Richard Kirkland heard wounded Union soldiers calling for water. He vaulted across a stone wall with as many canteens as he could gather and relieved their suffering at the risk of his own life."

Richard Rowland Kirkland was a tall, slender youth with dark eyes and hair, gentle in nature, with pleasing manners, good English and perfect penmanship. He was also a devout Christian and learned his lesson well from the great pulpit Bible of the Flat Rock Baptist Church in Kershaw County, S.C. This Bible was bought in 1833 and from it he would read in the quiet of a summer's evening that "It is more blessed to give than to receive," "Greater love hath no man than he lay down his life for another," and "If thine enemy thirst, give him drink." This great Bible is now a part of the Richard Kirkland collection, as is also his rifle and other interesting relics belonging to this American soldier and are to be found in the Lancaster (S.C.) Museum in Kershaw County.

When the great Battle of Fredericksburg was fought December 13–14, 1862, Dick Kirkland had been with Lee's army from 1861 when he went with Kershaw's brigade through the Seven Days Battle before Richmond, Second Manassas, Harpers Ferry, and Antietam. He was a seasoned soldier, but had never become hardened to the cruelties of war.

Today, I give you a poem written by Walter A. Clark of Augusta, Ga., one of Cobb's men who fought by the side of Sergeant Kirkland in that great trench behind the stone wall on the sunken road, at Fredericksburg. I wish to dedicate this poem to the gallant men in blue and the brave men in gray who, that day, gave their lives for their country—locked in deadly combat 100 years ago:

"THE ANGEL OF MARYE'S HEIGHTS

"(By Walter A. Clarke, of Georgia)

"A sunken road and a wall of stone
And Cobb's grim line of gray
Lay still at the base of Marye's Heights
On the morn of a winter's day.

On the plains below, the blue lines glow,
And the bugle rings out clear.
As with bated breath they march to death
And a soldier's honored bier.

And then from out of the battle smoke
There falls on the lead-swept air.
From the whitening lips that are ready to die
The piteous moan and the plaintive cry
For 'water'—everywhere.

And into the presence of Kershaw brave
There comes a fair-faced lad,
With quivering lips,
As his cap he tips,
'I can't stand this sir,' he said.

'Stand what?' the general sternly said,
As he looked on the field of slaughter;
"To see those poor boys dying out there,
With no one to help them, no one to care
And crying for "water! water!"'

'If you'll let me go, I'll give them some.'
'Why boy, you're simply mad;
They'll kill you as soon as you scale the wall
In this terrible storm of shell and ball,'
The general kindly said.

'Please let me go,' the lad replied;
'May the Lord protect you, then,'
And over the wall in the hissing air
He carried comfort to grim despair,
And balm to the stricken men.

Like Daniel of old in the Lion's den
He walked through the murderous air,
With never a breath of the leaden storm
To touch or to tear his gray-clad form,
For the hand of God was there.

And I am sure in the Book of Gold
Where the blessed Angel writes,
The names that are blest of God and men,
He wrote that day with his shining pen,
Then smiled and lovingly wrote again:
'The Angel of Marye's Heights.'"

Little remains to be told. After the battle and in the winter of 1863 Kirkland was furloughed home by General Lee to recruit more men for the harvest of war. It was at this time when he was returning to the Army of Northern Virginia at Fredericksburg that he kissed his sweetheart goodbye. The lovely Susan was never to see her hero again.

He was with Lee and Jackson at Chancellorsville. Then Gettysburg. Here, again, he distinguished himself in battle. For this act, beyond the call of duty, he was promoted to first lieutenant.

He was with Longstreet at Chickamaugua in September 1863. Here, in the hour of victory, he fell mortally wounded. He gave his life to save his comrades for in the last few moments of mortal life his thoughts and words as ever were for the safety of his comrades: "Save yourselves men, let me be. I am done for. Tell my Pa I died right."

In the Episcopal Church, the Prince of Peace, at Gettysburg, Pa., erected in 1880 as a thank offering and a memorial to our reunited country following the War Between the States, there is appropriately inscribed on a white marble tablet on the north wall of the front northex, this tribute to an American soldier who wore the gray:

"Lt. Richard Rowland Kirkland, Company E, Reg. 2, South Carolina Volunteers, a hero of benevolence; at the risk of life, he gave his enemy drink, at Fredericksburg."

In Camden, S.C., a massive boulder, given by the Kershaw County United Daughters of the Confederacy, marks the last bivouac of Richard Kirkland, American Citizen Soldier. His earthly remains rest in the old Quaker Cemetery, near the graves of his beloved leaders, Maj. Gen. Joseph Benjamin Kershaw and Brig. Gen. John D. Kennedy. And there Richard Kirkland sleeps. His name unknown to most of his countrymen of the North and the South, to whom for a few hours on a long past December afternoon he demonstrated what it was like to be "an American."

General of the Army Douglas MacArthur wrote: "I am deeply moved by the story of Sgt. Richard Kirkland. As a soldier myself it is a gratification to do honor to another."

Alexander Bielaski, of Springfield, Ill., close friend and adviser to Abraham Lincoln, was trained in the War College of the Czars. He was in the Federal Cavalry from Illinois and on Grant's staff. He was great-grandfather of Mrs. Angelique Bielaski whose message to the youth of America follows:

"Richard Kirkland's heroism at Marye's Heights, when he risked his life to carry canteens of water to the Federals, brought cheers from the men on both sides of the wall, and he was acclaimed the "Angel of Marye's Heights."

"Our youth of today badly need heroes to emulate—daily headlines are not conducive to inspire them with the patriotism of George Washington or Patrick Henry or Robert E. Lee. They read of corruption in places, politicians whose corrupt practices fill them with disgust, clergymen who have disavowed the old principles of their faith and by their irreverent conduct have given aid and comfort to the Communists who are hopeful that the anti-Christ doctrine which they so fervently espouse is making progress—Is it any wonder that youth is confused?

"It is important that the monument which will be erected at Marye's Heights be an impressive one—one that will evoke the praise of the thousands of visitors, who, each year are attracted to the places of historic interest in Fredericksburg."

Mrs. Robert Bachman, president general of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, writes:

"I do not know when I have been so deeply touched by anything * * *. This is the kind of commemoration of such acts of valor that will bring our Nation together * * *. Thanking you, and wishing you a thrilling dedication of a most courageous deed * * *."

The memorial to Sergeant Kirkland will be completed and dedicated in the spring of 1964, on the battlefield in front of the stone wall where he performed his brave deed of mercy. Those wishing to help in the erection of this memorial to an American soldier may send their building stones to the Richard Kirkland Memorial, care of Postmaster, Fredericksburg, Va.

---

## Numerical Composition of the Rules Committee

SPEECH
OF
## HON. ALBERT W. WATSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 9, 1963*

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, despite the admonitions of some that a freshman Congressman should be seen and not heard, I am compelled to speak out on this vitally important matter. We are not debating a temporary change of the numerical composition of the Rules Committee as was done during the last Congress, but what is done today will result in a permanent change in the organization of this important committee.

As the distinguished gentlemen from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] has so eloquently said, this proposed change in the rules is not designed to give a broader representation on the committee so that bills might be more carefully considered, but the move appears to be prompted to suit the purpose of the moment. Very well a movement so motivated to serve the hour could rise up to haunt this august body in the years ahead as we strive to save our country from bankruptcy and prevent further usurpation of our individual freedoms.

It is passing strange that the sage advice of Judge SMITH, the wise and experienced chairman of the Rules Committee, could be so blindly ignored in reaching a decision on the issue. I wholeheartedly concur in his remarks, and if in taking this position I am labeled as a southern Democrat or a conservative, I shall accept the label and be proud of the name.

In conclusion, may I say that in my humble opinion the effort being made today to pack the Rules Committee will ultimately destroy the effectiveness of this committee in determining the orderly consideration of legislation by this body. As I have said before, rather than attempt to pass a measure by manipulating the membership of a committee, may I respectfully suggest that the authors of this resolution attempt to have their legislation conform to the majority wishes of the Rules Committee and the House of Representatives.

## Independence Day of Sudan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. ADAM C. POWELL**
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 1, the Republic of Sudan celebrated the seventh anniversary of her independence, and we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President of the Supreme Council for the Armed Forces, Ibrahim Abboud; and His Excellency, the Sudanese Ambassador to the United States, Dr. Osman al-Hadari, on the occasion of the anniversary of Sudan's independence.

Seven years have elapsed since the Sudan was declared independent, years of continued progress that have made the Sudan a nation to consider, to applaud. From the time of its independence ceremonies on January 1, 1956, the Sudan has achieved a unique position of self-reliance, rapid economic transformation, and political stability. It is with great pleasure that we in America extend greetings to honor the Sudan's independence anniversary.

On Independence Day, 57 years of Anglo-Egyptian rule came to an end. Colonialism had been imposed upon a proud people. Several attempts to overthrow the oppressive yoke had ended in failure. But through perseverance and peaceful constitutional means, colonial rule was at last expelled.

Seven years of economic development have been the greatest achievement of the Sudan as an independent nation. During those short years, over 4,000 acres of irrigated cotton was added; 750 miles of rail track now binds the far-reaching corners of the nation to its capital and port city; electrification of hydraulic plants promoted industrial expansion; and healthy foreign trade was realized, with cotton being the prime motivator in most transactions. These are milestones in the economic development of a new nation.

As a new nation, it has and will continue to suffer setbacks. Because of political ineffectuality and dismemberment, a bloodless coup overthrew the old regime and established a ruling junta, generally supported and praised, though, by all save the Communists.

While dissimilarities of culture, religion, and race between the north and south have brought about eruptive disorder, the Sudanese Government is determined to obliterate the differences between these sections of the country so that the entire nation may progress in harmony and unity.

I salute these achievements and hopes of the Sudan. I am certain that the next 7 years will bring even greater advancement. We hope that in the forthcoming years the Sudan will set an example for the world community to emulate. We are proud to claim the Sudan as a friend and to share with the Sudanese people the celebration of their independence anniversary.

## Brooklyn Women on the Frontier of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH**
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Mr. Andrew S. Roscoe, president of the Equitable Savings & Loan Association, at the Brooklyn Young Women's Christian Association campaign dinner on Thursday, November 1, 1962:

BROOKLYN WOMEN ON THE FRONTIER OF FREEDOM

Madam Chairman, Madam President, distinguished members of the board of directors, board of trustees, and the campaign committee, my ladies, I feel highly complimented by the invitation of your gracious cochairman, Mrs. J. Victor Herd, to enjoy this nice visit with you, and I am thankful to Mrs. R. Whitney Gosnell, president, and Mrs. Ernest Tutino, campaign chairman, for their hospitality. But I warn you that when I get up steam, I am like the preacher who announces the theme of his sermon, then goes off on a tangent and speaks about everything else. My topic is "Brooklyn Women on the Frontier of Freedom," and I approach my assignment in the spirit of gratitude that all of you so well merit.

Gratitude is the greatest of all commandments; gratitude to you and gratitude to the splendid Young Women's Christian Association.

Let me, please, at this point record my appreciation to Mrs. Herd who, accompanied by Miss Kintner, so kindly briefed me on the history, program, and manifold accomplishments of the YWCA. I learned that I am meeting with you tonight after 74 years of glorious service by the Y to our young women—after 74 years of rich life. But life is a quality, not a quantity, and it cannot be measured entirely by clock or calendar. Time is but a system through which we measure the passing of the future, through the present, into the past. For there are organizations, whose value is such that to measure them by clock or calendar, might be trivial and meaningless. Their power is such that we cannot tell how long they will last or have lasted, for they give inspiration and direction to their whole generation and community and will always stand out as a source of strength and hope for posterity. Certainly, the YWCA stands out front as one of these organizations. The YWCA was founded 74 years ago and there must be many here in Brooklyn who recall with great reverence and appreciation what their grandmothers achieved two generations ago. They may not have occupied a seat next to their husbands on the covered wagon but they were pioneers in the very sense of the word. They builded well, these pioneers.

As we approach our greater community, not for alms or charity, but for continued support, broader support, and increased support of the program of the "Y," we can say that a contribution to the YWCA is a great American investment. The program was developed during the past three-quarters of a century by the very best brains of a dedicated leadership. It consists of varied services directed to the preservation and the enhancement of the position of our American women in whose hands, I say, lies the fulfillment of America's hopes.

Your program, in offering residences to young women without family ties in our greater community, represents immense moral, social, and economic benefits for these young people. Your clubs and affiliated services, providing a congenial and dignified annex to that home lacking such facilities, serve as an encouragement and a source of hope for a better life. A home away from home is a typical American institution.

Your program of health education, personnel counseling, and food services, attests to the ingenuity of your planners because from a practical point of view in this and other areas, women are at a disadvantage, the 19th amendment notwithstanding. Your participation in that great Robin Hood camp, is exposing many of our young ladies to the beauties of mother nature of which our women are a conspicuous part.

Your school of practical nursing—this phase of your service is a heartwarming subject with me. I recall, rather vividly, that after Pearl Harbor, one of my responsibilities as a member of the nurse recruitment group of the American Red Cross obligated me to enlist all the registered nurses we could to join the Armed Forces, because at one point we had only one nurse for hundreds of servicemen in the Pacific theater. The practical nurses were there to fill the great vacuum left on the homefront. They are sorely needed today. Your school of practical nursing is "another jewel" in the crown of your attainments.

I could devote many hours to the analysis of your manifold services and to an interpretation of the impact of these services on our community at the present time, and on the future of Brooklyn. However, father time must be respected.

I said that the founders of the YWCA planned a great effort. Your distinguished officers and all those who labored for this great organization ought to be remembered and congratulated. Your dedication and devotion to the YWCA has earned the gratitude of the community and of America. You have built, and are building, a foundation with ever-increasing strength under the status of our American women, and, the future of America lies in their hands. We are very fortunate, and we are very grateful, for that 19th amendment to our Constitution because it assured America and the world that our human society can be preserved in a form consistent with the will of God and for the benefit of mankind.

I could devote much time to a discussion of the immense contribution that our American women have made to our economy, to our political pattern, and to our social structure. Their integrity, ingenuity, resourcefulness, and effectiveness, are unquestioned.

We select a few people, vest them with coercive power, and depending upon the area, we call them government, corporate management, or a board of a social welfare organization. The question on the ethical side is, what is the moral basis for their power and their authority? The answer is, obviously, general welfare, community welfare, and if we extend this philosophy to the "Y," your very presence here indicates that you have accepted a responsibility in this field of social action, and that you are blessed with that high degree of morality upon which our American women have always had, and always will have, an A–1 priority.

You are seeking the modest sum of $90,000 to service 5,000 young women. It is indeed a modest sum considering this great frontier town of ours, which for three centuries has welcomed more new citizens to our shores than any other community. These groups include men and women, young and old—requiring social services, the provision of which, at times, exacts superhuman effort. But our $90,000 is a small sum for the values created through the molding and the development of American womanhood, the firmest pillar of our great Republic.

Forty-some-odd years ago, I heard a story from one of my fellow seamen. On one of the islands of the seven seas, there was carved, by Nature, on the side of a coral hill, the head of a woman. Under certain atmospheric conditions, prior to a storm, when the sun's rays were reflected upon this object which otherwise was enshadowed, brilliant roses appeared around that head. This beautiful phenomenon was a warning signal to youngsters on the beach to seek shelter in anticipation of destructive tidal waves. The natives called this great work of Nature, the Goddess of the Roses.

You and I know that in this troubled world, we view the horizon many times with anxiety, particularly on ethical and moral issues. It is simply wonderful as I look around here to see dedicated women, each of whom has much in common with that Goddess of the Roses. I know that with your effort, fully aware of the warning signals, you will continue to provide the kind of support that the "Y" and your leadership merits, preserving for this community, and the Nation, the status of the American women, the greatest ideal on our frontier of freedom.

## Truth-in-Lending Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill designed to accelerate the stabilization of the Nation's economy by assuring equitable relationships that will result from the full disclosure of financing costs in connection with extensions of credit. In recent years an increasing number of complaints of widespread extortion, arising from presently accepted business practices, has been disclosed by witnesses before congressional committees, revealed in reports of the public press and related by individuals personally victimized by the flourishing credit racket. An abundance of relevant testimony, clearly establishing the viciousness of the system, has been recounted by witnesses before the House District Committee and the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

I, therefore, have presented the bill both to stabilize the economy and to promote individual justice. I am deeply concerned over the fact that from both the quantity of substantial evidence presented to committees and secured through personal sources it is conclusively indicated that countless Negroes have been robbed and cheated by unscrupulous business people who willfully exact exorbitant interest through subtle means unrevealed to them. As a consequence of such practices the full cost of articles to the trusting purchaser is withheld while the seller is realizing profits as great as 100 percent or more. Moreover, through such criminal practices there are thousands of well-known instances pointing out that it is a common policy of dishonest sellers to resell the same articles several times over with the identical built-in interest charges to other unsuspecting Negroes further compounding, thereby, big profits for such businessmen. And, the sum total of the tragedy of this unconscionable condition has been that consumers who have suffered most are those in the lowest economic group and, thus, least able to pay.

Full disclosure of financing costs incident to consumer credit could prevent or at least restrain abuses of the helpless imposed as is now the case through the concealment of true rates, the manipulation of charges by the use of fees, and the failure to rebate amounts taken in advance. These considerations, Mr. Speaker, are so compelling that I have presented this legislation and am now appealing to the leadership to join me in its passage.

## The Brotherhood of Free Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following "Greeting to Our Christian Neighbors," which appeared in the December 24, 1962, edition of the Washington Post.

Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld here gives the response of the Jewish community to the expressions of spiritual brotherhood given them by their Christian neighbors. The unity of Christian and Jew as Americans is one of the finest expressions of a free society.

The holiday season has passed, but brotherhood in freedom remains.

Rabbi Gerstenfeld's greetings follow:

A GREETING TO OUR CHRISTIAN NEIGHBORS

On the eve of the high holydays of the faith of Israel many faithful Christians have tendered to me some profound expression of their spiritual comradeship. In the same spirit I now extend to the devout Christians of our city these prayerful greetings.

This week the children of the faith of Israel celebrate Hanukkah, the festival of light, to remember the heroism of the Maccabees, who, more than 2,000 years ago, fought for religious liberty against Hellenist tyranny. It was their struggle against the forces of cruel darkness that made it possible for our sages to keep burning the flame of our ancient faith on the altar of Israel. It was the torch raised high by these stalwart Maccabees of ages past that blazed the trail of light for the coming of Christianity. If not for their spiritual strength and sacrificial struggle and rededication, as they faced the forces of religious decadence within and intolerance without, the vision of the democratic state of freemen would never have been born.

As you gather this Christmas Day to turn your souls in prayer before the altar of Almighty God our hearts are joined with yours in the quest for peace on earth for men of good will; and our lives are reconsecrated with the fellow citizens of this blessed land in the will for the good that makes possible a world of good will. We pray for God's blessing to the Christian churches of our community and to all of the Christian faith everywhere; who have faced the oppressor without appeasement; who have befriended the innocent from mankind's malevolence; who have truly shared the world's sorrow and who have been the living witness of our common faith: "To do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God."

May our prayers unite us, Christian and Jew, in this festival season of light, so that we will stand together, as free citizens of this good land, the hope of the world, to raise high a sacred torch to dispel the darkness. Now that God in His wisdom has swept mankind into the orbit of a tiny community, so that even the blind can see that all men on the face of the earth are neighbors, we pray that He shall give us the strength to rise to a great covenant of righteousness; so that the individual man everywhere shall have his divinely endowed, inalienable rights, guarded by neighbors who will live as brothers.

Rabbi NORMAN GERSTENFELD,
*Minister of the Washington Hebrew Congregation.*

## Congressman Philbin's Unique Tribute to Speaker John W. McCormack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, last Monday, January 8, 1963, in the House Democratic caucus held here, it was the privilege of the Members on this side to hear the distinguished gentleman from the Third Massachusetts Congressional District, Mr. PHILBIN, deliver one of the most eloquent addresses and tributes ever uttered on such occasion when he nominated, for the continuing speakership of this House, our beloved and revered colleague from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK. Of course, the nomination was unanimously approved and that afternoon we wisely and formally reelected Speaker MCCORMACK.

All of us agree with and share in the sentiments so ably expressed by Congressman PHILBIN as he summarily traced the patriotic public service of our great Speaker and reviewed the remarkable talents of his brilliant mind and courageous heart, which have endeared him to all who have ever served with him and which assure that the name of Speaker MCCORMACK will be, forever, an inspiring byword in the legislative history of this Nation.

A great many Members, on both sides of the aisle here, asked me to intercede with my very dear and esteemed friend and colleague from the Third Massachusetts District for the purpose of having his eloquent address included in the permanent record. He graciously consented to permit me to introduce it into the RECORD and Congressman PHILBIN'S nominating speech follows:

CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN'S SPEECH NOMINATING SPEAKER MCCORMACK

Mr. Chairman and members of the caucus, I have a very delightful duty to perform this

morning and it comes to me as a very great honor and privilege indeed.

Our dear and highly esteemed and illustrious friend, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, is one of the greatest Americans who has ever served in the Congress.

He enjoys the highest respect and warmest affection of each and every one of us.

He enjoys the confidence, esteem, and respect of the American people, indeed of the people of the world. To talk of his magnificent qualities and accomplishments seems almost like carrying coals to New Castle.

His service in the House, as we well know, can be measured only in superlative terms. During the time he has been here he has served his district, State, party, and country with a great ability, fidelity to duty, and humanitarian impulse that certainly has never been exceeded in the history of this great Government.

I hardly need, before this distinguished group, comprised of so many warm friends, admirers and supporters, to recount the prolific abundance of natural gifts, talents, characteristics and services that have distinguished the inspiring career of this great American from the colorful and patriotic community of South Boston in my home State of Massachusetts, as he forged his way from the humble precincts of his historic city to the third highest position of trust, honor, and responsibility in the great Government of the United States.

Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK is admittedly endowed with all the attributes of personality, character, leadership, and capacity that make for greatness.

Time and time again, in and out of this great body, the renowned House of Representatives, the greatest deliberative body of its kind in the world, he has demonstrated his true worth as an unsurpassed public servant.

A fearless, articulate, and inspiring leader, a gifted and effective debater, a respected and admired political strategist, a skilled diagnostician of the public will, a truly great heart and great mind, devoted to lofty concepts and objectives of statesmanship, JOHN MCCORMACK is commended and beloved by all of us.

A patriot of the top-most rank, a lawyer and counselor of recognized skill and experience, an eminent parliamentarian, known everywhere for his knowledge, fairness and impartiality, and, above all, a man whose vigorous, determined work in promoting the well-being and welfare of the great rank and file of the American people, the oppressed, the lowly, the exploited, the helpless and inarticulate, wherever they may be, has known no bounds.

Born with a great fighting heart and a buoyant spirit of uplift and regeneration, JOHN MCCORMACK has always been in the vanguard of forward-looking leadership, philosophically, politically, socially, economically, spiritually, and in every other way.

Resolutely committed to the doctrine that our political and parliamentary institutions are valid instruments for promoting the liberty, stability and progress of the Nation, no man has ever labored more ably, diligently, and effectively to further the general well-being of the Nation, protect the rights of those who struggle and toil under our free enterprise system and enlarge and elevate the advantages and opportunities of the American people.

To succeed our late, lamented, dear friend and memorable leader, that great statesman and ever to be esteemed and remembered former Speaker, the great Sam Rayburn, was indeed a task of monumental proportions.

Yet, in a comparatively short time of JOHN MCCORMACK'S noteworthy service as Speaker, our membership, the Nation, and the world recognize the mettle and the high worthiness of the present great Speaker of the House.

In his characteristic way of deep humility, devout dedication to principle and conviction, Speaker MCCORMACK has been something more than the leader of this body. He has been our warm friend, our ready counsellor, our unselfish guide and adviser, our constant sustaining strength.

Confidant and adviser of our Presidents since the 1930's, he has labored with vigor, loyalty, and marked success to implement the legislative program of our cherished former colleague and great President and friend, John F. Kennedy.

As we know, he can be trusted and relied upon to carry out these great tasks of leadership in this session of Congress and in the time to come.

And as in the past, he will carry them out with dispatch, efficiency and a great driving force of sagacious statesmanship that will make for success and victory for the great cause we represent.

To touch a personal note, JOHN MCCORMACK has been my friend since before I came to this body. Just as many of you, I have seen and known him at close range. He is a great man, a great leader, a great American, a great Speaker, and he is a true and loyal friend.

We as Members of the House and the people of the Nation are fortunate indeed, especially in this time of uncertainty and peril, when surging movements of conspiracy and unrest are assailing the pillars of free government throughout the world, as well as in our own Nation, and when we must unite as we will, in an invincible, resolute force against these evils and dangers, to have a truly outstanding, well-poised, experienced, humane leader like JOHN MCCORMACK to guide and counsel us and to join so wholeheatedly with our beloved and esteemed friend, our great President Kennedy, in preserving, protecting, and strengthening the rich heritage of our freedom and seeking peace, understanding, and amity for the world.

Man of deep faith and high destiny, man of profound spiritual beliefs and trust in his Divine Maker, who proudly bears the shield of justice and fair dealing and carries in his big heart an inspirational love of country and humanity, sprung from the people and devoted to their welfare, a true, dedicated, demonstrated believer in the American way of life, a great credit to our great party, the House of Representatives, the Congress, and our Nation, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK is destined to go down in history as one of the greatest statesmen and leaders of the Nation.

The reelection of Speaker MCCORMACK is a foregone conclusion. But I want to say to my valued colleagues that Massachusetts is very proud of our great native son, the distinguished Speaker of the House.

It is with great pride and pleasure that I place in nomination in the Democratic caucus for Speaker of the House the name of our great, esteemed, and beloved friend, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

## A Salute to Homer Capehart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, as this 88th Congress gets underway, we find on both sides of the Hill that many familiar faces are missing. We in the Indiana delegation particularly will miss Homer E. Capehart, who has represented the Hoosier State in the Senate for the past 18 years. He is, incidentally, the only man from Indiana ever to be elected to three full terms in the Senate.

As we all know, Homer's bid for a fourth term was a little short of being successful—and in this business there is no prize for second place. But our country today is a better place because Homer served here so long and well.

We wish Homer many years of health to enjoy the prize he has already won—the love and respect of so many, many Hoosiers which is reflected in this editorial from the Martinsville Daily Reporter of November 9, 1962:

HOMER ENTITLED TO RESPECT

In defeat, as in victory, Homer Capehart is the same man, entitled to respect.

By his own effort, without benefit of higher education or inherited wealth, he became a powerful man. Powerful, and respected because of his ability and his integrity.

He is an unashamed admirer of the "American system" which has made the United States the land of opportunity for those willing to work.

People either work for the Government or they work in private enterprise. "It is that simple," he has said. He held to the sound idea that it is better to encourage private business than to add to the Government payroll.

Even his friends and intimates in his party have had quiet fun at some of the Senator's little boo-boos. Once, in reading a speech someone had written for him, Homer is reported to have mispronounced "naive" as "nave." A former Indiana Governor, according to report, audibly corrected him, to the amusement of many.

These minor slips, which all must make occasionally, did not detract from, but rather added to, his personality. The old boy was not always right, but he has too much native good sense to be wrong most of the time. He is the salesman type, not a timeclock puncher. We choose to believe he was always thinking, striving to find answers to questions that have no apparent answer, as the farm problem.

The figure of Dempsey, the greatest of the heavyweights of our time, comes to mind. Fast footwork by his opponent and the inroads of time toppled Dempsey, as they did Homer. But honor remains.

Still of championship frame, Capehart is a symbol of individual effort, which our country must never lose if she is to progress.

"I want to retain that form of government under which the farm boy of today becomes the farmowner of tomorrow; under which the worker of today becomes the successful businessman of tomorrow; under which any citizen is free to become a leader in civil affairs, business, or government."

At the time of its greatest weakness, Capehart, originally a Democrat, rallied the forces of private enterprise and individual freedom as represented by the Republican Party, with his famous "cornfield conference."

So the party owes a lot to Capehart. Maybe all citizens, whether they acknowledge it or not, also owe him something. At the very least, respect.

In the Army, when a Regular retires, he is honored with an appropriate ceremony.

As a solid, loyal soldier of the Republic, Homer Capehart, on his retirement, is entitled to the true honor accorded those who have given loyal, faithful service to their country.

So, a salute to Homer Capehart.

## Problems of the Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable sadness that I announce to the House of Representatives that the problems of the textile industry have not been solved. I had hoped that we could make such progress on the seven-point program of President Kennedy that I could on this, the second day of Congress, make a statement that our problems were on the way to solution.

We have made progress, and we have every hope of progress in the future; meanwhile, the situation steadily degenerates from bad to worse, and, if not corrected, I fear, to desperate.

Typical, and exemplary, of conditions that are existing, and the abuses the Japanese textile people are making of our largess, and the Geneva agreements, is the plight of the narrow fabrics industry. Many of the plants which have employed good, red-blooded Americans, have had to go out of business and others are being threatened. A plant in my district is being threatened, if not with extinction, with such changes or curtailment that many people will be out of work. This is not in keeping with the American democratic idea of full employment, and if this is the result of our foreign policies, or trade policies of the United States, then these policies should be changed.

A chronology of what is happening has been brilliantly cataloged by Mr. Arthur R. Hutchinson, president of J. Sullivan & Sons Manufacturing Corp., part of whose operations are located in my district. I include that letter as part of my remarks and I commend this to the thinking of my colleagues in the House of Representatives and to the American people, neither of whom, I am sure, wish for conditions such as this to exist within the textile industry or any other because of harmful promises, policies or agreements made by or on the part of our own governmental bureaus. These policies have been in existence too many debilitating years now, and need quick and sure revision.

The letter is as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO ANY INTERESTED PARTY

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
*November 28, 1962.*

Re importation of Japanese component parts of zippers, zipper tape, and zipper chain.

Our companies, J. Sullivan & Sons Manufacturing Corp., of Philadelphia, Pa., founded in 1853, and our affiliate Sullivan-Southern, Inc., of York S.C., incorporated in 1949, are the largest producers in America of sales tape for the slide fastener or zipper industry.

Since early in 1961 we have been in constant touch with the excess imports of Japanese zipper tape and recently to the start of the importation of Japanese zipper chain.

The U.S. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Wednesday, January 24, 1962, No. 9, on pages 715 to 727, carried a portion of our fight against this increasing menace to our industry.

My letter to Congressman ROBERT W. HEMPHILL, of South Carolina, dated October 7, 1961, was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in full.

I quote from this letter as follows: "In my opinion the increased voluntary quota of Japan, standing at 900,000 pounds in 1961, represents approximately 30 percent of all the zipper tape that all of the narrow fabric manufacturers made in 1960, which explains the reason why prices are becoming depressed and unemployment in the zipper tape portion of the narrow fabric industry is increasing.

"At the present time Sullivan-Southern, Inc., in York, S.C., has not fully felt the impact of these imports, and inasmuch as they have not, neither have our employees in Philadelphia, but if the voluntary quota of 300,000 pounds in 1961, which was voluntarily increased to 900,000 pounds, is further increased or not decreased back to where it was, I feel sure that come 1962 our companies will certainly have to curtail production both in Pennsylvania and South Carolina."

Well, this has happened. Three months ago we reduced production by curtailing the number of hours worked daily. On October 1 we further curtailed our production by full days off for many employees. We now plan further cuts in production starting December 3.

This curtailment in working hours is made in the face of statistics given us by our customers, the zipper industry, that sales of zippers have materially increased during 1962 over 1961, which gives our industry the answer—increased Japanese imports.

Other facts given and statements made in my letter to Congressman HEMPHILL have not changed since that date. A manufacturer of zipper tapes in North Carolina shut down as reported, and has, for the past year, been producing narrow fabrics other than zipper tape.

Another narrow fabric manufacturer has, I believe, found it more advantageous to purchase Japanese woven zipper tape for resale than to produce it in America as they have done in the past. Employees of this company are now looking for work.

In a letter writter to our accountants on January 5, 1961, I quote, "We have a customer who purchases over $750,000 worth of zipper tape per year at approximately $10.50 per thousand yards average. A better grade we manufacture sells for $12 per thousand yards. He has been offered a tape as good as, or better than our best, at $7.02 per thousand yards delivered in New York, all charges and duty paid. I suppose this customer will be the next one of ours to defect."

Well, he has, in an effort to compete with his competitors who import both Japanese zipper tape and Japanese zipper chain.

Furthermore, our price of approximately $10.50 per thousand yards is now approximately $9.35 per thousand yards and we, of course, cannot compete with the Japanese quotations. Neither yarns, dyeing, nor labor has decreased for us nor have we been given any Government subsidy. This customer does not want to purchase Japanese tape but has been forced to in order to compete in the New York market.

The Japanese manufacturers have various ways and means of flooding our market with their products:

No. 1. They ship in to zipper manufacturers or chain manufacturers dyed flat zipper tape.

No. 2. They ship in to zipper manufacturers or chain manufacturers dyed zipper tape on which two cords have either been woven or sewed.

No. 3. They ship in to zipper manufacturers, chain manufacturers, or narrow fabric manufacturers flat tape or beaded tape in unbleached skeins, ready for dyeing.

No. 4. They ship in to zipper manufacturers or assemblers dyed zipper tape to which the metal element has been attached to the beaded tape.

As to No. 1: Zipper tape is, in our opinion, a component part of a zipper. In fact it is one of the most important component parts and when dyed flat zipper tape is imported with a 17½-percent duty it hurts the narrow fabric industry and the dye houses that would ordinarily dye this item in America.

As to No. 2: Dyed corded zipper tape, also in our opinion a component part of a zipper, is also imported with a 17½-percent duty and hurts the narrow fabric industry, the dye industry, the thread and bobbin industry, the cord industry, and the zipper or chain industry that previously sewed this cord on in America.

As to No. 3: Unbleached zipper tape either flat or beaded is imported in skeins, again at 17½-percent duty. This importation does not hurt our dye industry but certainly hurts the narrow fabric industry, if flat tape, and the zipper and chain industry, as well as the cord, thread, and bobbin industry, if it is a beaded tape.

As to No. 4: Dyed corded zipper tape made up into continuous or gap chain all ready to make into zippers with a duty of only 19 percent, it not being considered a component part of a zipper, although you and I could, within a few seconds, make a zipper from it with a top and bottom stop, a slider, and a small hammer.

Zippers are duty assessed at a rate between 40 and 50 percent. Component parts are supposed to be assessed at 50 percent.

However, tape, cord, thread, bobbins, and chain are not considered by the customs department as component parts of zippers, which we in our industry feel they are.

Up until a few months ago the zipper industry and the chain industry were not too much exercised about the plight of the zipper tape division of the narrow fabric industry.

Under date of December 5, 1961, the New York Daily News Record carried this headline "Slide Fastener Producers See Sales Zipping Along" and in the article "Although there has been much talk about slide fastener imports, particularly in the new nylon tape, most U.S. manufacturers are not unduly concerned. These U.S. producers feel that the quality and service they can deliver will more than offset any price advantage expected to be gained by a foreign producer. Moreover, they enjoy a sturdy tariff protection of 50–60 percent ad valorem."

Now that chain is coming into America by the thousands of pounds and hundreds of thousands of yards at a duty of only 19 percent, I wonder what will be the report this December in regard to the sturdy tariff protection of 50–60 percent they enjoyed a year ago. I feel that there is available the protection the narrow fabric industry, the chain industry and the zipper industry need in our custom's regulations. What we all need is an enforcement of its provisions.

The reported increase in the business of the zipper manufacturers during 1962 has been opposite to trend in the zipper tape division of the narrow fabric industry, where production has been curtailed because of Japanese imports and will have to be further curtailed because of the importation of zipper chain.

Quotes from Daily News Record of November 20, 1962: "Spinners have expressed disappointment in the weaving season. Weavers have not come through with the yarn business as was expected. They continue buying close to the vest, and the outlook for any improvement in this situation is dim" and "American cotton textile mills are in the most competitive industry in the Nation but still they cannot successfully compete with imports."

I feel that there are three ways to solve our problems and the problems of the narrow fabric industry, which in turn will help the zipper industry, the chain industry, the thread and bobbin industry, the cord indus-

try and the dye industry and furthermore help the cotton yarn industry in America, who up to the present time do not realize how badly they have been hurt but who I am sure must know that recently a cord manufacturer threw in the sponge.

1. By the proper application of the duty on all zippers and component parts, as already in the books.

2. By the enforcement by the Federal Trade Commission of their rules and regulations as to the proper marking of imported tape and chain.

3. By the adjustments of quotas as being worked on by the State Department with the cooperation of the Commerce Department.

In 1961, when we started to bring the Japanese tape situation before the eyes of our suppliers, our customers and our competitors, I stated that our company was running full and was not hurting but that some of our competitors had gotten out and others are hurting. Now, we are starting to hurt and we find as a result—

1. Decreased yarn purchases.
2. Decreased cord purchases or production.
3. Decreased commission dyeing.
4. Elimination of premium wages.
5. Curtailment of work week.
6. Many other curtailments in cash outlays.
7. Depressed selling prices.

We cannot compete with a tape manufacturer who gets his cotton with a subsidy, has his yarn made with 25-cent-per-our labor and follows through all weaving, warping, winding, dyeing, and finishing operations with substandard wage rates, even though our equipment is just about the newest and best equipment available in the world.

Respectfully submitted.

J. SULLIVAN & SONS MANUFACTURING CO.,
ARTHUR R. HUTCHINSON,
*President.*

## Alabama's Economy Hits New Peaks in 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the year just ended was a good year for business all over this country. We in Alabama's economy is a healthy growity of the Nation and in so doing reached new heights of economic growth and advancement.

Alabama's economy is a healthy growing one, and all of us are hopeful that in 1963 there will be further advances. In addition to this we will all be working to eliminate the pockets of poverty and unemployment through improvements in the structure of the economy.

I think all of the members of the House will be interested in the article by Irving Beiman which appeared in the January 6 edition of the Birmingham News, which I insert herewith in the RECORD:

STATE'S ECONOMY HITS NEW PEAK IN 1962

(By Irving Beiman)

Business in general reached an alltime high point in Alabama during 1962.

Figures from the U.S. Department of Commerce showed the State's economy made important gains in many fields during the past year.

For example, deposits in 238 banks over the State totaled $2¼ billion, 11 percent more than at the end of 1961. So Alabamians have more money than ever before, money with which to buy things, to invest or to hold on deposit.

Banks are lending more than ever also. Loans in Federal Reserve member banks in Alabama were at the $1 billion level at the end of 1962, a rise of almost 10 percent over loans at the end of 1961.

That is a healthy business indicator, because when banks lend money, that money is put to use somewhere in the State's economy.

In the retail trade field, department store sales showed an increase of 9 percent over the State during 1962. Birmingham department stores had a 2 percent decline for the year, approximately.

PHONE INCREASES

More telephones were in service than ever before over the State, Southern Bell reported. More than 800,000 phones were in place in homes and business establishments in the State, a record high.

More than 12,000 permits were issued to build new homes valued at more than $100 million. This was a better record than for 1961.

Airlines and railroads had notable increases in their respective operations during 1962 in Alabama. The airlines counted 7 million revenue passengers and more than 5 million ton-miles of cargo carried. Railroads serving the region realized around $1 billion in freight revenue and close to $100 million in passenger fares.

EMPLOYMENT UP

Employment figures furnished a real bright spot for Alabama in 1962.

The State had more than 750,000 workers engaged in nonagricultural jobs, including around 250,000 in manufacturing. This was an increase in both categories over 1961.

It also was a source of satisfaction to know there were 10 percent fewer persons drawing unemployment compensation in Alabama during 1962 than in 1961.

Alabama's share of the world trade market also rose in 1962. The Mobile customs district recorded around $275 million in total trading done with countries of the world during 1962. This included increased activity in both exports and imports.

FARM PROFITS

Another good spot in an otherwise fine business picture was in the agricultural field. Farmers in the State collected more than half a billion dollars in the cash market for their crop and livestock products. Alabama held firmly to third place in the Nation in commercial production of chickens, its hatcheries turning out around 275 million baby chicks, and slaughtering houses handling more than a million beef cattle and calves and hogs in the production of red meat for the tables.

ON OTHER FRONTS

In addition to all this, the year brought some other good encouragement for Alabama business by recording progress the State had made in different fields of economic activity.

It saw Alabama, for instance, advance from 24th to 23d among all States in homebuilding progress.

Pick up 48,000 residents between 1960 and 1961.

Go from 18th to 15th place among all States in total expenditures for new plant and equipment by manufacturers between 1959 and 1960.

Record one of the Nation's lowest rates of business failures in 1961, only 1 out of every 328 closing their doors, 33d down the list of 48 States.

Stood 14 among all States in rate of increase in dollar volume of goods and services sold to the Federal Government between fiscal years 1961 and 1962.

Counted nearly $3 billion put into all forms of construction from 1956 to 1961, inclusive.

Manufactured $16½ billion worth of goods from 1950 to 1960, inclusive, doubling, trebling, quadrupling, and quintupling the value of output in various lines, employing an average of 225,000 workers in the process each year, and paying them around $800 million in wages and salaries annually.

Saw the number of motor vehicles registered in the State pass the 1.3 million mark.

Experienced the Nation's third greatest rate of increase in median family income between 1950 and 1960, with a rise of 116.3 percent in the decade.

Pointed to the fact that the average monthly earnings of its Government workers between 1950 and 1961 were third in the United States in rate of advance.

Go from 19th to 11th place among all States in production of paper and paperboard between 1950 and 1961, and land in 6th position in output of woodpulp in 1961.

Finally, 1962 produced the good tidings that Alabama was among only 9 States in the Nation to show an increase in number of commercial and industrial firms between 1960 and 1961, and among 21 to reflect a gain between 1950 and 1961, winding up 1961 with 37,777.

## Young Men, Young Women, Wake Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Chronicle, of Detroit, Mich., on Saturday, December 15, 1962, by the distinguished scholar and educator, Dr. Broadus N. Butler, of Wayne State University.

As a vigorous and diligent civil libertarian, and as a courageous leader in the battle of equality, Dr. Butler expresses some thoughts which issue a challenge worthy of our consideration.

While his editorial by no means suggests that the real battle for equality is yet ended in this great land of ours, it nevertheless indicates a remarkable awareness on the part of this great American of a new phase of the problem of equality of opportunity which is entering the American way of life.

The editorial follows:

YOUNG MEN, YOUNG WOMEN, WAKE UP

(By Dr. Broadus N. Butler)

We are deeply impressed by two facts about the present employment and career horizon for young Negro men and women. One of them is bold and encouraging. The other should be a matter of grave concern to us all. The bold fact is that the dedicated labors of the many organizations and people who have striven for equal employment opportunity have begun to come to harvest—and opportunity is real now. The fact about which there should be grave concern is that neither the young people, nor their parents, nor their counselors, with few

exceptions, have achieved a full appreciation and realization of what this means.

It can be said with complete justification and validity that until the past year, equal opportunity, or even opportunity itself in any genuine sense, was a kind of nebulous thing that made good platitudes, but did not really exist for young Negro men and women in the important sectors of our national and economic life. It is no wonder that they could not be easily motivated to engage the strenuous effort of high preparation for careers which they were, at the same time, being impressed that they would be denied.

However, it can now be said with equal validity that so radical a change has taken place over the past year that the mantle is upon our shoulders now to produce young men and women to assume the responsible roles that now cry for them and now find them neither sufficiently motivated nor yet fully prepared (in the sense of discipline, not in the sense of capacity) to gird themselves to assume.

We are so rapidly approaching the dream and the hope expressed by Langston Hughes when he said:

"O, let my land be a land where liberty
Is crowned with no patriotic wreath,
But opportunity is real, and life is free,
Equality is in the air we breathe."

The most degrading and depressing consequences of employment discrimination have been that it has made the potential man look down and has sunk that potential man's aspirations and achievements so far below the level of his inherent capacities, that it not only demeaned and degraded the man, but it deprived society of the full measure of what would have been that fully developed man. Any person tends to see things at his own eye level. So if our youth do not raise their sights or have their sights elevated, they will not even now see the real opportunities and concomitant responsibilities there are for competent, confident, responsible, and adequate young men and women in this day.

Industry is calling for young executives. Where are they? Skilled trades are calling for young Negro men to return to them. Where are they? Technology is calling for men of science and research. Where are they? Government is calling for civil service executives for classifications G–12 and above. Where are they? Cities, States, and our Nation are looking for capable and responsible office holders. Where are they? Agencies of stock exchanges and banking and finance are looking for brokers and analysts. Where are they? Educational institutions and boards of education need able and visionary policymakers who will avoid the inadequacies of the past and have the courage to build an educational foundation adequate to the needs of the future. Where are they? Houses and communities which are not yet homes and neighborhoods are calling for young men and young women who can make houses homes in the real sense of family life and make communities neighborhoods in the positive reciprocity of neighborliness. Where are they?

They are in our schools and colleges—some of them. They have dropped out of school and are not working at all—some of them. (A relatively recent report showed that almost half of the best students in high school still do not enter college.) They are working odd part-time jobs—some of them. They are working jobs out of proper classification—some of them. They have resigned themselves to jobs that are well below their performance capacities—some of them. They are confused and discouraged—some of them. Wherever they are, they must be found and counseled and encouraged. They must have the confidence in themselves to explore and to keep exploring. Above all, they must quickly acquire that added measure of competence, qualification, and confidence that transforms a youth to a man.

To this end we need more organized efforts to bring promising young people together under an entirely different definition of purpose. Frankly, we have had the day of massive mobilization of resources for annual dances. We need less social club emphasis and more preprofessional and prebusiness club emphasis. We need fewer social fraternities and more career-oriented fraternities and sororities. Among such clubs and fraternities, we must get well beyond future teachers clubs to add future engineers clubs, future architects clubs, future diplomats clubs, future executives clubs, future politicians clubs, future writers clubs, future poets clubs, future businessmen clubs, and so on.

Young men, young women, I tell you opportunity is real now. The mantle is upon your shoulders now, and the call is for you to hear and heed—and wake up to the opportunities that are now real.

---

## H.R. 71: Restore Economic Freedom to Automobile Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago I introduced H.R. 71, a bill to supplement the antitrust laws of the United States against restraint of trade or commerce by preventing automobile manufacturers from financing and insuring the sales of their products. I have introduced again the same measure, bearing the same number.

I presented this bill—and another like it 4 years ago—because I was convinced that such action was essential to stop monopolistic powers and trends in the automobile industry and related businesses. I was convinced that automobile manufacturing should be separated from auto financing and insurance in order to restore free competition to vast segments of our economy and to prevent captive market patterns from totally engulfing the sale of autos and related goods and services.

Events of the past 2 years have strengthened these convictions. Six days of public hearings in 1961 and voluminous statements, documents, and letters established such a strong case that the House Antitrust Subcommittee reported the bill favorably to the Committee on the Judiciary in 1962. With the press of an extremely heavy agenda in the 87th Congress, the full committee did not vote on it. This measure deserves to advance further toward passage in the 88th Congress, and I am confident that it shall.

All of us are gratified that automobile production and sales proved to be one of the highlights in our economy in 1962. But we should not let our satisfaction obscure underlying shackles on economic freedom which endanger us all.

In this past year, the world's largest manufacturer, General Motors Corp., has tightened its hold on the American automobile market, to claim well over 50 percent of sales, and at times nearly 60 percent. Some 80 percent of the U.S. auto market is controlled by only two manufacturers.

Such concentration is not healthy for our economy—neither for business nor consumers. In large part, this concentration has been a fruit of coercion of auto dealers and restraint of trade of sales financing. These abuses led long ago to antitrust indictments of the largest three auto manufacturers and their finance companies, conviction of General Motors and subsidiaries, and consent decress enjoining certain coercive and discriminatory practices.

Injunctive consent decrees have failed as a substitute for the real remedy of divestiture which the Government originally sought, and to which Ford Motor Co. and Chrysler Corp. agreed if it would apply to all.

Captive markets in auto sales financing have surged, with the control which the dominant manufacturers wield over there dealers. Captive financing is both cause and effect in the manufacturer control over dealers and their sales.

General Motors dealers turned over 67 percent of their new-car sales financing to General Motors Acceptance Corp. in 1960—up sharply from a heavy 56 percent in 1956. These are GMAC's own estimates, prepared at the request of the House Antitrust Subcommittee.

The captive market pattern is equally clear in the dramatically abnormal growth of Ford Motor Credit Co. in its second and third full years of operation. In 1961, this fledgling finance company more than doubled its business with Ford dealers. FMCC apparently more than doubled its business again in 1962, almost reaching that stage in 9 months. It now holds well over $200 million in sales finance contracts.

To appreciate the abnormalcy of this quadrupling of business by one auto finance company, consider that auto sales financing for all financial institutions together declined somewhat in 1961 and will have increased something like 10 percent in 1962.

What sets two finance companies apart from the hundreds of independent finance companies and thousands of banks and other financial institutions? A parent that is the dealer's only supplier of new cars—the source of his livelihood.

Under the GM pattern, now being copied swiftly by Ford, the car manufacturer is the fount for all the dealer's needs—new cars, financing, insurance, parts, and accessories. Another way to express it is "putting all his eggs in one basket."

This is an expression which Ford Motor credit circulated to Ford dealers last March. It quoted a dealer as saying: "A dealer may be reluctant to put all his eggs in one basket. But if FMCC helps him become financially stronger—as I am sure it can—is this so bad? I, for one, that it is fine."

From reports which have come to me, most Ford dealers have indeed remained reluctant to put all their eggs in one

basket, but they cannot afford to offend the factory when their turn comes to start using the factory finance services. Most, I am sure, would gladly trade the real financial strength of real independence for any advantages, apparent or real, of dependence on one source for everything.

The trouble for auto dealers in putting all their eggs in one basket is that someone else gets a tighter grip on the handle.

There are other troubles too. The captive auto financing and insurance pattern poses unfair handicaps for those manufacturers, and wholesalers of auto without such means. Moreover, when dealers must put all their eggs in the manufacturer's basket, monopolistic conditions result in various related markets.

Independent businessmen—insurers, manufacturers, and wholesalers of auto parts and accessories, repair garages, as well as sales finance companies and banks—have told the House Antitrust Subcommittee of being denied the right to compete in GM-controlled markets on their merits—all because of captive financing and insurance controls. If Ford keeps racing in the same direction, thousands more of independent businesses will become casualties.

I should like to make clear that H.R. 71 applies only to the automobile industry. It deals with specific and demonstrated restraints of trade which have been subject of much antitrust criminal and civil court action. It would provide an antitrust remedy at least 25 years overdue. I should like to point out also that divested companies can, and do, survive.

No other industry, to my knowledge, has a comparable economic and legal history to that of the auto industry and related markets. Our concern is not bigness as such, nor finance or other subsidiaries as such. Rather our concern is subversion of free competitive processes.

Businesses which have not misused finance or other subsidiaries to monopolistic ends have no need to fear either new laws nor the long-established antitrust laws under which the automotive giants were indicted and convicted.

In view of the clear need for relief, surely Congress will not stand by and let the free marketplace suffer further restraint by the two automotive giants. Consumers and all businessmen thrive best when goods and services are judged on merit in a free marketplace.

If competition is extinguished in any one sector of our economy, its survival is endangered in all commerce. Suppression of competition means suppression of economic freedom, and political and social freedoms as well.

Passage of H.R. 71 will be a great victory for the free enterprise system.

## Congress Must Control REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, most of us will recall the debate in this Chamber late in the last session when the House had under consideration the appropriation bills for the Department of Agriculture, and several pertinent questions were raised concerning operations of the Rural Electrification Administration. At that time due credit was given to REA for its gratifying accomplishments in the pursuit of its assigned objective—the transmission of electric current into rural areas where the standard of living had been held to minimum levels because of the lack of an electric power supply.

At the same time many Members indicated that they were disturbed by the growing tendencies exhibited by REA to branch out into other fields, without any directive to do so by the Congress, and to thereby enter into direct competition with private industry while holding an insuperable advantage through REA use of low-interest Federal funds. In this connection Congressman ROBERT MICHEL, of Illinois, has recently published in the Public Utilities Fortnightly an outspoken and discerning article which underscores a fundamental issue yet to be resolved satisfactorily. I commend this statement to your attention because I am firmly convinced that, sooner or later, we must grapple with this problem realistically, and determine by congressional action the ground rules within which REA must operate.

The article follows:

A student of government once made this wise observation: "Irresponsible bureaucracy can be made responsible most quickly through financial control. The legislature is the logical agency to exercise it and thereby restore democracy in administration."[1]

The Rural Electrification Administration today is an outstanding example of "irresponsible bureaucracy." Although some of this irresponsibility may be attributed indirectly to the failure of Congress to exercise sufficient supervisory control over this agency, it is Congress and Congress only, as the legislature, that is "the logical agency" to "restore democracy" in the Rural Electrification Administration.

What has gone wrong? Essentially, Congress has not adequately exercised its constitutionally granted "financial control." But there is much more to it. As long as REA was doing what it was suposed to do, according to the law as it was drafted in 1936 and according to the intent and purpose of the founders of REA, Congress could rightly delegate its "financial control" to the Administrator. But this is 1962, not 1936. Conditions and circumstances have changed. Above all, by a steady process of pyramiding one twisted interpretation of its basic statute upon another, REA is now headed in a direction never intended by its creators, the Congress.

Today REA is basically a Federal power agency. The words "rural" and "farm" have little meaning in terms of its program. It is even using Federal funds—the public's money—to help Federal power agencies bypass Congress in their efforts to build a nationwide public power system. In the absence of the "financial control" that Congress should exercise and does not, REA has taken upon itself the task of attempting to direct national power policy, and, even more disturbing, to actually establish national economic philosophy. This is not, and can never be, the function of bureaucracy. REA today is violating virtually every precept of its founders. The need, therefore, has become pressing for Congress to step in and take control.

Look back for a moment. In 1936, American agriculture had been in a depressed condition for nearly two decades. Farm income was low, farms were widely scattered and, in some cases, relatively inaccessible. Despite the fact that land-grant colleges, national farm organizations, electrical manufacturers, and many of the Nation's power companies had been engaged in serious research programs, and positive efforts toward extending central station electric service to farms for over a decade only, about 11 percent of the farms were actually electrified. Under these conditions, and in an effort to stimulate the overall national economy, there was ample justification for the Congress to approve a program to promote farm and rural electrification.

Under the REA program, rural electric systems are 100 percent debt financed by the Federal Government. In the early years, borrowers had little or no equity in their systems. (These same cooperatives now have total assets of over $3.5 billion and an equity of nearly $700 million—or 20 percent—in their systems.)

Over the intervening years the REA grew largely with little or no congressional direction or supervision. At the same time, a radical change was taking place in the farm economy. Income improved steadily. Today, the whole farm economy is generally up as the capacity of American agriculture to produce has expanded. And, according to the latest available statistics from the REA, almost 98 percent of the Nation's farms are electrified. The task of bringing electricity to rural America is virtually complete.

### INITIALLY FOR DISTRIBUTION

A cardinal fact to remember is that Congress originally intended rural electric cooperatives to secure their electric power, wherever possible, from existing power sources. They were to be primarily distributors of power. They were not to build generating plants unnecessarily. This was clearly understood by REA. Early in 1936, Morris Cooke, the first Administrator of the REA program, stated before a committee of the House of Representatives that "in 99 instances out of 100, they (REA cooperatives), are going to buy current from existing plants." The late Honorable Sam Rayburn, who introduced the bill in the House, had this to say: "By this bill we hope to bring electrification to people who do not now have it. This bill was not written on the

[1] Prof. Harvey Walker in "The Legislative Process."

theory that we were going to punish somebody or parallel their lines and go into competition with them."

These comments indicate that there was some concern even then that the REA program might become a means of using Federal financing to compete unfairly with existing free enterprise and to do a job that others are ready, willing, and able to do. It is clear from the record that Congress was assured that this type of activity would not be carried on. So, with the belief that REA would be a noncompetitive type of program designed to supplement the activities of others in their efforts to electrify the rural areas of our country, support for the program was widespread.

Apparently in keeping with the promise of obtaining power from existing sources wherever possible, loans for generation and transmission, as against loans for distribution, constituted only about 3 percent of total REA loans over the period 1936–41. By 1950, however, this had risen to 18 percent. By 1961, the percentage of generation and transmission loans made up to that year had risen to 25 percent. In fiscal year 1962, a new record for G. & T. loans was set with more than 59 percent of all REA electric loans for the year being approved for this purpose; and, for fiscal 1963, it is estimated that between 65 and 70 percent of the electric loans will be for generation and transmission purposes.

The obviously changing character of the REA has not gone unnoticed. Because the very thing that the original founders tried to guard against was happening, attention has been focused on the problem.

Widespread controversy has been evoked by (1) new administrative policies of REA concerning the granting of generation and transmission loans, (2) the cloak of secrecy surrounding loan applications, and (3) the subsidizing of industry through rural electric cooperatives.

Increasingly, REA loans are financing generating facilities of giant "super cooperatives" so that they can create an autonomous, nontaxpaying, and generally unregulated electric supply system to compete with private power sources, contrary to the coauthor of the original act, the late Mr. Rayburn, who said they did not intend to go into competition with anybody.

Prior to last year, it was REA policy to award generation and transmission loans only (1) where no adequate dependable source of power was available in the area to meet the borrower's needs, or (2) where the rates offered by existing power sources would result in a higher cost of power to the borrowers than the cost from facilities financed by REA. This was based on the announced policy of the first REA Administrator to Congress when the question of generating loans was discussed during debate on the 1936 act.

The present Administrator of REA, Norman M. Clapp, has stated, however, that it is not enough to judge the desirability of generation and transmission loans on the basis of adequacy, dependability, and low cost of power. On April 21, 1961, Mr. Clapp, in a speech before a Louisiana electric cooperative, said, "We must be certain that cooperatives enjoy a supply of power which will guarantee the cooperative device a permanent place in the American power industry."

On May 31, 1961, the Administrator announced a third criterion for G. & T. loans apparently aimed at enabling him to accomplish his previously stated goal. This new third criterion provides that, in addition to the two original criteria, loans for generation and transmission can be made "where generation and transmission facilities are necessary to protect the security and effectiveness of REA-financed systems." This completely nullifies the two above criteria which, if administered fairly, carry out congressional understanding and approval of REA G. & T. policy.

EXISTING SUPPLIERS PROTEST

Under this new philosophy abuses of the REA program have been mounting. At least 10 large loans totaling over $215 million have been approved in recent months for cooperative generating plants which will not fill any power shortage. All these loans were made over the protests of existing power suppliers that all present and anticipated future cooperative power needs would be provided and at a price cheaper than it would cost the cooperatives to generate it themselves.

A $60 million loan to an Indiana generating cooperative, heralded by REA as the largest loan in its history, was approved on June 15, 1961. When it became evident that the Indiana Public Service Commission might disapprove this loan as unnecessary, the cooperative switched the loan to another cooperative in an obvious and blatant circumvention of the rights and powers of the State commission.

Last November a loan of over $20 million was made to the Alabama Electric Cooperative to build a 66,000-kilowatt steamplant. This loan was made although REA's own published figures show that the local electric company is supplying power of the G. & T.'s member co-ops at a cost to them less than that G. & T. is now selling power to its members.

Not only is the total amount being loaned for generation and transmission facilities increasing each year, but the size of the individual loans is, on the average, becoming larger. With individual loans now running into the multimillion-dollar figures, Congress needs to take a closer look at the G. & T. program to make certain that loans of this size are necessary and in the public interest. A loan application has been filed by REA borrowers in Louisiana totaling $53 million for the construction of two 100-megawatt generating plants and nearly 1,800 miles of transmission line. This is enough transmission mileage to crisscross the State from north to south and from east to west five times. If this loan is approved out of funds made available by the 1963 appropriations bill, it will require one-eighth of all the money Congress approved for REA loans for 1963. Certainly, under such circumstances the Appropriations Committees of Congress should review a loan of this magnitude.

It has also become evident that REA loans under section 5 of the act, intended primarily to assist farmers to utilize the electricity the REA program was bringing to them, are now being made to subsidize industry.

Section 5 of the 1936 act authorized the REA to make loans to finance electrical and plumbing equipment for persons in rural areas. During recent years, REA limited loans under this section to facilities for rural households and farmsteads. But the present administration has made section 5 loans for such diverse purposes as the purchase and installation of gravel-crushing and washing machinery, for the purchase of a snowmaking machine for a ski resort, and for the purchase of textile machinery for a private textile mill. Incidents such as these force one to view the House Agriculture Committee's statement that it "feels that REA's present interpretation of section 5 of the 1936 act is inconsistent with the original intent of Congress" as a gross understatement.

LOW INTEREST RATE

The public money that REA is using to finance such industrial electrical machinery through section 5 loans is, of course, loaned to borrowers at the below-cost, taxpayer-subsidized interest rate of 2 percent.

With the aid of this public money REA is therefore subsidizing industry, not to help the farmer, but merely to expand its own bureaucratic activities.

The Administrator also states that section 5 funds will not be used for financing industrial machinery until an industry has exhausted all other sources of credit. This may be the Administrator's policy, but the REA staff apparently is more interested in making loans than checking out the efforts of prospective borrowers to first obtain alternative borrowing sources. A case in point is the loan to finance snowmaking machinery for a ski jump. An official of the REA borrower making the loan testified before the House Agriculture Committee on the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962:

"Chestnut Hills [the ski resort] is our biggest load, and it promises to grow bigger every year. That is one impotrant reason why our co-op agreed to make a loan [under sec. 5] to the company when the company could not get financing for snow-making equipment from any other source, including the Small Business Administration." (Pt. 2, p. 968.)

In reply to my query to the Small Business Administration as to whether the ski resort had applied to SBA for a loan, the Small Business Administrator wrote on March 22, 1962:

"This will confirm advice given to * * * your staff concerning the status of the loan inquiry made by Chestnut Hills Resort, Hanover, Ill. No loan application has been filed with this agency."

In short, if I could obtain such information by merely addressing a letter to SBA, why wasn't REA able to ascertain this fact? Obviously, REA made no real effort to verify the extent of other efforts to obtain financing when processing this section 5 loan. REA was apparently too interested in loaning its subsidized money and building up its own bureaucracy to check out all the facts it needed. If this is an example of REA efficiency in processing a relatively small loan amounting to only $30,000, how can REA be trusted to handle the many millions of dollars made available to it by Congress each year and process the more complex G. & T. loans amounting in some cases to $50 and $60 million? As a banker entrusted with the taxpayers' money, REA standards appear to be slipshod. This provides a good reason why Congress through the Appropriations Committee should start taking more control over the activities of this agency.

The secrecy surrounding REA generation and transmission loan applications has also evoked criticism of the House Committee on Agriculture. In its report accompanying the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, the committee admonished the REA, as follows:

"Testimony revealed a growing concern over the failure of REA to disclose information on various phases of its operation. The public is entitled to know how public funds are being used, and the REA should approach the consideration of loans for generating facilities in a manner designed to provide as full public information as possible. * * * Certainly, interested parties should be notified and their views obtained before such loans are approved. Secrecy tends to kindle doubt, whereas public knowledge of the reasons for and justification of loans would go far toward dispelling criticism which could bring the program into disrepute."

Last April, under pressure of increasing criticism from Members of Congress, congressional committees, as well as from the press and the public, REA issued an administrative bulletin on the release of information and availability of records relating to loan applications. REA supporters hailed this bulletin as a major departure from its previous policy of secrecy. A careful study of the bulletin failed to reveal any basic major policy change. In fact, rather than lowering the iron curtain of secrecy, the bulletin,

with minor exceptions, merely implemented existing REA practices in writing.

Perhaps the most determining argument in support of tighter congressional control over REA through the Appropriations Committee is the secrecy which surrounds the program. Today, secrecy stands between REA and what should be effective congressional financial control. Once having received its annual appropriation from Congress, REA conducts its lending activities in complete secrecy—not only from the Congress, but from the public and other interested parties who may be directly affected by its activities.

QUESTION OF CRITERIA

Two of the criteria which REA uses in approving G. & T. loans are the cost of power and adequacy of service. To ascertain the necessary facts upon which to base a decision, REA needs the best possible alternative offer from existing suppliers, public or private, in the area of a proposed G. & T. system. Unless existing power suppliers know what they are bidding on—i.e., the future plans and needs of the borrower—they cannot adequately present their own case for providing additional facilities to serve borrowers' needs. If the best alternatives cannot be presented by existing suppliers because of their inability to obtain enough facts to prepare their offer, then REA may be guilty of making an unnecessary loan as it is not comparing the proposed generating loan with the best alternative.

This raises the entire question of how the Administrator can honestly and accurately comply with his own criteria to measure the need for a G. & T. loan unless adequate information is made available to existing suppliers so they can make their best offer based on up-to-date, accurate information on their customers' needs. How can the Administrator in all candor approve a G. & T. loan application and spend the taxpayers' money when he is comparing a G. & T. application with alternatives drafted without knowledge of all the facts?

This raises further questions as to why REA conducts its program in secrecy from Congress and the public, the answers to which are not too difficult. Once secrecy is removed from REA's operations, it would become obvious both to Congress and the public that REA's generation and transmission program is, for the most part, wholly unnecessary and, in many cases, uneconomic and unsound.

Our Nation today is served by a power system unmatched and unparalleled anywhere in the world. There is an abundance of power available to meet the country's present and future needs. The average cost of electricity to the electric consumer has been steadily decreasing over the years.

In view of these accomplished facts, there is little or no excuse for REA to spend tax money for financing separate power systems for its borrowers. This is an uneconomic approach from the standpoint of both the REA borrowers and the public and, therefore, contrary to the best interests of the people.

REA is now in its 27th year. As local distribution borrowers repay their 35-year loans to the Federal Government, REA loses the control over their activities which is embodied in its mortgage and loan contract with its borrowers. As long as a local borrower is in debt to the Federal Government, the REA Administrator maintains such rights as the veto power over a borrower's choice of manager and attorney, and the right to maintain an exclusive banker's position by refusing to permit the borrower to obtain expansion funds elsewhere. Once the Federal debt has been retired, however, the borrower is free to conduct his business independently as a cooperative should.

Thus, when REA approves a G. & T. loan for a group of distribution borrowers, these cooperatives become indebted to the Federal Government and come under the Federal Government's control for another 35 years. Once a group of cooperatives construct their own G. & T. system and take on a utility responsibility for their own power supply, normal load growth (a co-op doubles its load every 7 years) requires periodic expansion of facilities, thereby increasing the borrower's debt to REA. Thus, borrowers soon find themselves indebted to the Federal Government for an indefinite future. REA's strict contractual control over its borrowers makes this agency as much of a Federal power agency as TVA or the Interior Department.

CONGRESS CONTROLS ONLY FUNDS

This is another important reason why Congress should take greater control over the REA program. As an elected body, Congress represents the best interest of the people themselves, while REA, as a Federal bureaucracy, is primarily motivated by its own selfish interests—those of agency growth, prestige, and self-perpetuation of its existence.

Congress today has virtually no control over the REA program with the exception that it makes a lump sum appropriation available to this agency for loans each year. Under the Constitution, Congress is given responsibility to maintain control over the Government purse strings. When Congress authorizes expenditures for an executive agency without knowledge of how the money is to be used, Congress, in effect, is automatically transferring its responsibility to the executive branch of the Government.

There is no question that the REA Administrator, under the law, should and does have the authority to study, recommend, and approve REA loans, but this does not supersede Congress' authority to decide how Federal funds—including REA's—should be spent. The Bureau of Reclamation, for example, has blanket authority to construct projects which it finds financially feasible. Congress, however, will not permit the Bureau to spend money except on projects that it specifically approves each year in appropriation acts. Reclamation also gets lump sum appropriations, but how the money is to be used is specifically set forth by Congress in the reports of the Appropriations Committees.

A further reason that Congress, through the Appropriations Committees, should have the authority of approving the use of REA funds—at least for major G. & T. projects costing over a certain amount—is that the purpose of the REA program is no longer one of constructing distribution systems to provide electricity to farms and other rural customers in unserved areas. The major share of REA's money is now being loaned to put REA permanently and completely in the power business—by constructing generating plants and transmission systems to serve customers and areas that are already receiving central station electric service in adequate amounts at reasonable prices.

Because of this changed policy the REA power program is becoming the largest spender of all the Federal power programs financed by the taxpayers. In fiscal year 1963, REA estimates it will be spending more money for generation and transmission system ($260 to $275 million) than either the Corps of Engineers ($238.8 million) or the Bureau of Reclamation ($185.2 million) have requested for their multiple-purpose power programs.

For many years REA has been a sort of "sacred cow" in Congress. Each time legislation has been introduced which would, in any way, limit the powers of REA, those brave enough to introduce or support such legislation have been denounced by cooperative lobbyists as "antifarmer" and even "anti-American." But this is changing rapidly. Events during the latest session of Congress have indicated an increasing awareness and concern of Members over REA actions in recent months. An amendment which I introduced to the agriculture appropriations bill this year to limit the amount of funds to be loaned for generation and transmission facilities received bipartisan support even though it lost by a vote of 133–94. The fact that Members would actively oppose REA's present administration of this program and stand up and be counted is, to me, a real step toward finding a solution to this problem.

Prior to this vote, during consideration of the REA appropriations request before the House Appropriations Committee, I proposed an amendment that would require the Budget Bureau in presenting REA's program for fiscal year 1964 to itemize and justify in detail all G. & T. projects costing more than $5 million. This would have given the Appropriations Committee an opoprtunity to consider the REA construction program in the same way that it considers the power programs of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers. The voting on this suggestion of mine, although defeated by a narrow margin of three votes in the House Appropriations Committee, indicated an increased willingness on the part of members to recognize the seriousness of the present trend in REA's policy.

A requirement of this nature would not deprive one single cooperative, or one single rural consumer, of electric power, nor would it create in any way a power shortage among cooperatives. It would not increase the cost of power to any cooperative. It would not in any manner reduce the amount of loan funds available to rural electric cooperatives. It would not impair the security of a single cooperative.

What such a requirement would do is to bring the REA program more closely into line with the intent and purpose of the Rural Electrification Act and to give Congress some semblance of control over this agency. In addition, the REA Administrator might be a little more careful of the manner in which he conducts some of his activities. Without any checks and balances, he has a clear field.

Presentation of this information to the Appropriations Committees of Congress would in no way infringe upon the authority of the Administrator to make loans. It would, however, give Congress the needed information to specifically approve appropriations for this agency. Congress has a right to this information and it has a responsibility to the taxpayers of assuring them that their elected Representatives still have control over Government spending. At present, insofar as REA is concerned, Congress has the responsibility, but not the control.

"Irresponsible bureaucracy can be made responsible most quickly through financial control. The legislature is the logical agency to exercise it."

---

## The Budgetary Outlook and Its Meaning for Federal Expenditure and Tax Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, since the House will be confronted with the new budget and recommendations for tax cuts early in the session, it seems to me that the advice of Dr. Raymond J. Saulnier, professor of economics, Barnard

College, Columbia University, who also served as Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers for President Eisenhower, is worth studying.

His article on the budgetary outlook and its meaning for Federal expenditure and tax policy as published in the December issue of Tax Foundation's Tax Review are as follows:

THE BUDGETARY OUTLOOK AND ITS MEANING FOR FEDERAL EXPENDITURE AND TAX POLICY

(By Dr. Raymond J. Saulnier, professor of economics, Barnard College, Columbia University)

There is a considerable body of opinion which holds that neither the current position of the budget nor budget prospects for the next few fiscal periods ahead should have any material bearing on tax policy or on expenditure policy, either. But I do not share this deficits-don't-really-matter theory of fiscal policy.

My preference is for an earlier but still not wholly extinct point of view that the Federal budget should be brought into balance over the cycle; with surpluses in the expansion phase offsetting deficits in recession and early recovery. The strategy of Federal policy which I think would serve us best at this time and for the implementation of which I propose to make several suggestions, derives from this underlying fiscal policy preference.

We may begin with the budget outlook for fiscal 1963. In the official statement issued only a few weeks ago it was estimated that the administrative budget for that period would show a deficit of $7.8 billion. The new estimate came as no great surprise and has evoked remarkably little comment, but there is a sense in which this outlook is both novel and important. Its novelty does not lie in the size of the prospective deficit. It has become commonplace in political exchanges to point out that a deficit of $7.8 billion isn't as large as the $12.4 billion deficit incurred in fiscal 1959. This is perfectly true. The novelty of the fiscal 1963 deficit lies in the fact that it comes at an advanced stage of a business cycle expansion. The $12.4 billion deficit in fiscal 1959 was a deficit incurred in the first full fiscal year following the trough of the 1958–59 recession. The $7.8 billion deficit in fiscal 1963, on the other hand, is occuring in the second full fiscal year following the trough of the 1960–61 recession.

The prospective fiscal 1963 budget deficit has a second significant feature, namely, that it is larger than that incurred in fiscal 1962. Thus, what it lacks in size relative to the fiscal 1959 deficit, it is more than making up in successiveness and in its capacity to grow. This suggests that we may be in a more or less chronic deficit situation. Far from a cyclically compensatory budget, what we may be confronting is the prospect of deficits in periods of expansion and growth as well as in periods of recession and early recovery. If this is the road we are traveling, we had better recognize it as such as soon as possible.

Much will depend on the budgetary outcome in fiscal 1964, which in turn will depend on developments in the economy over the next year and a half. Accordingly, let me state my views on the economic outlook.

EFFECTS OF CUBAN SITUATION

After a so-so kind of spring and summer, during which the economy made very little advance and in some important ways was losing ground, a new momentum developed at or just before the time of the Cuban crisis. There is evidence that some strengthening developed in the economy just prior to the Cuban incident. So far as I can see, this resulted mainly from the unusually heavy volume of defense and space contracts awarded in the third quarter of the year. Additionally, there was mild help from tax changes, legislative and administrative, and considerable benefit from a heavy volume of early automobile production. The economy was still in a distinctly precarious position in mid-October, but these factors prevented a decline and appear even to have produced a mild upward movement.

In this atmosphere, the Cuban crisis had a clearly stimulative effect on the economy. I would not want to make too much use of this point, but I do believe that Chairman Khrushchev should realize that in recent years some of his major moves have been timed to earn him the right to be regarded as one of our most important economic stabilization aids, though this could hardly be a deliberate aim of Soviet policy.

The Russian reversal on Cuba was also a help to our economy. It evoked a sense of relief that seems to have strengthened psychology generally: consumers, financial investors and businessmen reacted positively, with good effects on the economy. There is something somehow precarious about all of this, but for the moment at least we have taken a turn for the better. What the Cuban developments means for the outlook is that our chances of navigating a difficult passage in the business cycle without overall decline in the near future have been very considerably improved. Given a reasonably favorable atmosphere, the momentum now developing will of course carry us through the yearend season and I would expect it to carry us well into 1963. Many of the indicators are still giving out warnings of a recessionary trend and these must be respected; but I would read them at this date, supplemented by what we know about developments in November, primarily as a warning against excessive optimism.

LOOKS FOR INCREASE UNTIL MID-1963

There are those who believe that the present momentum will carry well beyond mid-1963 and accelerate in the second half of the year. But the evidence for this is as yet visible only to the eyes of faith. I regard the momentum as still of modest proportions and there are still many obstacles in our path, notably the handling of tax legislation in 1963. For the moment, therefore, I look for an increase until around mid-1963 and then a situation much like what we had to cope with through the summer of 1962, namely, a kind of stalemate in which little overall advance is scored.

The next step we must take is to translate this view of the business outlook into terms that are meaningful for the estimation of budget receipts. To do this, we have to project gross national product from the third quarter of 1962 to the second quarter of 1964. I have made three such projections which we may identify as models A, B, and C.

Model A comes directly from the business outlook estimate I have just described. It extends gross national product at a rate which gives an overall growth for 1963 over 1962, in current prices, of about 3½ percent. With an allowance of 1 percent for price inflation, this would be a 2½-percent increase in real gross national product. This seems to me like a fairly optimistic projection but I am never quite sure of such things. What seems optimistic to me frequently seems pessimistic to my friends in government. So I will simply say that of all the models I have constructed this seems the most plausible.

Model B contemplates an increase in current price GNP of around 4.5 percent, with a constant price growth of around 3 percent.

Model C, which I regard as wildly extravagant, pictures a current price gross national product growth of around 6 percent and a constant price growth rate of 4 percent.

POSSIBILITY OF $15 BILLION DEFICIT

Employing assumptions drawn from budgetary experience since 1954, I have derived estimates of budget receipts for fiscal 1964 for each of these three models of gross national product growth. What I find is that receipts in fiscal 1964 would be $90.8 billion on model A; $93 billion on model B; and $95.8 billion on model C.

From these estimates of receipts we can derive some ideas as to budgetary outcome for fiscal 1964. What they tell us is that the deficit would be reduced to a relatively small figure if, with no reduction in tax rates from present levels and with fiscal 1964 expenditures at the same level as in fiscal 1963, we were to grow between 1962 and 1963 on a model A or model B pattern. And they suggest that economic growth in 1963 at the rapid rate pictured in model C would produce a surplus of around $2 billion in the fiscal 1964 budget.

These are the results one gets if rates of economic growth ranging from 2½ to 4 percent in real terms are assumed to be achieved at the same time that Federal expenditures are held at the fiscal 1963 level of $93.7 billion and if tax rates remain as they are. One may say that it would be impossible to achieve growth at these rates, even at a 2½-percent (constant price) rate, with this fiscal policy. This may be so; certainly, in view of what has been said officially about the prospect for substantial tax reduction in 1963–64, a good many people would be disappointed, with a generally dampening effect on the economy, if they were to be told now that there was to be no tax reduction for the present. Accordingly, let us consider the budget implications of a fiscal policy that would reduce taxes for the fiscal year 1964 by $5 billion over what they would otherwise be and raise Federal expenditures by $5 billion above the $93.7 billion fiscal 1963 level.

What seems to be implied by such a fiscal policy is a very substantial deficit, as large or larger than the currently projected fiscal 1963 deficit of $7.8 billion. Specifically, the deficit would be held close to the fiscal 1963 level if the economy were to grow by 6 percent on a current price basis (model C) and would be between $10 and $15 billion if the economy were to grow by 3½ to 4½ percent [rate] on the same basis (model A or B).

In other words, if a $5 billion tax cut is effective in fiscal 1964 and if Federal expenditures are higher by another $5 billion, we face a substantial and very likely enlarged budgetary deficit. This would mean an unbroken succession of deficits, each one larger than the one before, extending through the third full year following a trough in the business cycle. I leave it for reflection over the budgetary outcome if, sometime between now and mid-1964, or indeed at any time in 1964 or 1965, we should slide into a recession.

BROAD POLICY IMPLICATIONS SEEN

In my judgment, there are two broad policy implications in this fiscal outlook. The first is that there is an urgent need for control over the increase of Federal expenditures. What we should do is put a ceiling on expenditures for, say, 2 years, at the fiscal 1963 level, that is, at about $94 billion. Considering built-in increases and additional new program requirements that must be met, such as those growing out of the present tensions in international relations, this means that substantial reductions in some expenditures are necessary.

The second policy implication of the fiscal 1964 budget outlook is that there is need for caution in the amount and character of tax reduction. As it is developing, the fiscal situation does not justify a reduction of more than $2.5 billion on anything but an emergency basis, and the economic outlook

at this time does not spell emergency. Furthermore, such tax reduction as is legislated should be designed to promote a higher level of private investment expenditure. This would be done best, for a $2.5 billion revenue loss, by a reduction in the corporate income tax rate to 47 percent. We are not now in a position to indulge ourselves in a large, across-the-board reduction of the tax burden. Under the right expenditure control conditions we could, however, take a first step in this direction, hoping to take additional steps at a later date.

Interestingly enough, however, the whole tenor of public discussion at this time contemplates a policy that is exactly the opposite of this. Very large increases in expenditure are being discussed for existing programs and last summer it was disclosed that our national goal for the next few years would be to land a man on the moon. At the same time that we contemplate these enormously exciting though also enormously expensive undertakings the air is full of official trial balloons and numberless unofficial proposals for large tax reductions. The mood is one of competitive venturesomeness and generosity in which there seems to be some thought that the prize should be allotted to whomever is prepared to make the boldest and most magnanimous offer. I trust I will be forgiven if I say that to me all of this has a distinctly bizarre quality.

Turning to the first of these policy implications, what about the possibilities of expenditure control?

CUTBACK ON CREDIT PROGRAMS

There is developing, I woud judge, a kind of defeatism on this subject. I would be among the first to concede the political difficulties involved in a program of expenditure control if it lacked administration support, and even more so if it conflicted with administration policy. But given administration support, a program for restraining the powerful tendency for Federal spending to increase would, in my judgment, be entirely feasible. The question, therefore, is whether there are practical possibilities of achieving economies that would be economically desirable.

There are such opportunities. To illustrate, let us take the case of Federal credit programs. There is a grossly inadequate public understanding of the magnitude, let alone the character, of the Federal Government's lending activities, but for anyone interested in learning more about these the budget message for a number of years has carried a special appendix of factual information. From this source we learn that in the current fiscal year all Federal credit programs combined will be a charge on the budget to the extent of $1.8 billion, which is the difference between the amount of disbursements made under the programs and the amount of repayments received and certain other offsets. However, this net figure tells little about the size of the programs. Currently, total disbursements under them are estimated for fiscal 1963 at something over $8 billion. About half of this is accounted for by the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Agency for International Development, but other agencies also account individually for considerable sums. Thus, the Export-Import Bank will disburse an estimated $800 million in fiscal 1963; the Small Business Administration, something over $400 million; the Farmers' Home Administration, more than $500 million; the Rural Electrification Administration, $360 million; the Community Facilities Administration, close to $500 million; and the Federal Natitonal Mortgage Asssociation, more than $400 million.

SELL LOANS AND SECURITIES

Since we are dealing with a very large deficit, economies must be of substantial size to be significantly helpful. In this respect, Federal credit programs would be a good place to start. It is never a wise budgetary policy to undertake flat, across-the-board budget cuts, because existing programs have such widely different degrees of merit, but it is interesting to observe that a reduction in disbursements averaging 10 percent would produce an expenditure reduction of around $800 million. And such a program could hardly be regarded as a severely austere one. Astonishing as this may seem, a 10-percent overall reduction would leave disbursements for Federal credit programs as a whole still as large as they were in fiscal 1962, and $3 billion higher than they were in fiscal 1961.

To do this would require a searching reappraisal of credit programs and techniques. Some of the programs, certainly those represented by the Agency for International Development, have been designed to accomplish purposes that could in no way be achieved except through governmental effort; but others are in part, at least, competitive with private effort and have assumed their present size mainly because they make credit, often of a long-term variety, available at interest rates significantly below the market. For such programs, an interest rate policy more closely attuned to market realities would direct a larger proportion of the financing to the private financial system and thereby reduce budget expenditures. Administrative limitations would do the same thing. Economies could be effected in other programs by requiring greater reliance on loan participations with private lenders, a more determined search for available private financing before public credit is offered, or the substitution of loan insurance or guarantees for direct lending. In still other cases, all that would be necessary would be for the Federal agencies involved to relax their currently aggressive search for loans.

Still in the area of Federal credit programs, let me mention another possibility for helping to offset budgetary deficits. This could be done through the sale to the public of loans and securities accumulated under Federal credit programs. The January 1962 budget message estimated that Treasury holdings of these financial assets will reach $29 billion by the end of the fiscal year 1963. Only direct loans are included in this amount; insured or guaranteed loans or securities are excluded.

This $29 billion fund constitutes what I believe is our least well-understood stockpile. It includes over $3.5 billion of mortgage loans held by FNMA; nearly $4 billion of loans made by the Rural Electrification Administration; $1.8 billion of loans made by the Community Facilities Administration; $1.4 billion of credits extended by the Farmers Home Administration; and nearly $15 billion of loans growing out of various international lending activities.

Many of these financial assets would be ineligible for sale; others would be unsalable under any practicable arrangement. But there is reason to believe that some of them could be sold publicly and to make a market distribution of even a small fraction of the total would produce a very large volume of budget receipts. And to do so would not be a novel move. The Federal National Mortgage Association was established in the first instance on the theory that it would sell mortgages as well as buy them. The Veterans' Administration has marketed some of its holdings of direct loans. Recently the Export-Import Bank did the same abroad and some years ago loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation were liquidated in this country under a carefully designed and executed program.

Of course, sales would have to be made subject to two major conditions: first, the terms of the sale would have to be fully protective of the public interest; second, sales would have to be made in a manner and on a schedule that would avoid depressing the economy by forcing a significantly higher level of long-term interest rates.

As regards the first of these two conditions: because most of the loans were made in the first instance at below-market interest rates it would be necessary to sell them at prices below par. But when one considers the difference between the income being earned by the Federal Government on the assets in question and the rate of interest the Treasury must pay on the public debt in order to continue holding them, it is by no means certain that a net loss to the Federal Government would be involved in a sales program. In any case, so long as sales were made on terms that provided no more than a reasonable compensation and return for underwriters and private investors, such capital loss as there might be could properly be regarded as a payment in advance of future subsidies, and this obligation would be discharged without imposing a current burden on the budget.

HOLD DOWN PUBLIC WORKS SPENDING

As regards the second of the two conditions, namely, that public sales of financial assets might raise long-term interest rates and exert a restrictive effect on the economy, this would depend on the timing and volume of sales and on the availability of investment funds. Actually, there has been a surplus of funds seeking investment of late, not a shortage, and there is accordingly a good chance that a properly administered sales program would have little effect on the prices of long-term securities. Also, whether sales tended to raise long-term interest rates would depend on monetary policy. But it seems reasonable to expect that monetary policy would actually assist a program aimed at helping to reduce the budget deficit. Of course, the budget assistance one would get from sales would be only temporary but it would come at an opportune time and it could be an ingredient of a fiscal policy that would hold promise of reversing the trend to larger and larger deficits.

Let me mention only one more expenditure program in which economies might be found, namely, the programs of Federal construction and grants to the States for civil public works. These have been increasing by leaps and bounds of late.

There is about a 50–50 distribution of expenditures for civil public works as between budget accounts and trust fund accounts, with each accounting in fiscal 1963 for about $3¼ billion. But the budget accounts alone have increased by about $1 billion in the last 2 fiscal years. As a group, their increase is exceeded by the ballooning of expenditures under the Federal credit programs, but it has been very rapid, all the same. A program under which civil public works expenditures would be held in fiscal 1964 to the level prevailing in fiscal 1962 would produce a budget economy of close to $500 million, but it would still mean a level of spending $500 million higher than obtained in fiscal 1961. This, again, would be no austerity program.

Other possibilities could be mentioned. What is really needed is a thorough reexamination of Federal expenditures. A Presidentially appointed commission of private citizens who would approach the problem in terms of what is good for all Americans and not of what is good for particular interest groups could do this.

To undertake such a budget reappraisal in order to prevent our being engulfed by Federal spending that is growing so fast and is getting so large and so complex that no one really comprehends it would be reason enough. An additional reason derives from the budgetary outlook I have sketched in these remarks. It is this:

We need to restructure our tax system and lighten the burden of taxation in ways

will improve the burden of taxation in ways that will improve the performance of our economy, but the budget outlook tells us that unless we exert a much more effective discipline over the volume of Federal spending we cannot undertake these needed measures of tax relief without courting larger and larger deficits. All the evidence points to the need for a searching scrutiny of expenditure priorities.

## Great Lady From Ohio: Mrs. Bolton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL**
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, there are 67 new Members in this Congress. They have not had the privilege many of us enjoy of having worked and counseled with a charming and remarkable colleague, Congresswoman FRANCES P. BOLTON. I am indebted to her tenfold for the benefit of her wisdom and for the courtesies she has consistently extended to me and my office ever since I came to Washington as a freshman in 1955. I can think of no better way to introduce her than through an excellent article written recently by Alvin Silverman, chief of the Washington bureau of the Cleveland Plain Dealer. There is, of course, one of the 67 new Members who needs no introduction to Mrs. BOLTON—and that is her son, Congressman OLIVER BOLTON, whom we are delighted to welcome back to Capitol Hill.

The article follows:

GREAT LADY FROM OHIO: MRS. BOLTON
(By Alvin Silverman)

WASHINGTON.—The passing last week of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and the resulting effusion of tributes to her character and achievements brought to mind the lamentable fact that not until death occurs is very much laudatory ever said about any individual.

Judged by any except the most illiberal of critics, Mrs. Roosevelt was a great woman. There are not many great women around. Their total only slightly exceeds the number of great men.

There is, however, a great woman who is a Clevelander. Since she is very much alive and very much disinclined to toot her own horn, this might be an appropriate time to discuss her.

Her name is FRANCES P. BOLTON.

Congresswoman from Ohio's 22d District since 1940, Mrs. BOLTON comes from a distinguished family long associated with public service. Both of her grandfathers served in the Ohio General Assembly and one of them, Henry B. Payne, became a U.S. Representative and then a Senator.

Mrs. BOLTON and her son, OLIVER, just elected to the House for another term after sitting on the sidelines for several years while recovering his health, comprise the only mother-son team ever to serve together in the Congress.

Mrs. BOLTON is regarded as an authority on legislation dealing with U.S. foreign policy, particularly Africa and France.

In 1955 she made a 20,000-mile study tour of Africa. Her visit to 24 countries south and east of the Sahara Desert was the first extensive mission to Africa by a Member of Congress.

Two years later, she returned to Africa as an official delegate to the Ghana independence ceremonies, and later in 1957 she made an official report on United Nation refugee camps in the Middle East.

There is not a single important official of any of the new African nations who does not consider Mrs. BOLTON a close friend and adviser. Her Washington home is virtually a headquarters for them when they are in the capital.

Far beyond her contributions in the field of foreign affairs, however, have been Mrs. BOLTON'S activities in health and nursing.

The first Army school of nursing in World War I was largely the result of the pressure she personally applied on her friend from Cleveland, Secretary of War Newton D. Baker. During World War II, her Bolton bill created the U.S. Cadet Nurse Corps, an orgainzation that graduated 125,000 nurses for the Nation's war effort. Western Reserve University's School of Nursing, named for her, eloquently bespeaks her efforts.

A friend recently was feeling pretty proud that he had been chosen to receive an honorary doctorate degree from a university. Mrs. BOLTON acted as if she could not have been more thrilled if she had received one herself. If she had, it would have been No. 15 for her.

France awarded her membership in the French Legion of Honor officer class for her work during and after World War II.

Her other awards include "Churchwoman of the Year," and the American Social Hygiene Association's award for distinguished service to humanity.

Mrs. BOLTON is vice regent for Ohio of the Mount Vernon Ladies Association, possibly the most exclusive organization in the Nation. For more than a century, it has been in charge of the George Washington National Shrine. Only recently, Mrs. BOLTON bought a large tract of land across the Potomac River from Mount Vernon so that the view would remain unchanged.

There is probably not a church or a hospital in northern Ohio that has not been saved in a major crisis by Mrs. BOLTON'S financial help or other assistance.

All this, of course, does not make her a great woman.

Her greatness comes also from her character and personality and—well, you get the general idea by now.

## Pay Increase for the Military

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. BOB WILSON**
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, for many months I have been extremely concerned at the delay of the Kennedy administration in pushing for a pay increase for the military, despite the fact that other governmental employees have benefited from pay raises on two occasions since the last general military pay increase in 1958.

Last fall I pledged to introduce, if necessary, and support legislation calling for a substantial pay increase. Included was to be a section correcting the inequities in the pay scales for those retired personnel who left the service prior to July 1958. These retired persons were discriminated against and a great inequity has existed for over 4 years as a result.

A few weeks ago I was heartened to learn that the Defense Department was supporting a pay increase measure amounting to as much as 14 percent in some categories and also correcting the inequities I mentioned previously.

Rather than introduce my version of a pay bill I have decided to defer such action until the administration's measure comes before the Personnel Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee. As a member of the subcommittee, I recognize that legislation as introduced by the administration is merely the raw material from which a truly effective and meaningful pay bill can be molded by our subcommittee and subsequently by the Congress.

It is the responsibility of the Congress to act with dispatch on a substantial and constructive pay bill for active duty and retired personnel of our military service and I am looking forward to helping to expedite this much-needed legislation.

## Current Communist Goals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.**
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Patricia Nordman of De Land, Fla., is an ardent and articulate opponent of communism, and until recently published the De Land Courier, which she dedicated to the purpose of alerting the public to the dangers of communism in America.

At Mrs. Nordman's request, I include in the RECORD, under unanimous consent, the following "Current Communist Goals," which she identifies as an excerpt from "The Naked Communist," by Cleon Skousen:

[From "The Naked Communist," by Cleon Skousen]

CURRENT COMMUNIST GOALS

1. U.S. acceptance of coexistence as the only alternative to atomic war.
2. U.S. willingness to capitulate in preference to engaging in atomic war.
3. Develop the illusion that total disarmament by the United States would be a demonstration of moral strength.
4. Permit free trade between all nations regardless of Communist affiliation and regardless of whether or not items could be used for war.
5. Extension of long-term loans to Russia and Soviet satellites.
6. Provide American aid to all nations regardless of Communist domination.
7. Grant recognition of Red China. Admission of Red China to the U.N.
8. Set up East and West Germany as separate states in spite of Khrushchev's promise in 1955 to settle the German question by free elections under supervision of the U.N.
9. Prolong the conferences to ban atomic tests because the United States has agreed to suspend tests as long as negotiations are in progress.
10. Allow all Soviet satellites individual representation in the U.N.

11. Promote the U.N. as the only hope for mankind. If its charter is rewritten, demand that it be set up as a one-world government with its own independent armed forces. (Some Communist leaders believe the world can be taken over as easily by the U.N. as by Moscow. Sometimes these two centers compete with each other as they are now doing in the Congo.)

12. Resist any attempt to outlaw the Communist Party.

13. Do away with all loyalty oaths.

14. Continue giving Russia access to the U.S. Patent Office.

15. Capture one or both of the political parties in the United States.

16. Use technical decisions of the courts to weaken basic American institutions by claiming their activities violate civil rights.

17. Get control of the schools. Use them as transmission belts for socialism and current Communist propaganda. Soften the curriculum. Get control of teachers' associations. Put the party line in textbooks.

18. Gain control of all student newspapers.

19. Use student riots to foment public protests against programs or organizations which are under Communist attack.

20. Infiltrate the press. Get control of book-review assignments, editorial writing, policymaking positions.

21. Gain control of key positions in radio, TV, and motion pictures.

22. Continue discrediting American culture by degrading all forms of artistic expression. An American Communist cell was told to "eliminate all good sculpture from parks and buildings, substitute shapeless, awkward and meaningless forms."

23. Control art critics and directors of art museums. "Our plan is to promote ugliness, repulsive, meaningless art."

24. Eliminate all laws governing obscenity by calling them "censorship" and a violation of free speech and free press.

25. Break down cultural standards of morality by promoting pornography and obscenity in books, magazines, motion pictures, radio, and TV.

26. Present homosexuality, degeneracy and promiscuity, as "normal, natural, healthy."

27. Infiltrate the churches and replace revealed religion with "social" religion. Discredit the Bible and emphasize the need for intellectual maturity which does not need a "religious crutch."

28. Eliminate prayer or any phase of religious expression in the schools on the ground that it violates the principle of "separation of church and state."

29. Discredit the America Constitution by calling it inadequate, old-fashioned, out of step with modern needs, a hindrance to cooperation between nations on a worldwide basis.

30. Discredit the American Founding Fathers. Present them as selfish aristocrats who had no concern for the "common man."

31. Belittle all forms of American culture and discourage the teaching of American history on the ground that it was only a minor part of the "big picture." Give more emphasis to Russian history since the Communists took over.

32. Support any socialist movement to give centralized control over any part of the culture—education, social agencies, welfare programs, mental health clinics, etc.

33. Eliminate all laws or procedures which interfere with the operation of the Communist apparatus.

34. Eliminate the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

35. Discredit and eventually dismantle the FBI.

36. Infiltrate and gain control of more unions.

37. Infiltrate and gain control of big business.

38. Transfer some of the powers of arrest from the police to social agencies. Treat all behavioral problems as psychiatric disorders which no one but psychiatrists can understand or treat.

39. Dominate the psychiatric profession and use mental health laws as a means of gaining coercive control over those who oppose Communist goals.

40. Discredit the family as an institution. Encourage promiscuity and easy divorce.

41. Emphasize the need to raise children away from the negative influence of parents. Attribute prejudices, mental blocks and retarding of children to suppressive influence of parents.

42. Create the impression that violence and insurrection are legitimate aspects of the American tradition; that students and special-interest groups should rise up and use united force to solve economic, political or social problems.

43. Overthrow all colonial governments before native populations are ready for self-government.

44. Internationalize the Panama Canal.

45. Repeal the Connally reservation so the United States cannot prevent the World Court from seizing jurisdiction over nations and individuals alike.

## American Jewry Meets the Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Mr. Louis H. Solomon on September 28, 1961, at a dinner meeting of the New York University Jewish Culture Foundation, marking the beginning of the campaign to erect a Center for Jewish Culture at New York University.

Mr. Solomon, a trustee of the New York University Jewish Culture Foundation, is a distinguished attorney. He is a graduate of New York University and a noted leader in many civic activities. He is well known among business and community leaders as the head of the Greenwich Village Chamber of Commerce.

His tribute to American Jewish leadership follows:

AMERICAN JEWRY MEETS THE CHALLENGE

(Address presented by Louis H. Solomon on September 28, 1961)

There has been a great deal of provocative discussion of late on the subject of the role of Judaism and the Jew in Judeo-Christian world society. Too much of the discussion is a veiled attack upon the devotion of the Jew to the heritage and traditions that define his status as an identifiable, ethnic personality in a Christian-dominated world and his resistance to pressure for assimilation.

The discussions acknowledge, sometimes with evident reluctance, frequently with extravagant generosity, the importance of Judaism in world culture, as the source of the Judeo-Christian religions, and the essence of Judeo-Christian ethical philosophy. Yes, they say, the Jew has given to mankind the Judeo-Christian religions. He has given Jesus to Christianity. He has provided the concept of justice and the sense of social responsibility which make up the meaning of Judeo-Christian ethical philosophy. But the whole mood of the discussion radiates the sentimental regret that the Jew remains unchanged in his determined status as a Jew, as a separate, identifiable creature, loyal to Judaism in defiance of centuries of pressure for assimilation.

Toynbee, the English historian, reflects the pronounced assimilationist viewpoint. He projects the argument that the resistance of the Jew to assimilation is responsible in a large measure for the anti-Semitic posture of the world.

In a recent discourse by Toynbee, he acknowledges generous recognition of the Jew for fundamental contributions to world society. He even ventures the regret that the strong traits of the Jew, the character responsible for the miracle of survival and so much of the world culture, that this strain is not available to enrich the other segments of human society. The underlying tone of the Toynbee creed is the covert annoyance of the historian, that in spite of centuries of history, in defiance of the sword and the pen, this remains the heritage of the Jew, a relatively small identifiable group, immune to absorption. On the other hand, is the frustrating regret of the historian, that society as a whole is denied the special strain of character values that persist in the Jew and would be made available to the rest of society by intermarriage and full assimilation.

Sometimes one wonders what prompts the persistence of the Toynbee followers to argue for the assimilation of the Jew. What is it that pushes the endeavors of this historian and his disciples so vigorously to bury centuries of sacred traditions, to subvert loyalties to faith, to destroy the spiritual potential that has given so much to so many? There is persuasive authority for the premise that all anti-Semitism is a psychoneurosis. To the psychologist, "anti-Semitism," so-called, to conceal specific Jew hatred (Judenhass), is not explainable as a rational drive. One is tempted to ask—is the pressure for the assimilation of the Jew but an unrestrained sprout from the same sprig? Is it a symptom of the same complex?

THE "INTELLECTUALS"

Contemporaneously with the Toynbee discourse, an article appeared in a recent issue of the magazine Commentary, under the title "Intellectuals" which poses the problem, but with a wide difference in motivation. This article purports to review the attitude on assimilation of the Jew on the college campus. It emphasizes a seeming indifference to heritage and tradition among budding intellectuals.

The intellectuals, so called, are not by any means the sages of our day. Nor do they reflect the mature community judgment. These are students, budding scholars perhaps, living in an environment of challenge, of abstraction and speculation. This is not the climate conducive to respect for tradition or heritage. To them heritage and tradition are related to the dead past. History is important more for its dates than for its monuments. They present a pose of pride in sophistication, a sense of revolt against the authority of yesterday. This is a passing phase in the pursuit of wisdom. Sober assessment of spiritual values will come with maturity. They will learn that man does not live by bread alone. Then shall they claim their kinship to the people of the Bible and the treasured heritage of the Torah.

The infamous Nauman group of pre-Hitler Germany is the prototype for a small segment of American Jewish life emphasizing a pose of sophistication, ready to trade heritage and tradition. They do not want to be counted out of the fold, yet they cannot endure minority status, and they spurn affiliation with the "common herd." Devoid of intellectual insight, of moral vigor, of loyalty to tradition, and the capacity to

evaluate the validity of their great heritage, they are content to separate, to be exclusive, to sit on the sidelines, seemingly in smug complacency, or to vaunt their separateness.

THE POSITIVE REALITIES—MEANINGFUL PLUS VALUES

There has never been a period in the long history of the Diaspora in which the Jew was altogether free from enmities and pressures from without and from within. But the Jew has moved far forward from the cringing, crawling figure of ghetto days. The American Jew has emerged. He stands with head high. He worships openly. He speaks freely. He defends his cultural status vigorously. He manifests openly and freely the enthusiasm and inspiration of a true pride in his great heritage.

In advancing the theme that American Jewry meets the challenge posed by the pressures for assimilation from without and from within, I am not unmindful of the lessons of history—the collapse of the gains made in France following the Dreyfus case, the horrors of the Hitler rule that descended even upon the optimistic and seemingly assimilated, proud German Jew, who compromised heritage and tradition for acceptance, in Germany. Nor am I unmindful of the threat of Nasser and his United Arab Republic, nor of the pose of Rockwell and pseudo-Hitlers of his ilk in America. These are the realities that the Jewish community must never forget or overlook. The frontiers of freedom must never be left unguarded. But in the same context, it must not be forgotten that this is America; that the principle of religious freedom is woven into the very fabric of our basic law and government; that every assault upon religious freedom here has been repulsed. As a lawyer, I have some knowledge of the difference between man rule and government by law. In the tradition of Judaic teaching, in America we "do not rely on princes and the sons of man."

The last 25 years for the Jew in America have been years of incalculable progress, probably the highest in the achievement of integrated community status for the Jew in America, in all of American history.

(a) Israel: Within this period has come the rebirth of Israel and the attainment of its place in the council of nations. Of course, the rebirth of Israel is not an American phenomenon, but the resources for economic and industrial status, for domestic well-being came from America. The response of the American Jew to the event was electric. American Jewish leaders arose. They came from everywhere and from nowhere. It is to the everlasting glory of American Jewish leadership, to the inspired men that led the drive to enlist American resources, to the dedicated leaders of United Jewish Appeal, then and now, that American Jewish millions poured into the little State of Israel, and the glory of Israel was served. This chapter of American Jewish history will ever remain a monument attesting to the realness of the loyalties of the Diaspora in America, to ties of kinship and heritage, as Jews, without dilution of loyalty to America, as Americans.

(b) In the area of higher education: During the last 25 years also, the American Jew has seen the emergence of Brandeis University, of Yeshiva University, and of institutions of learning not so well known, under Jewish sponsorship and supported by the American Jew. Of no less significance is the awakening responsibility of the Jew for sharing in the support of nonsectarian private institutions of learning within the American domain. The growth in the contributions of the American Jew to the support of our colleges and universities and the greater participation of the Jew in executive and administrative departments of American private colleges and universities is writing another important chapter in the history of the developing integrated status of the Jew in American community life.

(c) The breakthrough in higher education: But the greatest gain in the status of the Jew in America, the vital step forward in the area of higher education, may be recorded here in New York, and specifically in developments at New York University.

Twenty-five years ago, not one secular institution of higher learning in America, not one American secular college or university had a department of Hebrew culture. In the early colonial history of America scholarship in Hebrew was an element of culture. The people who came to America and settled in New England were revolting against religious restraints. They sought religious freedom. The first settlement in America was part of a religious revolution. The Old Testament was respected as the source of Western religions. Classical Hebrew was a requirement of the cultured gentleman when Harvard was founded in 1636. Early colonial literature is replete with classical Hebrew.

Then came the impact of politics. Immigration increased. In the political environment that followed, cultural values suffered. Classical Hebrew became but a memory. It was just tolerated as a dead language in the department of Semitics. Then, in the first half of the 20th century, came an unique development.

Twenty-seven years ago there was born at New York University the first curriculum of studies that grew into the Department of Hebrew Culture at New York University. It was the first department devoted to a comprehensive course in Hebrew culture, in any major secular college or university in America. This event was destined to make history.

The factors that led to the founding of the Department of Hebrew Culture at New York University are details of history available to the student of American culture at the university level. Prof. Abraham I. Katsh, head of the Department of Hebrew Studies at New York University, will ever remain the pioneer in the movement, which blazed the way for the scholars who followed.

The significant fact is that this achievement at New York University was a breakthrough, an opening in the hard crust of conventional, American, educational procedures. This was indeed a historic milestone that integrated Hebrew culture into the curriculums of the secular colleges and universities of America.

Today, the top 50 universities in America, including the group known as the Ivy League, boast a department of Hebrew culture and civilization. This is in the pattern set up at New York University, embracing the cultural contributions of the Jewish people, over the entire span of world civilization.

(d) New York University Jewish Culture Foundation: In the academic curriculum of New York University is a chair of Hebrew culture and education, established in perpetuity by generous, farsighted men and women in the community who comprehended the meaning of this historic event.

A full-fledged undergraduate and graduate department of Hebrew culture and education was established. Forty subjects of study in the area of Jewish culture and civilization are now part of the New York University curriculum, leading to all three degrees in Hebrew language and civilization, the baccalaureate, the masters and doctorate. This is the positive, dramatic reality of today.

The now famous New York University Library of Hebraica and Judaica is also a fact. It grew in this great university. It includes priceless volumes and manuscripts, among them the private collection of the late Dr. Mitchell M. Kaplan, poet and bibliophile, containing rare editions, rare manuscripts, and important incunabula. It includes the valuable collection of the late Solomon Rosenthal, presented by his son, the late William Rosenthal; also the invaluable Israel Matz collection of current Judaica and Hebraica and the Semitic collection of rare volumes from the famous Lagarde Library. This proud collection has been augmented by the rare Hebrew and Judaeo-Arabic manuscripts and microfilm uncovered from the unique Hebraica treasures within the Soviet Union, assembled and contributed by Dr. Katsh. This discovery from the archives of Soviet Russia was heretofore unknown to Western scholars.

The campus population of New York University has now reached 20,000 Jewish students, the largest population of Jewish students on the campus of any university in the world. More than 50 percent of the total student enrollment at this university are Jewish students.

This, too, is a significant reality and points up the climate at New York University, referred to in the evaluation made by the great educator, Dr. Carroll V. Newsom, president of the university, as he assessed cultural integration as the factor in true freedom in the following words: "giving reality to the only concept that can make this earth the kind of place we really want for ourselves, for our children, and for our children's children."

This is the living reality at New York University.

Sober scholars speculate that the integration of the study of Hebrew culture and civilization into the curricula of the universities of America, is the most important event in the annals of Judaism in America. Integration of Jewish culture and civilization into the curricula of the universities of America is now a significant reality.

THE GOLDEN ERA IN PROSPECT—A CENTER FOR JEWISH CULTURE

It is difficult even for the student of Jewish history, with a sincere interest in contemporary human progress, to evaluate the contributions of New York University in broadening the academic horizon in American institutions of learning to make a place for Jewish culture and education, in the study program. It is difficult to acknowledge in sober prose the influence of this progressive outlook in the general area of academic life in America. The influence of the Jewish Culture Foundation of New York University and especially of Dr. Katsh in this meaningful result may better be conjectured than explained.

The work of the New York University Jewish Cultural Foundation has moved quietly, with little fanfare, with no attention to publicity. The magnitude of its achievement is not generally known. Its mission to implement and to advance the academic curriculum of the Department of Hebrew Culture tells but part of the story. It serves New York University's 20,000 Jewish students. Its extracurricular service encompasses forums, public lectures, books and other publications, workshops to Israel, study groups, exchange students, interfaith relations.

For me, the last 25 years in America have produced meaningful plus values for American Judaism, historically important beyond present measurement. These gains represent the labors and the heroic achievements of American Jewish leaders. History will record to the memory of the men and women who shared in these achievements a tribute as enduring as time.

As significant as is the emergence of Brandeis University and Yeshiva University on the American scene as institutions of higher learning, as awe inspiring as is this great achievement, it is important that we evaluate the net result for the Jewish community. It must be considered for its service potential in the area of higher education by these institutions. This net result must be assessed in the light of the magnitude of the effort and the cost.

This towering achievement but pales in the light of the monumental developments at New York University in the last 25 years and in the foreseeable future. Here, at New York University, the lives of 20,000 Jewish students are being fashioned for the role of leadership in every field of human endeavor, to take their places in the living community of man. This is the unparalleled, living, functioning reality.

This equation must not be withheld from the American Jewish leaders. Its purpose is not to lessen interest in Brandeis and Yeshiva, of course, but to avoid obscuring the growth, the potentials, the true portion in the promise of tomorrow.

There is now in the making at New York University a program for the articulation of interfaith relations of such scope as to bypass every frontier thus far explored in that area. I refer to the program projected at New York University for a triangular University Religious Center.

The project embraces three centers of culture, the Catholic, the Protestant, and the Jewish, each independent, each wholly autonomous, all united in function and in motive, for better interfaith relations. These three units represent the three sides of the triangle that makes up the Religious Center of New York University.

The thesis underlying the united program is the premise that religious freedom as a theory is not enough. It must be made a way of life in America. It affirms that meaningful integration in community life among peoples of different faiths is attainable only with uncompromising religious freedom. It aims for a broader and better exposure to religious culture and its disciplines and a better climate of understanding among peoples of different faiths.

The New York University Center for Jewish Culture is the first structure of its kind in any secular institution of learning in America. The importance given by American Jewish scholars to the achievement of the integration of Hebrew culture, into the curriculums of institutions of higher learning in America is exceeded only by the magnitude of what is to come in the plan of the triangular Religious Center of New York University, now within reach.

The three centers that make up the New York University Religious Center and the operating fund for each are being financed by public contributions, each group relying primarily on the members of its own faith for support. The campaign for the Catholic Center was organized first, and has raised well over $1 million and is working toward the budgeted requirement of $2 million for building and operating costs.

The Center for Jewish Culture is the responsibility of the New York University Jewish Culture Foundation. The campaign is now in progress. Last October, a member of its board of trustees, aroused by the prospect of a Center for Jewish Culture in this meaningful triangle, acquired and donated to the Jewish Culture Foundation, as the site for the center, a 10-story building and the adjoining 7-story building, on the Washington Square campus of New York University within the area designated for the New York University Religious Center.

The $2 million goal is the problem of a committee of Jewish community leaders which include such names as Mr. Irvin A. Edelman, president of the Jewish Culture Foundation, Mr. Benjamin Hornstein, its honorary president, Mr. Jack A. Goldfarb, its vice president, Mr. Charles Frost, head of the building committee, Hon. Maximilian Moss, Surrogate of Kings County, chairman of the executive committee, and trustee, and others equally identified with the major Jewish philanthropies in contemporary America. They look to the awakening of Jewish leaders in America to the magnitude of the event.

The building is to be the first on the campus of any secular college or university in America, to serve as a center for Jewish culture. It will have the stature and the functioning organization equal to the great responsibility.

The building will house the now famous New York University Library of Judaica and Hebraica available to students of the university and to scholars and researchers from everywhere.

It will serve the 20,000 Jewish students of New York University, many of them away from home and without affiliation for spiritual guidance and influence.

It will provide a center of culture with generous facilities for study and research, within the academic climate of New York University. Its facilities will be available to scholars and study groups from every part of the world.

It will have an auditorium for lectures, for seminars, for the dissemination of ethnical values and disciplines implicit in religious culture, with emphasis on interfaith relations for the community.

It will provide the stimulus to implement the thesis underlying the entire interfaith program at New York University—religious freedom as a way of life in all America.

It will consolidate the gains of yesterday; it will broaden and perpetuate these gains. It will transmit the basic truths beyond the realm of the scholar into the broad avenues of community life.

The program of a Center for Jewish Culture at New York University is so big in meaning, so large in opportunity, so important in fortifying the advances made by the community of Jews in America over preceding generations that its potential must be studied to sense its full significance.

The terms "assimilation" and "integration" are frequently used interchangeably in common speech, with consequent misunderstanding and confusion. To assimilate is to absorb, to destroy identity. To integrate is just the opposite—it means to preserve identity.

When the early Roman Empire prohibited religious worship to the Jew, after the destruction of the second temple, it aimed to destroy the identity of the Jew. When misguided churchmen ordered the tortures of the Spanish Inquisition to end Jewish worship, it amied to destroy Jewish worship and the identity of the Jew. All the cruelties to purge the Jew over 2,000 years of history—all of this aimed at assimilation. The miracle of the survival of the Jew, as a phenomenon of history, attests to the long, successful struggle of Jewish leadership to resist assimilation.

Th recognition of Judaism as on American culture; the introduction of a department of Hebrew Culture and Education into the curricula of studies of American colleges and universities, that is integration. Integration preserves identity.

The freedom to live as you are in a world of diverse cultures is the final test of freedom. That is integration.

The integration of the culture and education of a people, into the curriculum of American life is the American ideal. It was the formula adopted for America when America defined freedom in its Constitution and opened its doors to immigration as the free world.

In that climate of integration a great civilization, a culture evolved out of 3,500 years of discipline, of the wisdom of its prophets and its sages; a culture that has provided the basic religious principle for all of western society and the ethical philosophy for all of contemporary civilization, may serve to enrich the present and be preserved inviolate for posterity.

A TRIBUTE TO JEWISH LEADERS

In the advances of the last 25 years American Jewry has met the challange. American Jewish leaders have served heroically and with inspiration. Never in the history of the Diaspora has leadership given so much and so nobly.

But the golden era lies yet ahead. It will encompass the great gains already here. It will preserve the roots of these gains and cultivate them for posterity. It will open the gates to new understandings and greater freedoms. In the next decades is fulfillment. Opportunity was never more promising.

The leaders of Jewry in America know the achievements of yesterday. They will not fail to evaluate what lies ahead. Let me quote from our sages:

"Men of vision and mercy whose righteous deeds have not been forgotten
Their heritage shall continually remain,
And their names live on unto all generations,
Men will declare their wisdom and continually speak their praises."

This is the tribute. Here also is the prophecy.

---

## Copyright—New Frontiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include my remarks before the American Guild of Authors and Composers on November 14, 1962, at the Hotel New Yorker in New York City:

Now that the American people have chosen their Representatives and we are on the threshold of the 88th Congress, it seems peculiarly appropriate to review with the distinguished members of this guild the strengths and weaknesses of the Nation's copyright laws and the immediate prospects for their improvement as a protection for the authors and composers of music. What are the new frontiers in copyright?

Both as a private citizen and as chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, I have long been interested in the drama and musical arts—as a musician, a devotee of opera, a student, and a champion of the rights of all creators of American music, whether serious or popular. The jurisdiction of our committee includes measures affecting copyrights, but it is not merely concerned with the technical aspects of copyright legislation. The committee has the solemn duty of guarding the intellectual property of composers and authors, and of making sure that as our civilization grows more complex, American native talent will continue to be encouraged by receiving a just return from the commercial exploitation of its works.

For it must be recalled that the copyright law of the United States is founded on the constitutional provision (art. I, sec. 8) which empowers Congress "* * * to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries."

The Constitution thus envisages two purposes in providing for copyright. It wishes to foster the useful arts and it proposes to do so by rewarding authors for their contribution to society. Obviously these two purposes are closely related.

The last general revision of the copyright laws occurred in 1909. We have gone from

a horse-and-buggy day to a nuclear age. Tremendous changes in technology have taken place in the intervening half century. These have fostered entire new industries and new methods for the reproduction and dissemination of literary and artistic works. In consequence the 1909 statute is no longer adequate in its application to present-day conditions. It is like measuring the tail of a pig with the tail of a comet. Among the respects in which the copyright laws fail to achieve the constitutional objectives are a number of shortcomings which peculiarly affect songwriters and composers—notably the present inadequate term of copyright protection, the outmoded jukebox exemption, insufficient sanctions against the counterfeiting and piracy of phonograph records, the compulsory license for the recording of music, and the awkward and unsatisfactory provisions governing renewal and reversion of copyrights.

Past efforts to bring the copyright laws up to date have failed, largely, according to the Register of Copyrights, because of controversy among various private interest groups having a stake in the matter. In 1955, however, Congress provided funds for a comprehensive study by the Copyright Office as the groundwork for a general revision and in 1961, after much study, the Register issued a tentative report containing detailed recommendations.

These recommendations in large measure meet the proposals of your own group as to major matters, though varying in some areas and in particular details. Widespread discussions of the Register's report were undertaken and are still in progress, with your organization taking a leading part. What is more, the Copyright Office has now turned its efforts to the drafting of a comprehensive bill which, in turn, will be the subject of extensive study by interested parties before it is submitted to Congress. It is hoped that, with the genuine cooperation of organizations interested in the project, such submission will take place during the forthcoming 88th Congress.

While waiting for the legislative proposals of the Register, the 87th Congress has not been idle in this field. With respect to the term of copyright, for example, Congress was called upon, as an emergency measure, to take steps to prevent the expiration of renewal terms of copyright during the period which still must elapse before the enactment of overall legislation. The present term of copyrights, as you know, is 28 years from first publication or registration, renewable during the 28th year by certain persons for a second period of 28 years. One criticism of existing law is that today the United States is the only important Western power in which it is possible for a copyright to expire during the life of the author. The Register's 1961 report recommends that the maximum term be increased from 56 to 76 years. Under this recommendation the basic term would continue to run for 28 years, and would be renewable for a second term of 48 years. Although some groups, including your own, prefer a term of protection that would endure for the life of the author and for 50 years thereafter, as is the rule in many European countries, all interested parties appear to agree that the present term of copyright is unduly short. Meanwhile, existing renewal terms were continuing to expire and would be lost forever.

In this context, I introduced House Joint Resolution 627, which extends the duration of copyright protection temporarily. As enacted, this measure continues until the end of 1965 the renewal terms of all copyrights subsisting on September 19, 1962, the date on which President Kennedy approved my measure. It thus provides an interim suspension of copyright expirations pending the enactment of detailed overall copyright legislation. Originally this bill proposed to extend copyright terms until the end of 1967, but the subcommittee accepted the argument of the Register of Copyright that a temporary extension of that length might unduly impair the incentive of interested parties for achieving agreement on an overall revision.

Another significant congressional achievement of the 87th Congress in this area was the enactment of my bill outlawing the vicious traffic in counterfeiting phonograph records. Hearings before the Copyright Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary elicited testimony from representatives of phonograph record manufacturers, music publishers, and composers and performers of music to the effect that there exists a widespread practice of counterfeiting phonograph records, including labels, produced by reputable phonograph record manufacturers and selling them in interstate commerce in competition with the genuine articles. In 1960, alone, it was estimated, this practice drained more than $20 million from the legitimate music industry. Typically, the counterfeiter takes hold of a legitimate phonograph record manufactured by a reputable concern and containing a popular song or arrangement. He makes copies of the recording and of the label as well. Then he palms off his counterfeit copies as the genuine products of the manufacturer whose label and recording he has appropriated.

Because the counterfeiter operates outside the law, paying no compensation to artists, no arrangers' fees, no copyright royalties, and no excise taxes, he is able to sell his illegitimate and often mechanically inferior records to jobbers and dealers at prices far below those charged by the legitimate manufacturers whose work has been forged.

The victims of this unconscionable practice are many. They include songwriters and publishers; record manufacturers, distributors, and dealers; recording artists and musicians; manufacturers of phonographs; and the U.S. Government. The songwriters, publishers, artists, and musicians are deprived of their royalties. The record industry is denied its legitimate profits. The Federal Government is robbed of its excise and other taxes. And the music-loving public, often as not, receives a mechanically imperfect product. This in turn injures the reputation of the artists and of the manufacturers of records and sound equipment, because the public naturally attributes the mechanical defects of the counterfeit record to the producers of the real thing.

The few State laws which attempt to deal with the problem impose relatively ineffective fines. Counterfeiters are happy to pay such fines, regarding them as in the nature of licenses.

Inasmuch as counterfeit records are being shipped in interstate commerce across State lines, I believe it essential to the proper administration of justice that Congress should enact a Federal criminal statute that would add the power and weight of the Federal Government to State and county law enforcement agencies. Accordingly, I introduced and Congress enacted H.R. 11793, a bill that amends the Federal Criminal Code by declaring the traffic in counterfeit records to be a criminal act, subject to fine and imprisonment.

I believe that it is significant that both of these measures—the copyright extension bill and the counterfeit record bill—underwent amendment before they were enacted. I cannot emphasize too strongly the necessity for flexibility and compromise in the area of copyright legislation. In the copyright extension bill, as I have said, Congress accommodated the need of copyright owners to be saved from unnecessary extinction of their right to the equally urgent need of the Register to avoid a flagging of interest in a final agreement in overall revision. I believe the accommodation was a wise one.

Similarly, the counterfeit record bill underwent revision by the Senate, which sharply reduced the penalties provided by the House bill. This took place near the end of the session. Our House Committee was faced with the alternatives of accepting the Senate amendments and the greatly reduced penalties, or asking the Senate for a conference. In the second alternative, it is possible that we might have come out with a stronger deterrent; on the other hand, we might have come out with nothing at all. In this context committee staff consulted the principal proponents of the measure, representatives of phonograph record manufacturers. These persons wisely expressed their preference for a bird in the hand. I think this was much to their credit. One must stretch one's feet according to one's blanket. The measure, as amended by the Senate, was enacted; trafficking in counterfeit records is now a Federal offense; and the investigative agencies of the Federal Government can be enlisted to stamp it out. A new deterrent has been placed on the books and, should the penalties prove inadequate, they can easily be revised upward.

There is one area, however, in which the spirit of compromise and accommodation has not yet borne fruit. I refer to my unceasing efforts to bring about the repeal of the anachronistic and outmoded jukebox exemption.

Through the years, Congress has amended the provisions of the copyright law to protect authors and composers in the commercial exploitation of their creative works by requiring users to pay reasonable fees to copyright owners for the sale or use of their property. Radio and television broadcasters, concert halls, movies, hotels, cabarets, wired music—all these industries pay composers of copyrighted music for the right of commercial performance. The sole exception is the coin machine operator—the corporation that owns and leases coin machine phonographs to taverns and restaurants. To quote the Register of Copyrights, "Jukebox operators are the only users of music for profit who are not obliged to pay royalties, and there is no special reason for their exemption. The jukebox exemption should be repealed or at least replaced by a provision requiring jukebox operators to pay reasonable license fees for public performance for music or profit." With this statement I agree. The use of copyrighted music on jukeboxes for profit without so much as a by-your-leave to the composers of such works is nothing less than legalized piracy.

In the 85th and 86th Congresses, I introduced bills to repeal the jukebox exemption. In June 1959 the Copyright Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary held extensive hearings on my bill, H.R. 5931. Witness after witness testified to the injustice and inequity of the out-of-date copyright law which was enacted in 1909, 21 years before the modern machine phonograph made its appearance. Helen Sousa Abert, daughter of the late John Philip Sousa, told the subcommittee; "A songwriter is entitled to compensation during the short term of his copyright from all sources which perform his work publicly for profit. The jukebox is certainly performing copyrighted music for profit."

The subcommittee also heard from qualified witnesses that the jukebox industry is today a $500 million industry—purchasing popular works at wholesale prices and selling renditions of the music at 10 cents a play. Coin machine performances of recordings are clearly performances for profit; but under existing law the composer receives no royalties for them.

On the other hand, the coin machine operators make the plea that they cannot afford to pay such royalties, that they fear that outright repeal of the present exemption would leave them at the mercy of the copyright owners who might charge them unconscionable fees.

Thus, embraced in controversy, the antiquated 1909 jukebox exemption remains unchanged. But it should be changed, and Congress must act responsibly to find a path of justice in this matter.

In August 1958 a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary reported favorably a bill to repeal the jukebox exemption. In the report on this measure there were several references to a possible compromise solution of the problem, offered by the National Beverage Association. This proposal envisaged the payment of between $15 and $25 per annum per coin-operated machine, depending upon size. Even Mr. George Miller, president of the Music Operators of America, Inc., originally expressed interest in this proposal and the House Judiciary Committee staff attempted to schedule a conference for the purpose of discussing it. This conference, however, could not be arranged, the operators having apparently lost all interest in discussing a possible area of agreement.

In the 87th Congress I again introduced a bill to repeal the jukebox exemption, H.R. 70. Along with the Register of Copyrights, many public-spirited citizens—authors, newspaper columnists, actors—have endorsed H.R. 70. The Department of State supports it. The American Bar Association, the American Patent Association support it. But because of the controversy that surrounds this matter, some Members of Congress may feel that a blanket repeal of the exemption is not the best answer, because the coin machine operators and the music copyright owners might not be able to agree on fair and equitable royalty in negotiations. Accordingly I introduced, as an alternative to H.R. 70, a new bill, H.R. 12450, which would not only provide for the payment of royalties by jukebox operators but would also establish trustees with an obligation to provide for the fair and orderly determination of the amount and the proper distribution of such royalties. Hearings were scheduled on these bills but had to be canceled because of the unavailability of necessary witnesses.

In the new Congress I shall again introduce legislation for the purpose of eliminating this grossly unfair provision of existing law and I shall do everything in my power to see to it that this legislation is given a very high priority.

In appraising the reasons for the failure of Congress thus far to remedy this unconscionable situation, I believe that the members of your guild—as well as all members and friends of the songwriting profession—have an indispensable role to play. Because of the inability to foresee the development and popularity of the coin-operated phonograph, the jukebox industry has been able to reap large profits from the exploitation of music and at the same time to deprive the songwriters of their just share. The songwriters must bring the justice of their position to the attention of the Members of Congress, not only in the large urban centers but also the less populated areas. I am confident that when the issue is thoroughly understood remedial action will inevitably follow.

I believe that all auguries are peculiarly favorable for substantial progress in copyright law reform. The Federal administration has uniquely manifested its interest in cultural affairs, having for the first time appointed a Special Presidential Consultant on the Arts, the Honorable August Heckscher. The President and the First Lady have manifested great zeal in fostering the arts in this country. They have in many ways shown that we do not live by bread alone. The Congress will be increasingly alert and sympathetic to these problems, having worked with them, and it is your job to make us wholly conversant with your needs and problems. The Copyright Office is diligently tackling the challenging task of drafting legislation. Last, but not least, distinguished organizations like your own with specific stakes in copyright legislation are lending their expert assistance to the Register in attempting to accommodate competing interests and minimize conflicts among groups. It is hoped the new Congress will see the introduction of a general revision bill supported by the greatest possible consensus. In this work, no less than in the work of legislators, patience, statesmanship, recognition of th other fellow's needs, and an eye to the public interest are indispensable. Above all you must learn patience. Patience is bitter but it bears sweet fruit. From what I have seen of their work, I am happy to say that your own president, Burton Lane, your counsel, Mr. Kellman, as well as the members of your copyright committee, admirably combine these qualities and seem uniquely fitted to represent the interests of your guild in this vital area. I am confident, also, that the public interest will be furthered by their continued efforts.

## American Memorial to Churchill To Be Established at Westminster College, Fulton, Mo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I include a report on the American Memorial to Sir Winston Churchill to be established at Westminster College, Fulton, Mo.:

AMERICAN MEMORIAL TO CHURCHILL TO BE ESTABLISHED AT WESTMINSTER

As a memorial to Winston Churchill's Iron Curtain speech a long-vacant Christopher Wren church, blitzed by enemy air raids over London in 1941, will rise again on the campus of Westminster College in Fulton, if the request made by the college board of trustees of the Bishop of London is granted. Westminster is the scene of the famous and prophetic speech, made at the college March 5, 1946.

Permission is being sought from the church, civil and arts authorities to dismantle St. Mary Aldermanbury, or at least the outside shell of it, transport it to Fulton, and rebuild it and rededicate it as the chapel of Westminster College. In honor of Sir Winston's visit to the campus it will bear the name of the British wartime prime minister. In response to a letter from Westminster officials, Sir Winston said:

"I am honored that Westminster College should wish to commemorate the speech I made at Fulton on March 5, 1946. The removal of a ruined Christopher Wren church, largely destroyed by enemy action in London in 1941, and its reconstruction and rededication at Fulton, is an imaginative concept. It may symbolize in the eyes of the English-speaking peoples the ideals of Anglo-American association on which rest, now as before, so many of our hopes for peace and the future of mankind."

Located in the heart of the city of London, not far from St. Paul's Cathedral, the Church of St. Mary the Virgin, Aldermanbury, was erected by Sir Christopher Wren on the site of an earlier church which was destroyed by the great fire. The year of its completion is believed to be 1677. In the adjoining churchyard are the tombs of Henry Condell and John Heminge, associates of William Shakespeare who are generally credited with the preservation of many of his plays by arranging for their printing from his original manuscripts. No tombs or other local memorials will be disturbed when the outer shell of the church is taken down.

Once it is located on the campus of Westminister College, the Wren church will serve not only as the College Prayer Chapel, but, attached to it, will be a repository of Churchill memorabilia, of which the college already has a sizable collection. It will in fact become the Churchill memorial in the United States. The present chapel, though built only in 1917, is slated for razing, due to foundation weaknesses which developed during a long series of droughts.

It is estimated that it will cost about $200,000 to complete the first step, namely, dismantling the church, packing it in numbered pieces and transporting the stonework overseas and by inland waterways to Fulton. Final estimates on the total costs of reconstruction have not yet been completed. The project's completion is contingent upon the ability of the college to raise the necessary funds.

## S-s-s-sh!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[Editorial from the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 9, 1963]

S-S-S-SH!

If participation in the Kerr-Mills program of old-age medical assistance had dropped last year, or even stood still, we can't help wondering what the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would have had to say about that in its roundup progress report on Government help for the aged.

As it turned out, the 16-page HEW report devoted a single brief paragraph to Kerr-Mills, concentrating almost entirely on the point that average payments declined under the program. It avoided entirely the facts that the actual number of Kerr-Mills beneficiaries during the year ending last June more than doubled, from 46,247 to 101,634, and that monthly payments around the country in that period increased from $9,311,027 to $17,415,814.

Why? Well, according to Miss Ruth Lauder, a spokesman for the HEW staff, the omission of any reference to gains in the program was not deliberate. For one thing,

she said, the report concentrated on newer and more dramatic programs—including, presumably, the President's bill for medical care for the aged through social security, which the report called the most important legislative proposal of 1962. And anyway, Miss Lauder added, the Kerr-Mills program is really an income maintenance program, which doesn't have anything to do with the health of old people, except indirectly.

This must be a surprise to those Members of Congress who passed the Kerr-Mills program, who think it has not been given a fair shake, and who believe it is at least a partial answer to the administration bill One who is not surprised, however, is Representative BYRNES, of Wisconsin, the ranking Republican member of the House Ways and Means Committee. Mr. BYRNES says the HEW has deliberately kept the program in a vacuum, that it has not only been dragging its feet on encouraging State participation in Kerr-Mills but has actually put stumbling blocks in the way of its success.

Whether that statement is accurate or not it is certainly true that the public at large has only the fuzziest idea about the Kerr-Mills program and how it is working. And from this viewpoint alone, the congressional investigation of the matter which Mr. BYRNES has advocated is clearly merited.

## Independence Day of Libya

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on December 24, 1962, Libya celebrated the anniversary of her independence, and we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Majesty, King Idris I of Libya; and His Excellency, the Ambassador of Libya to the United States, Dr. Mohieddine Fekini, on the occasion of the eleventh anniversary of Libya's independence.

Eleven years have passed since the nations of the world were witness to a modern Christmas story; for on December 24, 1951, a new nation was born for all the world to proclaim and honor. Libya, so long a pawn and conquered territory of militant powers, became a new member of the world community.

Successive waves of conquest comprise Libyan history, from Phoenician times through Greek, Roman, Vandal, Arab, Turk and Italian, to German and British forces during World War II. All have imparted an important lesson where Libya is concerned—its strategic importance as a crossroads between Europe and Asia.

Libya is primarily a desert. And unfortunately this desert, until the present, has been a deterrent for economic stability and independence. The Romans had built vast irrigation systems to support the large cities which they built in Libya. But through the years, these cisterns and water aqueducts fell into ruin. The newly independent country was in poor straights at its birth. The desert, though, became the succor for the nation when oil was discovered. The discovery of oil in other desert nations in the Mediterranean area led geologists to suspect the presence of oil in the South of Libya, but its production is above and beyond the expectation of any specialist. "Oil" is now the keyword to the country. Its entire economic system is being geared toward an oil economy. As one writer so aptly proclaimed:

> Only 5 years ago, Libya was regarded as little more than a vast empty tract of the Sahara's rock and sand. • • • Within that brief half decade, Libya underwent an economic metamorphosis that has already transformed it into a viable State possessing a dynamic and expanding economy.[1]

By 1965 oil royalties will amount to $500 million. Twenty-one oil companies have established headquarters in the country, with more expected. Development possibilities are unlimited.

Each year, as the world helps the Libyans to celebrate their independence, one and all can review with pleasure the progress that has occurred. Expansion of agriculture and water projects will enable the Libyans once more to call their country a granary as the Romans did during their reign. Confidence in the government is establishing greater unity throughout the three semi-autonomous provinces and will enable the Central Government to carry out without discord its development projects.

The United States has interested itself in Libyan affairs since the Barbary Pirates pillaged American shipping. Today the United States has in Libya, Wheelus Field, a tremendous air base. There are approximately 10,000 Americans stationed or living in Libya. The policies of Libya and the United States are, therefore, closely allied. Recently the Crown Prince visited the United States on a good will tour, solidifying the amity of the two nations. It is with great pleasure that we in America recognize the anniversary of the establishment of Libyan independence.

[1] Stephen Duncan-Peters, Foreign Commerce Weekly, Feb. 5, 1962, p. 208.

## Is Venezuela Changing?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, last year I inserted in the RECORD a history of the seizure and confiscation of the properties of American citizens and investors in Venezuela. Subsequent to the seizure and confiscation of some $20 million of property, the U.S. Government gave aid and loaned millions of dollars to Venezuela.

I cannot understand this and have opposed it with all the vigor at my command. American taxpayers cannot understand it and, certainly, investors are not going to put more money in these Latin American and South American countries and then have it taken away from them. This, to me, is utterly ridiculous, and I sincerely hope that our State Department and the President will take some steps to see to it that the Government of Venezuela or any other country first reimburses the American investors the money they have put into businesses in Venezuela, or return the properties to the rightful owners who operate under the agreements made.

I am inserting herewith an article entitled, "Is Venezuela Changing?" This gives a reasonable history of the present situation and the seizure of one property that cost millions of dollars of investors' money:

IS VENEZUELA CHANGING?

Is Venezuela moving, and in which direction, forward or backward. Nothing remains still, as it is a world of faction, one of movement. Which way is Venezuela going?

It is a question asked by many. To arrive at an intelligent answer we must look at what has happened in the immediate past—not what has been said, or will be be said. Actions speak for themselves and are easily understood, while volumes are written that well may be meaningless.

In this present 13th annual conference on the Carribbean much has been expressed about various roles—that of the private investor at home—that of the foreign investor—the role of the Government, both fiscal and taxwise—and the role of the Government in aiding business—and how such roles are activated—promoted—and influenced. Much has also been said of projects of the past. We must look at the present and to the future.

The main foundation upon which all such roles must be supported is confidence.

Confidence is an element that is created and nurtured over a long period before it arrives at its full maturity. It then must be protected from any sudden impacts, or shocks, as it always remains delicate. It can be destroyed overnight.

We now look at the record of the immediate past in Venezuela. It is again emphasized—actions speak louder than words—they speak for themselves. A single incident is chosen from the record.

In 1952 a small group of U.S. investors, having among its members, leading bankers and industrial leaders, obtained large concessions to explore for minerals in Venezuela. This group put up its own money and started a vast exploration program on its area in northeastern Venezuela. It was first necessary to build many miles of roads through dense jungle and mountainous terrain in order to have access. This initial stage of exploration took several years. It was during this part of the program after the drilling equipment had been brought in that geothermal energy (superheated natural steam) was discovered at depth. This continues to blow off with great force. This steam is also laden with minerals, making it most economical to extract them directly from the steam. The best known scientists were engaged to continue the studies.

As more money was needed this original group was greatly enlarged and the work was continued. This superheated natural steam (geothermal energy) had lain under the earth's surface in the jungles of northeastern Venezuela for over 20,000 years according to scientists prior to our discovery.

The volume of the geothermal heat source is, of course, millions of times greater than all the known resources of fossil fuels and will endure for millions of years. In other words, it is inexhaustible. Of the 4,000 miles from the surface of the earth to the center

of the earth, some 20 miles of this surface cap has been cooled off, and has taken millions of years. Therefore, the remaining heat source has practically eternal life expectancy. The only problem is to find the vent flues bringing this heat to within accessible distance from the surface. These have been found in Italy, New Zealand, California, and lastly on these concessions in northeastern Venezuela.

This great and important discovery was made by these private investors from the United States. It would have added much to the economy of Venezuela in many respects, in addition to generating cheap electricity. How were these investors rewarded—the following is the story.

A contract was made with the Venezuelan Government in April 1959 who were to purchase electric power that was produced by this geothermal energy. On the strength of such contract and the future plans for the project arrangements were made for a credit of $25 million. These were also private funds.

At this time after 8 years of work and without any discussion this geothermal energy, which had been our property since its discovery in 1955, was nationalized by decree No. 126 dated August 28, 1959. These private investors were given a choice by their Venezuelan attorneys, either to sue then for damages, or to attempt to negotiate an equitable contract. They were assured that no harm would come from this act of nationalization by the Ministry of Mines, Juan Pablo Perez Alfonso, on November 17, 1959. Negotiations were then started.

The results of this no harm guarantee was that after 3 years of useless negotiations, and just 3 months ago, the company was given an ultimatum by the Minister of Mines, on a take it or leave it basis to produce and sell electricity, to the Venezuelan Government at a rate that in itself was confiscatory.

No compensation was ever offered the company for the confiscation of its property rights, or for the unilateral cancellation of the original purchase power contract, or the losses sustained by the 3 years of paralyzation of the project since the nationalization.

The effects of such crude and ruthless treatment to U.S. investors has had wide and distinctly unfavorable repercussions toward Venezuela, having been denounced in the Senate of the United States, as well as on the floor of the House of Representatives of the United States.

This incident is cited from the record as an aid to future planning, and in an effort toward possibly creating a more favorable investment climate in Venezuela for private investment funds.

Let us all learn from such actions. Let such wrongs be corrected, so that, the important element called confidence may again be created and nurtured in Venezuela.

As we are one large hemispheric family, it is only by such frankness and open discussion an understanding of fundamentals can be reached.

## The Spirit of the Unknown Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, my constituent, Mr. Dan Arteaga of Richmond, Calif., has written such an inspiring tribute—"The Spirit of the Unknown Soldier"—that I would like to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that it may receive the widest possible distribution:

THE SPIRIT OF THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER

I am the spirit of the Unknown Soldier, my name, rank, or place of origin is of no importance. I am an American.

I died for you to obtain and preserve freedom and independence, the pursuit of happiness, peace and security.

I died all over the world by the struggle of war between nations and among brothers.

I died for good causes, also for appeasement, miscalculations, and blunder.

To obtain the independence of this Nation, I fought and died at Lexington and Bunker Hill. To maintain the Union and abolish slavery, I gave my life at Fort Sumter, at Gettysburg, and Richmond, Va. At the Alamo I died to repel the invasion of the imperialist Santa Ana.

In the two World Wars I died to stop the arrogance of the Kaiser, Hitler, and Hirohito. In Korea, I died to appease the Communist hordes.

I died in Verdun and St. Mihiel, at Pearl Harbor, Manila, and Corregidor, in the sands of Iwo Jima, in the Pacific and in the Atlantic, at Tunis, Cologne, Essen, and Dusseldorf.

I died in the battlefields, in the air and on land, in the swamps, and jungles, in the hot sands of Africa, or froze and drowned in the cold waters of the ocean; by the treacherous air raids at Pearl, or by the tropical diseases of the Pacific. I died of malnutrition, weather exposure, or mistreated as a prisoner of war. I died as the result of war, at home and abroad, in war and peace. I died for you, for my country, and for liberty.

By an act of Congress, a day has been set aside to commemorate the event on Memorial Day. Flowers were spread over the ocean, wreaths placed over my tomb, speeches delivered, special events performed; I saw you at the parks and beaches, at home and on the road; I was awakened by the event.

While awake, my spirit went back to the places and times where I died. I want to recapitulate, to observe and ask: What have I died for? Has freedom, the pursuit of happiness been maintained? Has the fear of war ceased all over the world? Has the stain of my blood been washed off from my flag, with peace, tranquillity, and respect for my country? If that is the case, let me accept your honor and I will rest in peace; if not, permit me to suggest how I should be honored:

Honor me by preserving the things for which I died; liberty and freedom from want, the independence and respect for my country. Honor me at the Executive decisions and congressional legislation, at the foreign conference table, when the common enemy of democracy would try to take something for nothing, when the lives and welfare of my fellow men are at stake. At the United Nations, when the property and dignity of the free nations are in jeopardy, then honor me.

Honor my wife with enthusiasm and the chance to maintain a home and raise my family. Put the Congressional Medal of Honor on the chest of my children by giving them the protection that I cannot give them, the proper education and opportunity to become worthy citizens; teach them the principles for which I died, tell them of the genuine glory and pride of this country, keep them from falling into the lies and treachery of totalitarian doctrines. Place a wreath of laurel leaves on the head of my elderly mother, help her if she is in need, reward my father in his older days.

With all these things, tell me that I did not die in vain, show me that you meant to honor me.

## Conservatives Are Justified in Hard Foreign Aid Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the Ypsilanti, Mich., Daily Press of January 8, 1963:

CONSERVATIVES ARE JUSTIFIED IN HARD FOREIGN AID STAND

(By John Chamberlain)

It is often said of conservatives that they are mean, curmudgeonly fellows who like to see babies starve to death. And when a conservative—or an old-fashioned liberal like myself—opposes an extension of foreign aid, the common retort is that men on the right wing of contemporary politics have no feeling for the needs of less fortunate countries.

In the arguments, pro and con, over foreign aid, the fact that it is generally unsuccessful when it passes through the hands of governments is pretty much overlooked. Yet even liberals such as J. Kenneth Galbraith, our Ambassador to India, are coming to see that intergovernmental grants and loans tend to get short-circuited. They are wasted, so to speak, on Cadillacs for potentates, and the common people, far from benefiting from the money, cower in the alleyways.

When foreign aid follows voluntary patterns, however, it is seldom wasted. And the fact is that some of our most effective foreign aid comes as a reflex of programs developed by farsighted businessmen.

There is Mr. J. Paul Austin, the new president of the Coca-Cola Co., for example. With a long background of experience in Africa and Europe, Mr. Austin is a mine of information about the unintended local benefits of American business activity in foreign parts. Coca-Cola went into foreign countries for a reason that was eminently acceptable to its stockholders: it was looking to make more money. But that, as Mr. Austin points out, proved to be only half of the tale.

In the Middle East, even as late as the 1950's thirsty people drank germ-infested water out of community tincups that were dipped, unwashed, into malodorous goatskins. For a short period the appearance of Coca-Cola in the Middle East seemed to be helping only that segment of the population that could afford the local equivalent of a nickel for a drink. But soon a number of secondary—and unidentified—effects became apparent.

It so happens that Coca-Cola depends on an absolutely pure water supply. To provide enough water to mix with concentrate, local bottlers had to import the latest and most efficient methods of water purification. Local politicos, watching sewerage water being transformed by running it through modern filters, suddenly saw a bright light.

The example spread to southeastern Asia; Singapore, for instance, gave itself a modern water system after looking at a Coke bottling plant. And in distant San Salvador in Central America, where Coca-Cola had an early program the Government used the local Coke bottling works to supply water for the town when an earthquake disrupted the municipal mains.

In its dealings with foreign countries, Coca-Cola is careful to avoid the taunts of "coca colonization" by letting local entrepreneurs build and own the bottling plants, the glassworks, the metalworking establishments, and the lithographic industries,

that are needed to bring the product to the customer.

But the benefits deriving from the diffusion of ownership among the local populations were not limited to indigenous capitalists. A metalworking industry, formed to produce, bottle caps, soon branched out in many countries to provide other types of metal products. Glassworks created to make soft drink containers found themselves taking orders for medicine bottles.

Local truck services, using Coca-Cola maintenance manuals, were quickly plunged into a general garage business, with the result that the lifetime of a truck in the Middle East or Africa has been extended to 5 years instead of the traditional 1.

To its establishments in Atlanta, Ga., and elsewhere in the United States and Canada, Coca-Cola brings hundreds of young native foreign executives every year on its own version of the Fulbright scholarships. Turbaned Indians mingle with Chinese from Malaya and Latins from South America as they go about the United States for 3-month capsule courses in modern management techniques.

And the hundreds who go back to Africa and Asia carry advanced management know-how with them to indoctrinate thousands of their countrymen who never leave home.

Thus the benefits from a voluntary foreign aid program are spread like seeds from a bursting milkweed pod. It beats anything that Washington has been able to dream up.

## The Words and Deeds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the major legislative actions of the 87th Congress was the passage of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. The administration made a strong request for support on this bill and members on both sides of the aisle responded. It was sought by the administration as a way of freeing up trade, of promoting the freer and fairer interchange of goods among the nations of the world.

At the time this proposal was under discussion, however, the administration was in the process of arranging an international cartel in the textile industry, setting quotas on the amount of textile products which would be received in each country from abroad. Very quietly, unlike the vocal proclamation of its free trade policies, the administration came to the Congress to get additional, after the fact, increase in power to be sure its trade limitation agreement would be valid. This act on the part of the administration, evincing so different a philosophy from its policy declarations on the Trade Expansion Act, is noted along with other suspected trade limiting "deals" by the administration in an editorial comment in the New Republic of December 8, 1962.

I think the administration owes the American people an honest statement of its beliefs in the area of foreign trade. Are we to believe the words or the deeds?

Especially disheartening to me is the fact, as noted in the New Republic's statement, that these under-the-table deals are far more restrictive of trade than are tariffs. The marketplace loses its function when decisions on how much of a particular item shall be imported falls within the discretion of an administrator with power to set quotas, issue licenses, control exchange rates, or whatever one of the broad range of trade restrictions is chosen in a particular case. The first real step to making trade more free is assuring that it is fair. The Trade Expansion Act did this by establishing a forum to which complaints of unfair trade practices might be brought and in which the interests of those affected might be aired. This is an excellent provision, yet through the acts of the administration the value of this forum, and the chance for an open resolution of the competing interests, is in jeopardy.

The New Republic's editorial is a serious indictment of the duplicity of the administration in this matter. I believe it deserves the attention and consideration of the Congress. It follows:

FREE TRADE, BUT—

The administration's most acclaimed legislative victory in the 87th Congress—the trade bill—was won at some cost. Protectionist pledges were made, and these presumably will have to be given consideration by Christian Herter as he administers the Trade Expansion Act. The cotton textile industry was assuaged by a worldwide system of quotas which will probably limit the imports into this and other industrial countries of cotton textiles to annual increases of between 3 and 5 percent. A high official in the Department of Commerce has even suggested that the administration is committed to trade limitation agreements for each textile commodity. The oil industry seems to have been promised that quotas on crude petroleum imports would continue, the coal industry that residual fuel oil imports would remain under control, the lumber industry that it will be saved from Canadian competition.

Last week, five senior Japanese Cabinet Ministers visited Washington to discuss trade, aid and international finance. The Japanese have done well in the U.S. market—imports from Japan went from $182 million in 1950 to $1.1 billion in 1961, and rose another 35 percent in the first 8 months of 1962. A few U.S. industries have been arguing since 1956, however, that these imports were seriously hurting profits and employment. They have been pressuring the administration to establish import quotas. That has not been done, but by threatening the Japanese with the possibility, the administration has persuaded them to impose a comprehensive system of "voluntary export quotas" on about 30 Japanese commodities, ranging from baseball gloves to Christmas light bulbs, which account for between 25 and 35 percent of Japanese sales in the United States.

Unlike tariffs, "voluntary" quotas are worked out under the table; the number and size of the quotas, and the ways of setting them up, remain obscure. The future of these quotas will be a significant index of how far the administration is prepared to go in supporting a policy of freer trade which, harmful as it inevitably is to some domestic industries, benefits both American exporters and consumers.

## Birmingham's Committee of One Hundred To Push Hard for New Business and Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, Birmingham's Committee of One Hundred was a pioneer effort of local business leaders to attract new industry to our area. Its efforts have been singularly successful. Part of the explanation for its success lies in the advantages that Birmingham has for plants and firms that are expanding their operations. However, part of the explanation lies in the dynamic and public-spirited leadership of men who have headed the committee in years past.

This year Caldwell Marks is chairman of the Committee of One Hundred and the following is an account of talk to local business and professional people which indicates that Birmingham's growth industrially will continue:

COMMITTEE OF ONE HUNDRED WILL USE BIG SELL TECHNIQUES IN 1963

Birmingham has the stuff of which great cities are made.

Take a look around you and start assessing the resources, natural and man made, that abound in this Birmingham district; in other words, start counting your local blessings.

These hard-hitting words came today from Caldwell Marks, newly named chairman of Birmingham's Committee of One Hundred, the industry-seeking organization of local business and professional people that set a pattern the world over for this type of agency.

"No salesman ever sold a product by knocking it," Chairman Marks said cryptically, foretelling the manner in which he will seek to mold the committee's activities during the coming 12 months.

What I mean is, we can sell Birmingham to the Nation and world at large by stressing the many fine things that already exist here.

In that way, we create an image of Birmingham that is true, factual, and salable."

MEDICAL AND RESEARCH

Then, enumerating some of the city's and district's advantages, Marks pointed to:

"We have a wonderful medical center right here in Birmingham. Can you point to another city in the South with such a center?

"We have great research facilities right here in Birmingham. Southern Research Institute is the finest institution of its kind in the entire Southland, and it is growing daily.

"How about our climate? Isn't it wonderful? You can work, play, do anything you want virtually the year round, right here in the Birmingham district. Our climate is a great asset.

"WATER RESOURCES

"Look at our water resources. We just cut into a new industrial water supply, which adds 75 million gallons of water daily to what we previously have been able to offer industry. We can offer industry in America today what few other cities can offer, and that is an abundance of water that is the best for industrial purposes."

The committee chairman then swerved over to Birmingham's cultural resources, pointing to:

"Our wonderful art museum; our grand symphony orchestra; our splendid little theater groups; our civic ballet; our varied recreational facilities here and within a 50- or 100-mile radius of the city.

"We have everything in or near Birmingham to provide the good life, the best life available in America."

Marks then pointed to a little-known fact about municipal airport. "It's closed down by weather factors less than any airport in the entire country, except for Miami, Fla., and Phoenix, Ariz."

FINE TRANSPORTATION

Marks also praised the district's "fine bus transportation system, its fine truck facilities for transporting goods and commodities, the excellent railroad facilities that connect Birmingham with all parts of the Nation."

Then this industrialist, with years of strictly industrial work in his background, expounded on Birmingham's "excellent labor supply."

"People are productive in this area," he declared. "They are easily trained. They adapt easily and well to new jobs, and in certain areas we have a large supply of highly skilled labor.

"Our labor climate has improved tremendously, and it's now better than that of most cities in the country. That is a great and salable asset for Birmingham today."

NO ORGANIZED CRIME

People for too long have taken Birmingham for granted in the realm of the way its governments operate locally, Marks stated. He explained what he meant this way:

"Our city is relatively free of vice, of organized crime, of corruption in government," he said. "You can read in your daily paper of vice, gambling, corruption in official circles, etc., in other cities over the Nation. It's not so in Birmingham."

Marks said the committee of 100 solicits the help of all Birmingham district citizens in its task of attracting new industry, new people, to Birmingham. "Everyone should be a salesman for his city," he declared, "particularly when he goes on a trip to other parts of the country. Tell them elsewhere what we have in Birmingham. Brag about your city, because you have the stuff to brag about."

## Textile and Related Industries in South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, on November 8, 1962, I was privileged to be a guest of the Rock Hill, S.C., Rotary Club. The speaker on that occasion was the Honorable Robert S. Small, president of the South Carolina Textile Manufacturers Association. Mr. Small made a very fine and timely speech and I was so impressed that I immediately asked him if I could take his speech and put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the enlightenment of all who may be interested, and for the purpose of continuing to record for all to see. I hope this will also enable our posterity to study the problems of the textile industry in this decade, and the efforts that are being made to solve those problems.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, I have on many occasions, spoken before the membership of the U.S. House of Representatives on this subject and I shall continue to do so with all the vigor at my command.

My purpose today is to use the fine testimony of one who is eminently acquainted with the industry to supplement the information we already have.

The speech is attached:

ADDRESS BY R. S. SMALL, ROCK HILL ROTARY CLUB, NOVEMBER 8, 1962

Industrial South Carolina is largely textiles and related industries.

(a) We are the largest textile-producing area in the world.

(b) Out of 260,000 industrial workers in South Carolina, 165,000 are directly associated with the textile industry. Textile wages alone amount to nearly $700 million annually.

(c) It is not generally known, but the average textile wage paid in South Carolina is higher than the textile wage paid in any other State—or the world, for that matter; and, it is higher than the average industrial wage in South Carolina.

(d) Many fine, new associated industries have located in our State since the war, due primarily to the proximity of this major textile market—plants like Du Pont in Camden and Florence; Allied Chemical in Lexington; Chemstrand in Greenwood and now Blacksburg; Saco-Lowell in Easley; Eastman has purchased a huge tract of land near Columbia; Draper in Spartanburg and Marion; Crompton-Knowles in Greenville; and, of course, the fine Celanese plant here.

We should really add Fibre Industries just across the line in North Carolina.

I tell you these things to emphasize the importance of textiles to all of us, in all phases of life here in South Carolina—whether we are a textile worker, doctor, schoolteacher, or merchant.

What then is the status of our industry today?

Assets: Our industry here in South Carolina, indeed in the United States, has many assets. I'm tired of hearing us classified as a "sick or ailing industry." We are actually vigorous, competitive, and an example of what one industry can accomplish through modernization and competition, to hold the price of its product down.

Our industry has many assets. I will deal with these rapidly for they are obvious and well known but have not received the publicity they deserve.

1. We have the greatest mass markets of any country in the world.

2. We have the greatest styling in the world.

3. Although we have been slow in our machinery research and development, in recent years we have taken advantage of many technological improvements.

4. Our technical schools are superior to and more advanced than comparable educational facilities.

5. We have the geratest group of skilled workers—men and women who through their free inheritance and native ability can outperform his or her counterpart in any country in the world. And they are proud of it.

Like nearly every industry, however, we too have our problems. Our basic problems are twofold and are Government made. Since this is the case, we are forced to work with any administration in order to have our position understood and acted upon.

The first of our problems is imports. I would like to bring you up to date on what has been and is being done in this regard.

(a) I speak of cotton imports. Cotton still comprises 65 percent of our textile manufacturing. And, too, although the President on May 2, 1961, directed the Interagency Textile Advisory Committee to restrain imports of all fibers, only cotton has been acted upon—and poorly—thus far.

(b) Let us see what has been done on cotton imports. 1. August 1961: Short-term Geneva agreement with 19 nations. 2. Bilateral agreement with Japan.

(c) Country by country, category by category. Imports to be limited by categories (64) and by country of origin, to the amount imported in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961.

(d) By March 1962, some obvious overshipments, mainly Hong Kong.

(e) By June, the fat was in the fire—over 100 items embargoed in more than 12 of 19 countries.

(f) As a result, the short-term Geneva arrangement has resulted in a colossal failure. One hundred thirty-three percent of the base quota was imported—with a quota of 567 million yards, 754 million yards were imported. Categories were largely ignored. Concentration of imports were, to a great extent, made in the heavier weight fabrics such as sheetings, where the raw cotton differential offered such a windfall profit. Many categories were overshipped 200 percent and more. Concentration of imports crippled certain segments of our industry.

What about the bilateral agreement with Japan?

We had increased Japan's quota voluntarily from 247 to 275 million, to run concurrent with the calendar year 1962. For the first 9 months, through September, we have imported 285 million yards from Japan—already 3½ percent over its quota. For the 12 months ending September 30, 1962, Japan shipped in 359 million yards.

Isn't it obvious that the exporting nations consider these agreements a floor, not a ceiling; a minimum, not a maximum—and our governmental committees, supposedly implementing these agreements while paying lipservice to our textile industry, have done little to protect the interest of our textile workingman.

Our total cotton imports for 1962 will exceed 1,100 million yards. Just realize that for every 1,000 yards imported, one American textile worker loses 1 week's pay—1,100,000 weeks' pay will be lost this year. At $80 per week, $90 million of pay lost—but more important, this year 21,000 American textile workers will lose a year's pay—on their jobs.

LONG-TERM AGREEMENT

(a) Five years based on imports during 12 months ending June 1952. This will result in a substantially higher base than the short-term agreement due to the gross overshipment under the short-term agreement.

(b) Increase in fourth and fifth years are to be granted under the long-term agreement.

(c) No rollback agreement or short-shipment agreement.

(d) Assets:

1. Year's experience.
2. Better reporting from census.
3. Still have 64 categories.
4. No longer have to prove market disruption.
5. Will call countries on a monthly basis.

But we are now told that this is subject to political significances as determined by the State Department.

Best we can hope for is a tighter control which will at best allow modest increases. We have to continuously fight for reasonable treatment.

Our governmental problem No. 2 and our major problem is the so-called two-price cotton system. We, the American textile industry, are forced to pay $0.085 more per pound for American cotton than our foreign textile counterparts have to pay for American cotton.

Why?

(a) This is why—we are the victim of the Government's agricultural problem.

We grow in this country an average of 15 million bales annually. The Government support price is roughly $0.335 per pound. The world price is $0.25. Our industry consumes 8,500,000 bales, so 6,500,000 bales have to be sold for export. In order to sell this surplus American cotton, our merchants have to compete with $0.25 foreign grown cotton. So, the American Government subsidizes the exporting mechant $0.085 per pound for any American cotton sold out of the United States.

(b) Why don't we buy world cotton at world prices? We are not allowed to, 60,000 bales only; it would upset the farm program—and that it would.

(c) What have we done?

First, section 22 case brought by the Secretary of Agriculture. It would have imposed an offset fee of $0.085, or equivalent to the subsidy, on cotton content of cotton cloth coming back to into the United States. By a 3-to-2 decision, this was turned down by the Tariff Commission on September 11, of this year.

(d) President Kennedy on September 7, 1962, commenting on the tariff decision, said, "The inequity of the two-price system of cotton costs remains as a unique burden upon the American textile industry, for which a solution must be found in the near future.

"I am therefore requesting the Department of Agriculture to give immediate attention to the formulation of a domestic program that would eliminate this inequity. I am also instructing all other departments and offices of the executive branch to cooperate fully to this end."

Secretary Hodges, recently speaking in Charlotte, termed the Nation's two-price cotton system, "The most foolish thing any government has ever done."

(e) As a result, efforts are now being made to formulate a program to satisfy the farmers, merchants, mills, the Agriculture Department, and bring about a competitive one-price for cotton. This will be submitted by the administration early in the new session of Congress; hopefully, to be effective with the new crop year, August 1, 1963.

(f) We should know the details of this new proposed cotton legislation within the next 2 weeks. It will be well publicized. You can help by writing your Congressmen. I cannot think of a more important piece of legislation for our section of the country.

IN SUMMARY

Given a reasonable and controlled import quota, given the opportunity to compete equally for our raw material, South Carolina mills will enjoy their greatest period of prosperity. Our mills are the most modern, our employees the most skilled, and management is willing to risk the capital to keep South Carolina the leading textile-producing area in the world.

## Independence Day of Cameroon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 1, the Republic of Cameroon celebrated her third independence day anniversary, and we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President of the Republic of Cameroon, Ahmadou Ahidjo; and His Excellency, the Cameroon Ambassador to the United States, Jacques Kuoh, on this memorable occasion.

CAMEROONS: A COUNTRY REUNITED

New Year's Day 1960 was a joyous occasion for the thousands of Africans whose home was the French Cameroons. On that day the U.N. trust territory under French administration became the sovereign Republic of Cameroon, the 11th nation on the African continent to achieve independence. Thus ended a 75-year period of foreign occupation. Germany had declared Cameroon a protectorate in 1884. After World War I the territory was divided between the British and the French as League of Nations mandates. Then in 1946 the Cameroons became U.N. trust territories.

October 1, 1961, was another day for rejoicing in Cameroon, when the British Southern Cameroons joined the former French trust territory to form a federal republic. This event marked the fruition of the Kamerun idea which had emerged with political consciousness in the Southern Cameroons and had gained momentum as the British territory moved toward self-government. Kamerun became the political ideal of the reunification of the two Cameroons. The formation of the Federal Republic was an important event not only from the standpoint of the Cameroons themselves, but also from the larger perspective of continental African political development, for it was the first African experiment in the union of a British territory and a French territory. The educational, linguistic, and legal adjustments of the new union are gradually and most satisfactorily being worked out under the skillful leadership of Vice President Foncha and President Ahidjo.

The successful development of Cameroon is all the more spectacular because of the enormity of the difficulties, pointed out by observers of all kinds, facing the new nation. Ethnologists reminded us that Cameroon, lying at an ethnic crossroads of Africa, contained a "bewildering hodgepodge" of races from Islamic stock breeders in the north to Bantus and Pygmies in the south. Political scientists noted that as of independence day there were some 382 legally registered political parties. Geographers pointed out that the northern and southern sections were divided by a central plateau which effectively discouraged communication. Economists said that the primary crop economy was extremely vulnerable to climatic change and price fluctuations. The pessimists predicted that President Ahidjo would have considerable difficulty in holding together his newly independent country.

But the pessimists were wrong. The republic has been stabilized. The economy is advancing. Substantial improvements are being made in education. Communications development is under way, and industrialization is being speeded up. When President Ahidjo made a 5-day visit to the United States as the guest of President Kennedy in March 1962, the President of the United States congratulated President Ahidjo for his successful efforts in the progressive development of his country. The two Presidents agreed to encourage commerce and investment between their countries and expressed confidence that the visit had strengthened relations between the United States and the Federal Republic of Cameroon.

The American people add their voice to the congratulations of President Kennedy. To President Ahidjo, Vice President Foncha, and the people of the Federal Republic of Cameroon we express our faith in, and best wishes for, the continued successful development of their nation.

## The Current Attitude Toward the Monroe Doctrine and Our Relations With Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the International Section of the Commonwealth Club of California spent almost a year studying the background and current attitude toward the Monroe Doctrine and our relations with Latin America. Following the study a secret ballot was taken among the members of the club on 12 selected questions.

The results of the voting are as follows:

VOTE OF THE COMMONWEALTH CLUB OF CALIFORNIA ON MONROE DOCTRINE AND LATIN AMERICA

(Results of the secret mail ballot submitted to all members of the Commonwealth Club of California immediately following distribution of the transaction, "Monroe Doctrine and Communist Threat to Americas")

I. After 30 years of the "good neighbor policy"—

A. Is the United States in general more popular in Latin America, 506; or less popular in Latin America, 1,371; or no change? 306.

B. Has the United States more or fewer Latin American nations on whom it can depend for support in our efforts to defend this hemisphere against communism? More, 932; fewer, 1,250.

C. Are the international policies and practices of the U.S. Government largely responsible for whatever may be your answer to B? Yes, 1,681; no, 446.

II. Do Latin Americans in general regard the United States as a so-called paper tiger (meaning a nation which will not effectively support its friends)? Yes, 872; no, 1,237.

III. Should it be U.S. policy, generally, to support any form of Latin American government which is anti-Communist? Yes, 1,275; no, 956.

IV. Should it be U.S. policy, generally, to achieve the replacement of any pro-Communist Latin American government? Yes, 1856; no, 369.

V. Should the United States act to prevent expropriation by Latin American countries of property of U.S. citizens—

When fair and dependable compensation is assured? 474; or when fair and dependable compensation is not assured? 1665.

VI. Should the United States continue its present policy of cooperation with Latin

American military forces? Yes, 2009; no, 158.

VII. Should the United States—

Consider the Russian intervention in Cuba's affairs a violation of the Monroe Doctrine? Yes, 2061; no, 171; at an appropriate time take whatever action may be necessary to overthrow Castro's government? Yes, 1751; no, 412.

VIII. Should the Alliance for Progress Charter be amended specifically to forbid employment of Communists in the Alliance organization? Yes, 1830; no, 349.

IX. Should specific provision now be inserted in the Alliance Charter, so as to provide a definite opportunity for private business to aid development of Latin American nations? Yes, 2070; no, 131.

X. Should at least semiannual reports to our Congress, and to the legislative bodies of other supporting nations, be made on progress or no progress achieved by Alliance nations toward conforming with Alliance standards as pledged in August 1961 at Punta del Este? Yes, 2123; no, 57.

XI. Is the Monroe Doctrine dead? Yes, 397; no, 1781.

XII. Is the Theodore Roosevelt Corollary dead? Yes, 715; no, 1192.

## America's Day of Infamy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, countless Americans have been shocked by news from the Congo where the United Nations has again ground its heel upon the hopes of the Katanganese who seek independence. We have still not received full reports on happenings there, but from what we know already it is a very distressing spectacle—a shame which may linger for many decades.

Summing up the reactions of many Americans is the following editorial from the Indianapolis Star of January 1, 1963:

AMERICA'S DAY OF INFAMY

For the first time in our history the United States has deliberately set out to destroy the liberty and independence of another people.

By our outright support of the savage colonial policy of the United Nations in Katanga, the American Government has made itself a party to one of the most vicious attacks on a free people since the Soviet Union smashed the victorious revolt of the people of Hungary.

Without U.S. support and direction, this brutal destruction of the rights of the people of Katanga could never have occurred. Succumbing to the pressures of the so-called neutralist states in the U.N., and to the Soviet-dominated Secretary General U Thant, our Government has turned its back upon its own historical principles.

We have abandoned our traditions and our principles.

To please the primitive and dictatorial regimes of Africa and Asia, to satisfy the ambitions of neutralist leaders who neither understand nor acknowledge the principles of self-determination and personal freedom, we have helped to destroy one of the few African states whose leaders understand the necessity for cooperation between the races and mutual tolerance and common effort for progress.

This despicable action flies in the face of everything Americans have always been taught to hold dear. We, who liberated Cuba from Spain, who gave the Philippines their independence, who fought three great wars to help preserve the independence and freedom of peoples from Europe to Korea and are still doing so in far off Vietnam—we Americans—have now joined the motley crew of self serving wreckers in the U.N. who want to destroy, not build; to colonize, not liberate.

Why was this thing done? What possible good can come of joining with these unlettered and unprincipled nations with their mercenary troops in stamping out one of the most hopeful and progressive African regimes to emerge from the welter of dictatorships and mismanaged police states on the Dark Continent?

No wonder the United States quietly agreed to drop the Hungarian suppression from the U.N. agenda in recent weeks. The administration was already planning to do the same thing to Katanga. We have copied the Soviet Union's bloody action in Hungary by mounting and directing the same sort of mercenary attack against the freely chosen government of Katanga.

We the people of the United States through our representatives at the United Nations supported and applauded a victory in Elisabethville where U.N. troops entered a hospital and shot to death hopeless, helpless, innocent patients.

This is indeed the climax of the gradual erosion of principle that has sickened the United States in the last few decades. This is the final abandonment by our Government of our long-held belief in the rights of people to determine their own destiny in their own way, in freedom.

This is the final abandonment of the ideals of our country to the expediency of the conscienceless United Nations.

This is America's first day of infamy.

Let us pray it is our last. It will be hard enough to explain this betrayal of principle to the rest of the world. How will we explain it to our own consciences?

## American Battle Monuments Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. VICTOR A. KNOX
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate and commend the American Battle Monuments Commission for its devotion and concern for the men who died in defense of our country during World Wars I and II.

I have received a communication from Mr. Roy D. Hollingsworth, of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., a former first sergeant with the 125th Infantry, 32d Division of Michigan and Wisconsin, during World War I, who visited Romange Sous Montfaucon and American Luxembourg cemeteries.

Under permission granted, I include the letter I have received from Mr. Hollingsworth as part of my remarks:

SOO MACHINE & AUTO CO.,
*Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., December 10, 1962.*
Hon. VICTOR A. KNOX,
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR VICTOR: I recently returned from Europe where I visited my son, a captain in the U.S. Army. He had obtained a 14-day absence from duty and he and his wife drove Mrs. Hollingsworth and me to the Argonne in the vicinity of Romange Sous Montfaucon.

I enjoyed the old battlefield in that my division, 32d of Michigan and Wisconsin, served in this well-known battle for 21 days ending the operation with my regiment, 125th Infantry, playing an important part in the occupation of Romange, beyond which there were no trenches or defensive works.

Now, VIC, my main reason for commenting on this trip is to bring to your attention just what I observed with regard to the activities of the Monuments Commission.

VICTOR, I wish that every mother and father could see the consideration given to our fallen heroes in the beautiful cemeteries where they now rest.

The cemetery at Romange Sous Montfaucon is most beautifully maintained, the masonry of the buildings and monument is outstanding.

At one time, more than 16,000 of our boys from homes in the United States of America were buried here. Actually, after 44 years, I could, with satisfaction, remain on the site for days, if time would permit.

My son drove us to the American Luxembourg Cemetery. This is one of the beauty spots of the Old World.

Every detail of care and original thinking is also evident here. I photographed my son, who proudly stood by the grave marker of General Patton. Nearby, 3,700 American boys are laid to rest in well-marked graves. Visiting relatives with whom I talked were strong in their praise of those responsible for the care and maintenance of our cemeteries in Europe.

Let me add that the authorities in France also never forget those who gave their lives for their Nation.

VICTOR, please forward my letter to the proper authorities in Washington.

Merry Christmas.

ROY D. HOLLINGSWORTH,
*First Sergeant, Sy Co.,*
*125th Infantry, 32d Division, AEF.*

## From a Meager Grubstake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. MORRIS K. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, recently the Valley National Bank, one of this Nation's 40 largest banking institutions and the largest in Arizona, celebrated its 63d anniversary. On that occasion the Arizona Weekly Gazette in Phoenix published an excellent history of this pioneer enterprise. All Arizona takes pride in this success story, so typical of the accomplishments made possible by our democratic system. The article follows:

[From the Arizona Weekly Gazette, Dec. 18, 1962]

VALLEY BANK CELEBRATES 63D ANNIVERSARY—A MEAGER GRUBSTAKE, A DUSTY CATTLETOWN, STARTED A GREAT BANK

PHOENIX.—Valley National Bank celebrated its 63d birthday this week with an outlook as bright and cheerful as the candleglow on its anniversary cake.

On December 15, 1899, articles of incorporation were signed and the Gila Valley Bank, forerunner of today's statewide Valley Bank, became a legal entity.

The bank was launched in the dusty little mining-cattle town of Solomonville (in what today is known as Graham County) at

a time when Arizona was only a territory and banking laws were virtually nonexistent. It was destined to become the most colorful of Arizona's prestatehood financial institutions.

Situated 5 miles east of Safford and roughly 180 miles east of Phoenix, the town of Solomonville was founded in 1876 by I. E. Solomon, pioneer merchant, who by the turn of the century had built (and owned) most of the buildings flanking the community's main street.

German-born Solomon had emigrated to New York in 1860 at the age of 16, then gradually worked his way West until he settled in eastern Arizona in 1876 with a contract in his pocket to supply charcoal to the Clifton copper mines.

The business prospered despite the threats of marauding Indians and white outlaws. Solomon branched out into sheepraising (the Apaches made a number of successful raids on this enterprise), freighting, hotelkeeping and general merchandising.

Headquarters for his various activities was a large brick building housing his general store in the center of town. It was in a corner of that crammed structure that the Gila Valley Bank officially opened for business on January 16, 1900.

Solomon's fellow incorporators—merchants and cattlemen for the most part—included many colorful personalities. Among them were George A. Olney and Phoebus Fruedenthal, the latter a brother-in-law of Solomon's.

Olney was an ex-Texas Ranger who resided in nearby Safford and was a wealthy cattleman of great influence. At the time of the bank's incorporation he lived in the area's biggest house and was its senator in the Territorial Legislature.

Fruedenthal, a merchant, later became a delegate to the 1912 Republican National Convention. Solomonville also was the home of a hearty storekeeper named Pete Bolan who had fought under Parnell in his native Ireland. Known for his fierce bouts with the bottle, Bolan was reputed to have caused the adjournment of a pre-1900 Democratic National Convention in Chicago with his stentorian shout: "Let's all recess for a drink."

There was some justification for Bolan's affinity for liquor—at least in Solomonville Territorial Gov. Benjamin Franklin visited the town in 1896 and pronounced its drinking water unfit for man or beast.

"It's terrible," he remarked but, after noting the community's many busy saloons, added: "I doubt if most citizens realize it, however."

Charles L. Rawlins, who later became one of the territory's best known attorneys, drew up the original charter. When he died in 1954, he was the only surviving depositor listed on the bank's opening day customer record. Valley Bank still retains Rawlins' law firm—now headed by his son George—continuing without interruption a 63-year-old association.

The Gila Valley Bank opened with capital funds of $25,000. At its first annual meeting it reported $64,284 in deposits and a net profit for the year of $1,546.55. The directors promptly voted themselves a dividend of $1,500—leaving a surplus of $46.55.

By 1912—the year Arizona achieved statehood—the Gila Valley Bank & Trust Co. (as it was then called) had climbed into second place among Arizona financial institutions.

It had survived the panic of 1907, had increased its deposits to $1.6 million, and was now operating branch offices in California, Morenci, Globe, Stafford, Miami, Ray Winkelman, and Hayden—all thriving copper-producing towns.

In June 1912, a fire which started in a Chinese laundry completely leveled the picturesque community of Ray—with the sole exception of the bank's concrete vault and the office's bare walls.

The next morning, while the town's ashes were still smoking, enterprising manager Jim Houston opened the fire-scarred vault's iron door, placed a board counter in the doorway, and painted a sign announcing the bank was ready to do business. His action brought cheers from the homeless miners and their families.

By 1912 the two dominant personalities in Gila Bank's management were mining executives Charles E. Mills and Dr. Louis D. Ricketts. A taciturn, hard-driving individual, Mills vanished in 1888 from Harvard University, where he had been enrolled as a student, and turned up in Arizona as a laborer in a railroad construction gang near Bisbee. By the time he was 25, he was a mine superintendent for the Phelps Dodge Corp. and at the age of 30 he was in charge of the famed Detroit Copper Mining Co. at Morenci.

Mills was elected a Gila Valley Bank director in 1912 and, until his death in 1929, was its principal policy shaper. He served for many years as president and, on two occasions, as president of the Valley Bank of Phoenix with which it merged in 1922. Prior to the merger he held the presidencies of both banks simultaneously, no small feat even in the freewheeling West.

Ricketts, a genial man of many talents, won his doctorate at Princeton University with a thesis on Colorado ore formations, then rejected a post on the Princeton faculty for a career in mining which ultimately gained him international renown.

In Sonora, Mexico, in 1897, for example, he built the industry's first all steel and concrete centrally driven ore mill which became the model for the larger concentrator erected at Morenci in 1900.

His brilliant career spanned three widely separated fields of interest: mining, education, and banking. As a mining engineer he became consultant to several of the world's largest companies. As an educator he served 8 years as a regent in Arizona and many more as a trustee of both Princeton and California Institute of Technology.

As a banker he worked closely with Mills in fostering the growth of both the Gila Valley Bank and its successor, Valley Bank. He was chairman of the latter's board of directors when he died in 1940 at the age of 80, mourned by countless thousands as one of his adopted State's best known and best loved citizens.

The Gila Valley Bank & Trust Co. merged with the Valley Bank of Phoenix in 1922, dropped the "Gila" from its title and became known as the Valley Bank & Trust Co. Thirteen years later it purchased the Consolidated National Bank of Tucson and changed its name to Valley National Bank.

But it was 2 years earlier—in 1933—that Valley Bank began taking the giant strides that were to transform it from a relatively obscure southwestern institution into one of the Nation's largest and most enterprising banks.

Responsible for this last surge of growth, which has continued unabated ever since, was Walter R. Bimson who took over the presidential reins in January 1933 at the nadir of the depression.

Bimson was no stranger to Arizona. For several years prior to 1933 he had been making trips here, servicing agricultural loans for the large Chicago bank he represented as a vice president. He was delighted to settle in Arizona; equally important, he wanted to test a number of progressive and often unorthodox banking services he felt were sorely needed in modern day banking.

When Walter Bimson was named president in 1933, Valley Bank listed less than $7 million in deposits, resources of only $8.6 million, a bare $3 million in loans outstanding, 11 offices, 15,000 customers, and a handful of stockholders.

Today it lists in excess of $700 million in deposits and approximately $800 million in resources. Loans outstanding are close to $500 million, offices add up to 78 (at this writing), and customers total around 400,000.

Stockholders now number over 10,000, and dividend checks are mailed to addresses in all 50 States and several foreign nations. Bulk of V.N.B.'s shareowners reside in Arizona, however. Capital funds are knocking on the door of $55 million—more than 2,000 times the original $25,000 posted in 1899.

Under the leadership of Walter Bimson and his brother, Carl, who succeeded him as president in 1953, Valley National's growth was termed "as dazzling a banking achievement as the country has seen" by the Saturday Evening Post.

The Bimson philosophy of banking was succinctly summed up by Carl a few years ago:

"Although we are a private enterprise, we try never to lose sight of the fact we are primarily an instrument of public service; we firmly believe the best way to build Valley Bank is by helping to build Arizona; we regard Valley Bank as 'a financial department store' which must be ready to offer every feasible service needed by its customers."

The Bimsons implemented this philosophy by introducing a number of "firsts" to the Arizona banking scene. Among them were the first installment loan department, first drive-in bank, first small business loan department, first "community room," first bank employees' profit-sharing plan under a new Treasury ruling, first "assured education" plan, and scores of other precedent-shattering innovations.

Result of the bank's public-oriented philosophy is history. By 1945 Valley National had forged into first place among all other banks in the eight-State Rocky Mountain area. Today it is among "the top 40" in size on the rollcall of the Nation's 14,000 commercial banks, guards half of all Arizona bank deposits in its vaults, and is the State's primary source of credit.

Highest honor in U.S. banking circles—presidency of the American Bankers Association—was conferred upon Carl Bimson in 1960–61. Editorially, it was hailed as a tribute to his banking acumen, Valley Bank's policies, and Arizona's remarkable economic expansion.

In January of this year, James E. Patrick succeeded Carl Bimson as president of Valley National. Carl moved up to vice chairman of the board and chairman of the executive committee. Walter continued as board chairman.

The three are unanimous in their belief that Valley National and Arizona have yet to witness their greatest growth. Their judgment is underscored by one of the Nation's largest brokerage firms which recently commented:

"Valley National has far outshone the U.S. banking industry over the postwar years, and this record is expected to continue over the years ahead." Another investment house plotted the expansion of both bank and State and noted "their growth lines are virtually parallel."

Community-minded Patrick summed up the bank's outlook this week as it looked ahead to its 64th year. "Arizona's future prosperity is inevitable. Barring the unexpected, it will continue to lead the Nation in most economic indixes in the foreseeable years ahead. And we at the bank are convinced that as Arizona goes, so will Valley National."

## Governor Lawrence Addresses Pennsylvania Assembly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity of attending the opening session of the Pennsylvania General Assembly in Harrisburg on New Year's Day. As a former member, I was very interested in the remarks which were presented by the Governor of the Commonwealth, the Honorable David L. Lawrence, in his final address to the new general assembly.

He called to the attention of the legislators a number of very important projects which should receive their attention in the coming session. One of these was the subject of education, which should not only receive the attention of the Pennsylvania General Assembly and of other legislative bodies in the country but should also receive the attention of the 88th Congress.

I am sure that members will read this speech, which I have attached to my remarks with great interest and benefit.

FINAL MESSAGE OF DAVID L. LAWRENCE, GOVERNOR OF PENNSYLVANIA TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF PENNSYLVANIA, TUESDAY, JANUARY 1, 1963

Mr. Lieutenant Governor, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the general assembly, almost three centuries ago, William Penn set forth the frame of government for his new colony and preceded it with a preface which has been described as the best expression of his ideas of government.

In that preface he makes the point that "Governments, like clocks, go from the motion men give them," adding "Let men be good, and the government cannot be bad; if it be ill, they will cure it."

I come before you today to report on the movement of Pennsylvania's government, on the direction it has taken, on the advances it has made during these past 4 years—years which have been difficult and challenging but which, also, have been rewarding and productive.

Fortunately, I entered this office with no illusions and I approached its duties realistically. I came to this beautiful capital city in a spirit of humility, in the hope that God might give me the power and the ability to help Pennsylvania and its people.

I leave, in a few short days, with the earnest hope in my heart that the beginning we have made, together, will be continued and improved upon and completed.

I have used the word "we" in the preceding paragraph with careful deliberation. Those of you who know me well, know also that I am a man who believes, with strong conviction, in the value of cooperation—cooperation among individuals in private effort and cooperation between the various elements and branches of a governmental organization.

I hope you will forgive the note of pride in my voice when I say that, during this administration, the cooperative spirit between the legislative and executive branches has been both healthy and productive for this Commonwealth's government and its people.

Pennsylvania is in far better condition, today, because of that spirit.

Having said this, I must say, also, that much remains to be done.

Pennsylvania stands, at this moment in her history, on the threshold of a great move toward recovery. The foundation has been set in place; the building materials are ready; the plans and blueprints have been drawn and the basic course is charted.

Pennsylvania's problems are many—but they are not new problems. They were not born overnight through the oversight of one administration or one assembly—and they will not be solved by a simple wave of a magic wand.

The greatest of those problems is Pennsylvania's economic growth, how to keep it going and make it stable. That problem has been with us since the turn of the century; unfortunately, it is not likely to disappear tomorrow.

A few people recognized the problem when it was still in its embryonic state, 50 years ago. They saw, then, that Pennsylvania should be looking for other economic foundations than those it had cut out of the heart of the forests or dug out of the western hills or the anthracite mountains. Their warnings fell on deaf ears.

A quarter of a century later, the number of those cognizant of the difficulty our economy faced had grown even larger—but we were in the heart of a national depression and, because of this, our situation was not unique and, once again, little was done to prevent the downward plunge.

From the domestic tragedy of economic depression, America moved through the superficial boom of two wars—one a global conflict, the second a determined effort to prevent a worldwide holocaust.

Both those wars provided a burst of speed for Pennsylvania's economy; we had been, by tradition, the Arsenal of Democracy and we remained so in World War II and the Korean conflict.

Despite the significance of our wartime effort, however, the surge did not survive and the private and public forces which mold our future were lulled, once again, into complacency.

Not until the midfifties was there general agreement that we were not only slipping backward while other States moved ahead of us in economic growth, but that we had been gradually and inexorably falling behind for many years.

We began, then, to look around us—and the shock of recognition shook the giant that is Pennsylvania into awakening.

The evidence was there, ready to be seen and analyzed by any objective observer who cared to look. It provided conclusive proof that Pennsylvania's government had neglected many of its responsibilities—and that it would take many painful months and even more painful decisions to remedy that neglect.

Our resources had been squandered and the majectic beauty of our countryside had been scarred and despoiled by those who took from it and gave little or nothing in return.

Our schools had been ignored and the goals of our educational system had been allowed to settle down in the comfortable platitudes of another time.

We patched narrow roads of limited usefulness rather than building the modern, high-speed traffic arteries that had become the lifeblood of growth industry.

We had discouraged new industries from coming in, often out of fear that they would compete too easily and too effectively for the labor market we had available.

Our industrial climate was not the most attractive in the Nation, and we had failed to keep our economy viable and diversified.

There were countless new industries abroad in the land—industries devoted to the conquest of space, the development of advanced electronics, and nuclear power.

They were searching for homes, for skilled workers, and community resources. They may have considered Pennsylvania, but they did not settle here. They went, instead, to Massachusetts where a great technical institute had established a concentrated center of brainpower and academic scholarship, or they turned to California with its plentitude of power, its enlightened tax structure, and a growing higher education system.

When the problems were, at long last, recognized, it took only a short while longer for us to realize that a large part of the responsibility for reversing Pennsylvania's downward economic spiral rested with government itself.

My predecessor in this office, Governor Leader, determined to accept that responsibility—and with the help of enlightened legislators, he was able to make a beginning. It has been my privilege to build upon that beginning and strengthen it these past 4 years.

At the same time, the first fact of life that became obvious to me was that the State's own governmental affairs were in deplorable condition, financially.

While this administration was faced with many things which should have been done long before, it was, at the same time, confronted with an appalling condition brought about by appropriation of State funds when there was no money available to foot the bill.

The disease had lingered for many years, sapping the strength of the patient and preventing its recovery. Skilled treatment was not only desirable, but mandatory as well.

When I took the oath of office on the 20th of January 1959, it was calculated that Pennsylvania's State government had a deficit of $177 million. Five months later, at the end of June, it had been reduced to $144 million—still a staggering amount. We succeeded in cutting it back further until last year when we ended the fiscal period with a surplus. The deficit has been eliminated and I hope and pray that it is never again permitted to accumulate.

The dilemma of the new administration on that cold and stormy day 4 years ago was a real one. We knew there were bills to be paid, that there were programs to continue and improve upon. We wanted, also, to give the people of this State new programs and new services where they were needed and wherever it was feasible to do so.

The administration had an obligation to restore fiscal integrity and responsibility to the management of State government affairs. That obligation was not only mandated by the constitution; it was, more than anything else, the moral duty of a government devoted to the citizens it serves.

Unglamorous though budget balancing may be, it is the cornerstone of good State government. It is, also, the cardinal requirement of a forward-looking program to attract industry, for the plain fact is that modern industries are not interested in a State that does not know how to operate its own business.

Granted, then, that the first challenge I saw confronting this administration was to restore fiscal responsibility, I feel a strong sense of pride in the fact that the budget, this year, is balanced and that several million dollars of the surplus have been distributed to public schools and Pennsylvania State University in accordance with the wishes of the general assembly.

I am happy to report, moreover, that revenues at this point are substantially in accord with our original estimates, and we

have now been able to lapse thus far more than $10 million in unused funds from various State agencies.

We not only balanced the budget last year but we leave to the incoming administration a fiscal condition which should assure balance for this year as well.

I should be less pleased with this report if it were necessary to say, at the same time, that the services of State government have been cut back or curtailed. But there has been no cutback and there has been no curtailment.

We have continued the valued and valuable programs of State government at peak levels. We have improved upon them and expanded them. In urban renewal, in education, in public health and mental health, in building a stronger, more effective State police force, in human rights, in recreation and conservation and industrial development, we have made far greater progress, relatively speaking, during the past 4 years than during any comparable time in Pennsylvania history.

More importantly, we have been able to initiate new programs for the development of Pennsylvania libraries and the encouragement of tourism that are the first of their kind in the Nation.

The odds against these achievements have been enormous, for Pennsylvania has been, traditionally, lacking in the stable financial resources that are necessary for governmental improvement.

Not until 1953 did our State have a broad-based tax to finance the operation of State government services—and not until 1956 did that tax, which many of us had not agreed with, become the major source of revenue for the State.

Not until 1955 did we see that the State had a direct and unavoidable role to play in the development of new industry. And it has been only during this administration that Pennsylvania has been given a forward-looking, adequately-financed program for highway construction designed to meet the industrial and travel demands of modern times.

Not until 1955 did we recognize the desperate need for a new approach to the treatment of mental illness—an approach that now results in cure and release, wherever possible, rather than senseless and inhuman perpetual imprisonment.

I have not come here, today, to present either a blueprint or a program for your consideration. My duties, in this regard, are nearing their official termination.

It remains for a new Governor and a new administration to map the next 4 years—and I pray, with you, that they will have far more than moderate success in that venture, for the sake of Pennsylvania.

There are certain areas, however, which I cannot ignore; they are too close to my heart and too much in my thoughts to be left out of these remarks today.

The first of these is the education of Pennsylvania's children, for this is a field in which you have also been intensely interested and it is the frontier upon which the destiny of our State, its people, and the entire free world will be decided.

I want to say, once again, that there has never been a better blueprint for the advancement of Pennsylvania education than the one now available through the report and recommendations of the Governor's committee so ably chaired by Lieutenant Governor Davis. It is a comprehensive, practical, and studiously realistic report and I am proud to give it my fervent and heartfelt endorsement.

Within the realm of public education—and higher education, also—it is imperative that we take steps to improve teachers' salaries and continue to provide the physical plants they need to perform their duties.

We must do far more than we have done in the field of higher education and in this respect I am delighted to report that Pennsylvania's State-aided colleges and universities have now come up with a formula for equitable assistance which is both sound and realistic and which I urge as a pattern for the new administration and this legislature.

I earnestly hope that this general assembly will give its approval to the constitutional amendment which would legalize scholarships and loans to deserving students. It is essential that we make it possible for good students to continue to advance their education and this is one of the most practical and reasonable methods available. Another, needless to say, is establishing a system of community colleges in the State—an action long overdue.

These are all constructive and creative measures; they deserve your support and your active interest.

At the same time, I feel it is necessary to warn against the potential destructiveness involved in the emasculation or possible repeal of Act 561 calling for school district reorganization.

Let's be frank about it. This law has been more flagrantly misrepresented—either through deliberate partisanship or ignorance of its provisions—than any other law ever passed in the halls of this assembly and signed into effect by a governor. The campaign against it has been a campaign or distortion and deception and demoralization—and that campaign has done an immense injustice, not only to this legislative body but to this administration as well.

Worse still, it has been completely unjust to our children, themselves—and that is what really matters.

Now that the rattling drums of political oratory have died away, I hope that the members of this legislative assembly will look upon Act 561 with the detached and sober minds of men who place the best interests of their State far above any small gain they might make otherwise.

The act is not a perfect one, for there are no perfect laws.

Perhaps the law can be amended; I reject the hypothesis that it should be hamstrung or repealed.

Act 561 was the greatest forward-step Pennsylvania education had taken in 50 years. It remains a good law and it deserves far better than the calumny and criticism it has thus far received.

There are numerous other fields in which I hope and trust this assembly will show its enlightened concern.

Although in practice it will not apply to our State, I hope that Pennsylvania will hastily ratify the amendment to the Federal Constitution which will abolish the use of the poll tax.

The Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority—which is already the most effective of its kind in the country—must be continued and expanded. The present rate of loan activity is at a record level, so much so, in fact, that additional money must be provided if the industry authority is to function at its maximum effectiveness for the remainder of this fiscal year. This, of course, is money we cannot afford not to spend.

Beyond this, the authority's work must become both preventive and remedial; its aid must be offered to communities which now seem prosperous and stable in their economy so that they may continue so. Aid to the chronically distressed areas of our State should be—and must be—maintained at its present pace, at least, and, if possible, strengthened in the future.

In the continued struggle to encourage industrial development, we must not lose sight of the need for improved transportation facilities and rates and the provision of feasible power rates for industrial uses.

Along this line, I want to express my pleasure at the recent announcement of Pennsylvania utility companies that they will build and operate power-producing plants at the mouths of mines. Such a move, it seems to me, could make Pennsylvania the foremost power-producing State in the northeastern part of the Nation.

We must move forward with the highway construction program that is already far ahead of original expectations. The plans have already been drawn; the money is available and there is no reason, whatever, that Pennsylvania cannot set the pace for the rest of the Nation in completing its interstate highways program.

The department of highways now has $1,600 million worth of plans in process—70 percent of that total already in final design, and all of it scheduled to be ready for advertising for bids within the next 4 years.

While we are building our highways and our schools, we must do everything in our power to insure the preservation of open space. We have too little of it, now, and we must make certain that the supply for recreation and scenic value is not further depleted.

This assembly will have the opportunity to vote upon—I hope, favorably, once more—the finest plan to guarantee open space of any State in the Nation. That plan, of course, is Project 70 and I earnestly hope that you will make it possible for the people, themselves, to vote on it in the next general election.

We must also make certain that we preserve and protect our precious water supply, and continue to pioneer in developing master plans for our great river basins, as we have done so successfully on the Delaware.

Although we now have the best and strongest strip mining legislation in America on Pennsylvania's law books, we must strengthen the effort to eliminate the further destruction of our natural beauty. I hope, also, that the assembly will give its support to the creation of a new agency, using both private and public funds, for the reclamation of land that has been scarred by workings prior to enactment of the present legislation.

There are many other areas which require attention—a list too long and too involved for me to recite here. Both parties have made promises and it is up to the party in power to implement those promises by legislation. It is the responsibility of the opposition to prod that action if it is not otherwise forthcoming.

But I must mention the necessity to push forward in such vital human fields as public welfare and public health. We must also zealously advance and protect the human and civil rights of all peoples.

I hope, too, that Pennsylvania will soon join its sister State of New York in developing a State arts council, which can bring to every section of the Commonwealth the great cultural attractions which are now available in the larger communities. I am pleased to note that a task force of the joint State government commission plans to recommend assistance for Philadelphia's University Museum so a mobile museum can be put into operation bringing great treasures to every section of the State. This, certainly, is a step in the right direction, and I hope it comes about.

There is one personal project, on which we have been working, that I would urge upon you. For many, many years, I have been closely associated with the deaf—a group of handicapped people whose problems have been generally neglected and misunderstood. A special study committee, which I appointed last June, has now recommended

that an office for the deaf be established in the department of labor and industry. Knowing the problems of the deaf as intimately as I do, I strongly recommend that this office be created as an imperative part of our overall work to aid the handicapped. I hope also that the Governor's committee on the handicapped, which has been chaired so effectively these past years by Pearl Buck, will be made a statutory agency and given the powers it needs to carry forward its exciting and far-reaching program.

Finally—but by no means least important—there is the desperate need to recruit the finest available talent to work in State government—not only in our mental hospitals, our libraries and health and welfare agencies, but equally in the management of the State's fiscal affairs.

We must have inspired and imaginative governmental leadership, for the complex and diversified functions of State government must have it if we are to hope to attract the kind of competent, professional workers we need.

We have made the transition from the day of the quill pen to electronic data processing rapidly—not only in private industry, but, as of now, in government also.

But new methods and new equipment require new talents and skills. We must, therefore, be able to recruit the kind of able, highly trained, technically skilled personnel that modern government demands.

Having said this much, I want to assure you that my remarks are nearing an end.

Speeches, like courtships, should not be overlong for the longer they are the greater the risk of disenchantment.

I want to say only this, in conclusion:

No Governor in Pennsylvania history has ever had the services of a finer, more dedicated or more effective cabinet than I.

To these men and women, I owe a great and everlasting debt of gratitude—and to the thousands of State employes who have worked with efficiency and dedication to make this a better State for the future.

To each of them—and to each of you—I offer my thanks and my fervent prayer for a provident and progressive future.

The incoming Governor and his administration have my best wishes and my prayers, also.

I ask that you give them the same measure of devotion, the same enlightened and selfless determination to do what is right for all of Pennsylvania that you have given me.

If you do that—and I know that you will—the beginning we have made these past 8 years under Governor Leader and under this administration, will result in a noble and prosperous new order for this great State and its people.

Thank you. And God bless each of you in your deliberations in this assembly.

## Certainly There Is No Freedom To Be Indecent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting, herewith, an editorial which appeared in the Brooklyn Tablet of December 8, 1962, treating with the television program of Howard K. Smith and the vilification of former Vice President Richard Nixon by none other than the perjurer and traitor, Alger Hiss.

As this article states, the program was defended by Jim Hagerty on the grounds of "freedom of the press." This, as everyone knows, was a specious argument and an attempt to apologize for one of the worst programs ever put on the air and to which the American people were exposed against their will.

The so-called freedom of the press is an abuse in this and other instances. What is meant is "freedom for the press" for no one else would have the same opportunity as was given to Alger Hiss. It is a sorry day in America when convicted perjurers and, far worse, traitors, are given free time on our television to vilify good Americans, sound Americans, and courageous Americans, through whose diligence and untiring efforts culprits are exposed to the point of sending them to jail.

During the past year, I said on numerous occasions that there is a strange philosophy, entertained by some people in our country, that extends a great freedom to Communists, fellow travelers, and "pinkos" that is never extended to sound, honest-to-God, patriotic Americans. I believe it is time that the American people who believe in justice and fair play see to it that the channel putting on this program be thoroughly denounced thereby letting them know that Americans do not agree with them. The article follows:

CERTAINLY THERE IS NO FREEDOM TO BE INDECENT

One would not be out of line in surmising that the American Broadcasting Co. is having difficulty getting the public to accept the argument advanced by James Hagerty, ABC official, and echoed by others, that the appearance of Alger Hiss on the Howard K. Smith program is to be excused on the grounds of an omnipotent "freedom of the press."

The argument, of course, of those who objected to a TV bit role for a man convicted of perjury concerning not land fraud or illegal whisky but the giving of his country's secret documents to her sworn enemy, a man who has evinced no contrition or remorse for his actions, was voiced on the ground of bad taste and in violation of decency. The protesting public and sponsors, insulted and beaten down by Mr. Hagerty's and others' counterattack with a strawman, are still making their objections known.

Two letters appearing in the New York Herald Tribune of November 30 are typical of those appearing in the daily press and which spell out the real issue so earnestly befogged by ABC and a host of well-meaning, mischievous people in high places:

"I have no newspaper or advertising affiliations and think that any advertiser is justified in leaving any medium that he thinks has lowered its standards. ABC's reputation is downgraded if the network shows poor judgment, and nothing has been as low as the Hiss presentation.

"B. N. HARRELL."

"The editorial, 'Mr. Hagerty and Mr. Hiss,' caused me great displeasure. Public opinion is subjected to every kind of pressure and propaganda by people with power. We have the right to accept it or reject it. There seems to be a double standard for those who attack and assassinate characters but describe as reprehensible and irresponsible those who protest this assassination.

"MARY KEARFOTT."

In the diocesan press there were those who correctly saw that the issue was not "censorship by the political Right" or the need for "balanced programming" or that a "tragedy" was incurred by the not altogether unique situation of a sponsor seeking to withdraw from a station.

In an editorial entitled "Time To Hiss Mr. Hagerty," the Providence Visitor, while agreeing on the perjurer's right to a TV appearance, said: "For the life of us we cannot understand how anyone can square with the minimum canons of decency and good taste placing a perjurer in judgment on a man whom 49 percent of the U.S. citizens believed worthy of the highest office in the land. We did not relish at all how Mr. Nixon made his political exit on television, but we can only admire his restraint in commenting on this humiliating treatment in a particularly bitter hour."

Msgr. John Kelly, editor of the Chicago archidocese's New World, asserted: "If gloating over the political defeat of a former Vice President of the United States comes into the area of good taste, I fail to see how. Mr. Nixon, whether you like him or not, is a man with a fine record of courage and diligence in serving the American public. The taste that makes you want to rinse your mouth is the employment of a convicted perjurer and traitor to vilify before millions the man who worked so courageously to expose his treachery.

"No doubt many will rise to defend ABC, Howard K. Smith, the sponsors Nationwide Insurance, and even Hiss, on the badly abused grounds of 'freedom of speech.' I would say they all deserve each other. Let's hope they're happy together."

We wonder why it is that when, using as a standard not decency but a system of ratings placed godlike on a pedestal as sole indicator of a program's value, a network unceremoniously dumps—read censors—a program, there are none to mount the battlements waving the tattered ensign of "freedom of the press"? Is it just that where cost per thousand is concerned, decency has nothing to do with it?

## Salute for B'nai B'rith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to pay tribute to the world's oldest Jewish service organization, B'nai B'rith, on the occasion of its 120th anniversary. This venerable organization, founded in New York City in 1843, is now worldwide in scope. It has played a major role in promoting understanding and tolerance throughout the United States and the 41 nations in which it has expanded its activities.

In this connection, I would like to include an excellent and appropriate editorial from a newspaper in my congressional district, the Washington Examiner.

The editorial reads:

MILESTONE FOR B'NAI B'RITH

B'nai B'rith is 119 years old. As it enters its 120th year, a venerable age even by Biblical standards, the world's oldest Jewish service organization carries its years well and remains a perennially zestful and energetic force in Jewish life throughout the free world.

B'nai B'rith's elixir has been its ability to meet history head on and become a force for good in the midst of turbulent human

events. Thus, it established the first Jewish library in America, and the first Jewish community center, opened the first free employment office for immigrants, fought anti-Semitism here and abroad before that word was coined, and was the first national organization to undertake disaster relief.

Its 119 years are studded with many rich and enduring contributions to community enlightenment and human progress. Since its inception in 1843 on New York's East Side, it has expanded to 41 nations throughout the world embracing some 470,000 members.

B'nai B'rith stays healthy and young because it continually meets the challenges and opportunities of contemporary events.

And so, hearty congratulations to B'nai B'rith on this significant anniversary. May it endure.

## Women Strike for Peace and the HUAC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, during December 1962, while Congress was not in session, the American public was treated to a sorry spectacle by a committee of Congress. The House Un-American Activities Committee decision to investigate the Women Strike for Peace and the subsequent hearings again demonstrated that this committee serves no useful legislative function and is antithetical to the principles upon which our Nation was founded. At the time of the hearings I issued a statement which I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues. I regret that on the first day of this session there was no opportunity to offer an amendment to the resolution on the rules of the 88th Congress which would repeal clause 1(r) of rule X and clause 18 of rule XI which provide for this committee. The House will have an opportunity to vote on this issue when the 1963 appropriation for the committee is before it.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM F. RYAN CONCERNING THE ACTION OF THE HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE IN HOLDING HEARINGS ON THE WOMEN STRIKE FOR PEACE

The announcement by the House Un-American Activities Committee of public hearings with reference to the Women Strike for Peace is another example of the misuse and abuse of legislative power.

The hearings apparently are intended to discredit the Women Strike for Peace and to cast doubt upon the loyalty of those active in it. The action of the committee induces conformity of thought and action and intimidates citizens who are seeking to express their concern for peace.

The spontaneous peace movement in the United States is dramatic evidence of the strength of our democracy. Even at the height of an international crisis, citizens exercised their constitutional rights of petition, assembly, and free speech. However, the committee consistently opposes the spirit of independent inquiry and humane protest. By intimidation and innuendo the committee spreads fear and stifles dissent. The committee has a habit of using its power to expose and punish groups and individuals whose programs and ideas the committee disapproves of.

Disarmament under effective international control and a strong United Nations, imperatives of our time, are stated goals of Women Strike for Peace. A group of citizens working for these goals within our constitutional framework should be commended, not condemned.

The first amendment explicitly protects all ideas and expressions. The framers of the Bill of Rights asserted their belief in freedom of speech and the right to nonconformity at a time when our Nation was new and insecure. We should do no less today.

The committee has said one purpose of the hearings is to determine "whether existing Federal laws are being violated." As Dean Erwin Griswold, of Howard Law School, has pointed out, "a legislative investigation is improper when its sole or basic purpose is to expose people or to develop evidence for use in criminal prosecution" ("The Fifth Amendment Today," Harvard University Press, 1955, p. 48). If the committee has any evidence of violations of Federal law, it should turn it over to the proper law enforcement agencies and not usurp the function of the Department of Justice.

We should be mindful of the words of Supreme Court Justice Black:

"History should teach us, then, that in times of high emotional excitement minority parties and groups which advocate extremely unpopular social or governmental innovations will always be typed as criminal gangs and attempts always made to drive them out. It was knowledge of this fact, and of great dangers, that caused the founders of our land to enact the first amendment as a guarantee that neither Congress nor the people would do anything to hinder or destroy the capacity of individuals and groups to seek converts and votes for any cause, however radical or unpalatable their principles might seem under the accepted notions of the times" (*Barenblatt v. U.S.*, 360 U.S. 109, 150–1).

The House Un-American Activities Committee is antithetical to the principles upon which our Nation was founded. Its latest action demonstrates again the need for its abolition.

## Open Season

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues the following editorial excerpt which appeared in the January 1963 issue of the IAA Record. It was written by William J. Kuhfuss, president, Illinois Agricultural Association:

EXCERPT FROM ARTICLE ENTITLED "OPEN SEASON"

Our Government was set up with checks and balances to insure the preservation of the rights of people. The legislative branch of Government was to set the policies and determine the course this country would follow. The executive branch was to administer those policies. The judicial branch was to check the validity of legislation. When any one branch begins to dominate the other, there is cause for concern.

When the U.S. Department of Agriculture, a part of the executive branch, begins to assume the role, not only of administrative responsibilities, but of policymaking and legislation, then our checks and balances have lost effectivenss. The USDA now has staff in every county in every State in the United States to administer legislative programs.

Legislation drafted and proposed by the Secretary of Agriculture in 1961 would have reduced these legislative responsibilities of Congress to a veto power. This year the USDA has solicited information from the county ASC (agricultural stabilization and conservation service) offices asking for opinions and ideas from farmers, at taxpayers' expense, to be interpreted by employees of the USDA and presumedly to be presented to Congress in support of newly proposed legislation. This effort to assume both legislative and administrative responsibilities is evident not only in agriculture, but in many other fields.

Real concern has been expressed by many people in the electric power field. Many feel that the concentration of authority and the buildup of a Government-directed public utility, providing electrical service for all of America, is definitely within the realm of possibility. This is the real issue that is being camouflaged with promises of lower cost, better service, and public benefit. This drive for centralized power and authority may be the real issue behind medicare, Federal aid to education, and all of the other Government-directed bonanzas.

Today, many discussions and proposals for legislation are heard that politicians would not have dared suggest or discuss a few years ago. It is time people became concerned for what lies ahead for America. If we get this centralized, supply management, Government-controlled operation all over America—and there isn't a way of isolating it in any one place—it can easily mean the end of the marketplace as a guide for future production. It can mean the end of private ownership and the inducements and incentives involved. It can mean the end of the rights of individuals to live and to operate as they see fit and to enjoy the benefits resulting from their good judgment, thrift, and hard work. It could mean the end of the extension service directed by dedicated scientists guided by the truth as they find it. It could mean there would be no place for a general farm organization to be active in the fields of legislation, education, commercial services, and public relations.

We have traveled far down this path of centralized authority in the past 15 or 20 years. We could some day be awakened and find that the ship of freedom has already left our shores.

Farm Bureau must not sidestep this issue. The future, not only of America, but of freedom-loving people everywhere may well depend on what we do.

## The 100th Birthday of Billy Frost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. One hundred years ago, on January 10, 1863, there was born at Tinesty, Pa., on the banks of the Allegheny River, an American citizen who was named Billy Frost by his proud parents. At 14 years of age this

new citizen started pumping oil wells at Oil Creek, Pa., when this business was in its infancy. Some of it must have gotten into his blood, because he has stayed with it through the years and as the great oil fields were discovered and developed, Billy Frost moved from one to the other—from Pennsylvania to Ohio, to Kansas, to Oklahoma, and to Texas.

In 1885 Billy Frost married Miss Effie Jane Thompson, the daughter of a minister. To this union were born two fine sons and two fine daughters. Billy Frost continued his work in the oil game and found his way with his fine family to Texas, in 1927. This was the beginning of the famous Panhandle oil field, which is located in the 18th Congressional District of Texas.

His kindness, good nature, and willingness to help others at all times had won for him the popular name "Uncle Billy," which has stayed with him through the years. As time began to takes its toll, as it does with all of us, "Uncle Billy's" walk became a little slower and his eyesight began to dim, but his great personality remains unchanged and the reasons for continued loving reference to him as "Uncle Billy" have become more pronounced with each year. His host of friends will pay honor to him at the Coronado Inn, in Pampa, Tex., on this, his 100th birthday. All America recognizes the great contribution that he has made to our country and to our way of life, in the exemplary leadership he has furnished in his chosen work.

## Cathedral Club Man of the Year, Joseph P. Hoey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 24, 1963, the Cathedral Club of Brooklyn will honor as its man of the year the Honorable Joseph P. Hoey, U.S. attorney for the eastern district of New York. A dedicated public official, Joe Hoey is richly entitled to the respect and admiration of his fellow New Yorkers.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the January 5, 1963, edition of the Brooklyn Eagle upon the occasion of Joe Hoey being chosen as that newspaper's man of the week:

MAN OF THE WEEK—U.S. ATTORNEY'S STORY FAME WITHOUT FANFARE

(By Steve Solomon)

Joseph P. Hoey is an enigma.

He has risen to the position of U.S. attorney for the eastern district without fanfare.

He is a man who could be in the public eye a great deal more if he chose to.

In an age when a dynamic personality tops all requisites for climbing the ladder of success in politics, he has risen on dedication and merit.

He has wanted it that way.

From 1940 until World War II interrupted his career as assistant Brooklyn district attorney in 1942, his office was one of the most efficient in the administration of William O'Dwyer as district attorney.

In the Navy, he served 3 years as an intelligence officer aboard a squadron of PT boats (Motor Torpedo Squadron 30) assigned to Europe and took part in the invasion of Normandy.

Reinstated as assistant district attorney in 1945, a position which he held until his current appointment on April 18, 1961, Hoey handled many outstanding cases.

He conducted the Mergenthaler Linotype Corp. larceny investigation. He also investigated tieup between bookmakers and the police in the Harry Gross case.

He participated in the inquiry into the operation of New York City departments which resulted in many important operational changes.

Hoey was born in Flatbush, not far from where he now resides, on October 21, 1912, to Patrick and Margaret Hoey.

He made a better than average record in public school.

It was not until he had been graduated from Brooklyn Preparatory School in 1931 and entered Fordham University, that he began to think seriously about a career in law.

"The law suddenly began to fascinate me during my early college years," Hoey said recently in his office at the Brooklyn District Court.

He went on to St. John's School of Law where he received his degree in 1937.

"Of course, the law is in my blood now," he said, "but what always made it so interesting for me is that it's always changing, always being modified.

"You can't really know the law unless you keep abreast of the latest court decisions being handed down."

Law was not the only subject that fascinated Hoey while at college.

A pretty little girl from Forest Hills named Kathryn Daley also caught his attention.

"I still maintain that I met my wife while at college," he said smiling, "but she insists we met at a party. We haven't come to a decision yet."

The Hoeys have been married 19 years and have four children—Anna Maria, 14; Joseph P., Jr., 12; Patrick T., 10; and Kathryn Marie, 9.

The transition from assistant district attorney to head of the eastern district attorney's office is not an easy one and Hoey is the first to admit it.

Into the jurisdiction of his department falls almost every type of criminal and civil Federal case.

"I used to work mostly on criminal cases when I was an assistant. As the U.S. attorney I have to be an expert on both criminal and civil law.

"I hate to say it, but I had to go back and learn the civil law all over again."

One of Hoey's prime tasks is reviewing every case his 32 assistant district attorneys have been assigned to.

He advises them and determines whether or not they are prepared properly.

The decision on whether he tries a case personally or assigns an assistant is his alone.

The list of organizations in which Hoey is active would fill a page in "Who's Who." He belongs to 14 organizations and is presently vice chairman of the criminal law and procedure committee of the Brooklyn Bar Association. He is a former president of the Emerald Association of Long Island and the St. Patrick's Society of Brooklyn.

On January 24, the Cathedral Club of Brooklyn will honor him as Man of the Year. It is a deserving award to a man who doesn't look for the limelight.

The limelight looks for Joseph P. Hoey.

## O'Neill: Politician's Politician

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, may I take this occasion to bring to the attention of the Members of the Congress an excellent article which appeared in the Boston Sunday Globe on December 16, 1962, written by C. R. Owens, one of the ablest political writers in the Nation. Mr. Owens here made a clear and concise report on the Honorable THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., my colleague and yours, and his efforts in behalf of the newly elected Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Endicott Peabody.

It has been my privilege to know Congressman O'NEILL for many years. I served for 8 years with him as a member of the Massachusetts General Court; 4 of which he was speaker of the house. Gov. Endicott Peabody was very fortunate to have a man of the ability of Congressman O'NEILL at the helm of his campaign and we in Massachusetts are very proud of him.

The article reads as follows:

O'NEILL: POLITICIAN'S POLITICIAN

(By C. R. Owens)

Each art, profession or trade—and politics can be all three—develops men who are looked upon by their peers as a master of his calling.

Among those who seek or hold public office in the Commonwealth such a man is Congressman THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., campaign chairman of Governor-elect Peabody in the election and recount.

The word "politician," so often used to defame, disparage or deprecate, has a brighter meaning when used to describe public servants of O'NEILL'S training.

"Politics is not a black art carried on in secrecy," according to "TIP" O'NEILL. "Nor is it a way of life to be ashamed of, but it must be studied and carefully cultivated by one who would practice it if the people are to receive the full benefit of a democracy."

For more than half of his 50 years, TIP O'NEILL has devoted his efforts toward fulfilling his duty, as he sees it, as an elected public official.

A native of Cambridge, the Congressman was raised in a family with firm ties in the Democratic Party. His father, the senior Thomas P. O'Neill, served in the Cambridge City Council in the early years of the century. TIP took to Democratic politics as naturally as a thoroughbred to racing.

Before O'NEILL was graduated from Boston College, he was holding party office.

Except for a single failure, he has been holding political offices since, as a State representative (he rose to be the first Democratic speaker of the Massachusetts House), as a school committeeman, and as a Member of Congress.

One of O'Neill's earliest supporters, Robert J. O'Hayre, currently a member of the State ballot law commission, recalls the one defeat for elective office, which occurred while "TIP" was a college junior.

"'TIP' was an at-large candidate for the Cambridge City Council and we were driving to a finish when he committed a faux pas and learned a lesson," O'Hayre said.

The youthful candidate had planned to destroy some of his opponents by reading

from a Cambridge Chronicle editorial at a Central Square rally, but when he reached into his pocket for the newsclip, it had disappeared.

He decided to improvise, pretending a letterhead was the clipping when a youngster standing at the tailgate of the truck shouted, "That's no newspaper."

When the boy repeated the accusation, O'NEILL, in what he thought was a stage whisper, told an aide, "Get that brat the blazes out of here."

"Unfortunately," recalled O'Hayre, " 'TIP' was speaking over a microphone and his comment on the youngster was heard by hundreds. He lost that fight by only 276 votes, citywide."

A gregarious man, O'NEILL was happiest during his years at St. John's High School and Boston College when engaged in group efforts—basketball, baseball, debating. He was never any great shakes as an athlete—"I couldn't play marbles"—but he tried, and enjoyed the associations.

His classmates were his supporters when in the spring of his senior year he sought and won a seat on the Cambridge Democratic city committee, and, later that year, backed him in his first successful bid for the House of Representatives. The Congressman remained in the House from 1937 through 1952.

Between 1944 and 1952, O'NEILL also served on the Democratic State committee, and in 1946 and 1947 was a member of the Cambridge school committee.

O'NEILL said both these offices came his way under unusual circumstances. Referring to his election to the party organization, he remembered, "I was at Ogunquit with Millie (his wife, the former Mildred Ann Miller, of Somerville) on vacation when early one afternoon I got a call from Sonny McDonough. Sonny was looking for the chairmanship of the State committee and he told me nobody was running from my district and that the deadline for filing was 5 that afternoon.

"I approved, so Sonny and my father took out papers for me and a week later I signed them. There was no opposition."

His election to the Cambridge school board also came about through the absence of candidates. "The only reason I ran," he said, "was that there was no one from our end of town on the school committee. Jerry Sullivan, that is, Judge Sullivan of the Nantucket probate court, and I were asked to run and hold a position until the boys came back from the war.

"So we flipped a coin to see who would run. I lost the toss and had to make the run, and won."

O'NEILL was a lean, gangling young man, well over 6 feet tall, when he entered politics. He has enjoyed elective office and it obviously agreed with him. By the time he reached his thirties—he observed his 50th birthday last Sunday—the Congressman's appearance was pretty much what it is today, a stocky build, heavy facial features, and topped by a shock of coarse, straight, gray hair.

Well liked by Representatives on both sides of the aisle, O'NEILL moved ahead fast in the House and was chosen minority leader at a Democratic caucus in 1947. Looking back, O'NEILL remembers the years when his party was in the ascendancy and the Republicans in the House were splitting between the old and the new guard.

Speaker at the time was Frederick B. Willis, now House counsel. "Freddie and I have been very good friends throughout the years, but once he ordered me 'seated,' which was perhaps the only time that the leader of the opposition was ordered to refrain from participating in a debate," said O'NEILL. "The debate was over a Republican highway bond issue and Freddie objected to my complaints as to the number of corners he was cutting."

Democratic legislators felt they were carrying the party in the 1947–48 period—"we were making the snowballs for Paul Dever and Maurice Tobin to throw"—and in the latter year, O'NEILL led a rebellion against the mossbacks in the party, headed by Boston's Mayor James M. Curley.

"I was only 34 at the time, but I had been in the House 12 years. Strangely, the man who has become my best friend in Washington, Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, and I had never met when we decided to fight city hall and elect our own slate of delegates to the Democratic National Convention that year," O'NEILL related.

"Well, our slate carried 38 of the 39 cities, but it was James Michael and MCCORMACK who went to the convention. Curley would have accepted myself and Representative Jerry Crowley as members of his team, but when we declined, he replaced us with Dr. Silas Taylor and Frank Goon.

"After it was over, Congressman MCCORMACK called me down to his office and we talked over the future of the Democratic Party. He asked me if I had ever considered that Massachusetts was a Democratic State and that with a little extra effort, the House, which had been in Republican hands since the Civil War, would go Democratic.

"It seemed like a wild dream. When I got back to the statehouse, I sat down with Tom Mullen, then and now my top assistant, and we reviewed every House contest of recent years. We found 25 districts which had been carried by Tobin 4 years earlier, yet the incumbent Republican Representatives had had no opposition.

"One district, around Athol, hadn't had a Democratic candidate for 45 years. We decided this called for a fight and we raised $14,000 for it. A second-year Congressman heard about our dream and he asked if he could help. We accepted the $1,000 contribution offered by John F. Kennedy.

"We handpicked the candidates in the districts, ran their campaigns even to paying for their campaign literature and addressing envelopes. The effort paid off and that November the House went Democratic 122 to 118."

The shift in power in the House also brought O'NEILL in as speaker. Modestly, O'NEILL today credits Congressman MCCORMACK, Mullen, and a group of representatives, including MDC Commissioner Robert F. Murphy, Representative John J. Toomey, of Cambridge, and Thomas F. Riley, now assistant clerk of the Dorchester District Court, for the upheaval.

"I can't conceive of the Democrats ever losing the house again," said O'NEILL.

During the 4 years Paul A. Dever was Governor, O'NEILL, a fellow Cantabrigian, was speaker and managed to make the Governor's lot an easier one.

In the fall of 1952, Dever sought a third term, and Congressman John F. Kennedy moved up the ladder to the U.S. Senate. O'NEILL moved into the congressional seat vacated by Kennedy.

The move wasn't an easy one. O'NEILL said his primary fight with the then Senator Michael LoPresti "was the only real fight of my life." LoPresti's senate seat represented about half of the congressional district, while O'NEILL's house seat represented only one-sixth.

O'NEILL graciously gives others credit for his successes, and his victory over LoPresti in 1952 he awards to Charles H. McGlue, former Democratic State committee chairman.

"We had 22,200 Democrats registered in Cambridge and it was Charlie who directed the drive for independents to vote in the Democratic primary. Mike must have wondered for a long time how 26,000 voted that primary day in Cambridge."

A lesson learned in his first congressional contest, according to "TIP" O'NEILL, is that there is no relationship between campaign expenditures and the vote a candidate receives. "Mike was spending money in my part of the district and I spent some $10,000 wooing support in east Boston. We had some of the biggest rallies and pizza parties in the district, but all I received was about 900 votes. The reverse was happening in Cambridge."

O'NEILL has been reelected to Congress with little opposition. Twice, he put aside his own campaigning to head campaign committees for nominees for Governor, Foster Furcolo and, this year, Endicott Peabody.

He has been particularly close to Peabody politically for many years. O'NEILL is confident that Peabody will make a good Governor and one in whom the Democrats will take considerable pride.

Peabody, he is willing to agree, is a new type of Democrat. "I hope his relationship with the legislature will be harmonious. He is a good Democrat and I am confident in the program he will present," added the Congressman.

"I am not helping Chub draft his State program," O'NEILL said, "I will be in Washington working along with the New Frontiersmen.

"But I have let Chub know in no uncertain terms that if he comes up with a program which runs counter to my views as a Democrat, I will let him know in no uncertain terms. He was amazed, but I wanted him to know in advance that if that day comes, I will not be turning my back on him, but he will be deserting party principles."

When he accepted the task of serving as Peabody's campaign manager, O'NEILL said, it was as one Democrat assisting another. "I told him, 'if you have to offer me something for me to be campaign manager, I'd be of no use to you, if I asked for something to be campaign manager, the same would be true.' "

O'NEILL has assisted Peabody through the recent recount. "It is interesting to see the number of persons who were with Peabody all along and fought to work for him on the recount," observed "TIP." "A couple of months ago, they wouldn't answer their telephones when we needed help."

Persons have turned to O'NEILL seeking his help with the Governor-elect. "Most of these requests," according to O'NEILL, come from State troopers who would like to be assigned to the Governor's office and from candidates for the State racing commission."

Party loyalty and party regularity are important elements in O'NEILL's makeup. The late Speaker Sam Rayburn, probably with a nudge from JOHN MCCORMACK, recognized this back in 1954 when he tapped O'NEILL for membership on the Rules Committee of Congress. TIP became the second Congressman in history to go on this committee after a single term.

At the time, Rayburn told O'NEILL that the new job had been offered him because he had served as speaker of the Massachusetts House, but more particularly, because he recognized the need for party discipline. O'NEILL is No. 8 man on the Rules Committee, which determines when and how legislation will reach the House floor. Five of those with higher rank have passed the 70-year mark.

"TIP O'NEILL enjoys politics as a way of life. He regrets, however, that being a Congressman often takes him away from his family. In any conversation with the Congressman, he makes continual reference to Mrs. O'Neill and her reactions to politics. The O'Neills are the parents of five children, Rosemary, now 19; Thomas 3d, 17; Susan, 14; Christopher, 12, and Michael Tolan, 10.

O'NEILL in the next 2 years may be the chief political catalyst in Massachusetts. His frendship with MCCORMACK and his position on the Rules Committee has made him a liaison man with the White House, where he is welcomed by his predecessor in Congress, President Kennedy. Now he will also have entree into the office of Governor-elect Peabody.

## Independence Day of Western Samoa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 1, Western Samoa celebrated her first independence day, and we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to Their Excellencies, Tupua Tamasese Mea'ole and Malietoa Tanumafili II, the heads of state of this Republic, on the occasion of the first anniversary of Western Samoan independence.

January the first is a symbol throughout the world for the birth of a new year; to the people of Western Samoa, this date has a special meaning. One year ago, on New Year's Day, Western Samoa was proclaimed sovereign and independent. It is this accomplishment that I wish to commemorate today.

Since its discovery by the Dutch in 1722, the Samoan Islands have played an important part in the history of the South Pacific. Strategically located as a naval station and a crossroads for trading ships, the islands were soon coveted by many nations. The United States sent its first expedition to the islands in 1839 and the first American consul was appointed in 1856. The climax of this particular struggle for possessions abroad occurred in 1889 when the United States, Germany, and Great Britain successfully checkmated each others forces. This led to a partitioning of the islands. The large islands of Opolu and Savaii, with several lesser islands, were awarded to Germany. These became Western Samoa.

As a result of World War I, Western Samoa was wrested from Germany by a New Zealand expeditionary force. Since then, New Zealand has held mandate over these islands, first through the League of Nations, then more recently through the United Nations.

New Zealand recognized the right of sovereignty for her trust territories and a constitution was promulgated in October 1960. Independence was proclaimed on January 1, 1962, thus ending 46 years of New Zealand administration and 70 years of foreign rule.

Samoa today has an approximate population of 113,500, mainly Polynesian, with a birth rate among the world's highest. Its complex constitutional system of government, headed by a dual chiefship and a prime minister, govern Western Samoa with wisdom and caution. Americans, visiting the country, will be able to pay their respects to Robert Louis Stevenson, who is buried near the capital, and who is revered and loved by the Samoans, his adopted people.

The Samoans, who are proud of the fact that they are the first independent Polynesian nation, look forward to a continuous and productive life under their own rule. The able Prime Minister Fiame Mata'afa summarized the sentiments of the Samoans when he said:

Rooted and responding to the invigorating influences of the modern world, the independent state of Western Samoa will grow and flourish to become an ornament—if only a minor one—to the world community.

It is to this spirit and this nation that I salute the people of Western Samoa on their first independence anniversary.

## Report of an Interview

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to receive permission to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with these brief remarks a report of an interview held by Jane Katims, an undergraduate of the Red Bank, N.J., High School which appeared in the school paper, the Buccaneer, a monthly newspaper published by the students of Red Bank High School, on Wednesday, November 21, 1962. Jane Katims was very objective in her interview and asked pertinent questions which showed thought and study. I was very much impressed with her knowledge of public affairs and commend the Red Bank High School highly for stimulating the interest of their pupils in such matters. The published interview appeared, as follows:

VETERAN CONGRESSMAN STRESSES VALUE OF BROAD SOCIAL STUDIES BACKGROUND

(By Jane Katims)

Congressman JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS is one critic who thinks the American schools are far superior to the European educational systems. However, he believes that there is a lack of training in American history in our schools.

He feels that it is imperative for students of today to study American history thoroughly before fully understanding the growth, industry, philosophy, liberty, and freedom of our great country.

It isn't easy to catch the Congressman at his home, 25 Waterman Avenue, Rumson. Most of his time is spent in Washington, D.C. But talking to Mr. AUCHINCLOSS is a real treat.

A veteran of 20 years in the House of Representatives, Congressman AUCHINCLOSS was reelected early this month to serve his 11th term. He has always been interested in civic affairs and considers service to the people as his reward. He believes that you must enjoy people before you can consider yourself qualified for a career in politics.

REMEMBERS ROOSEVELT

In his interesting public life Mr. AUCHINCLOSS went to school with Franklin D. Roosevelt and campaigned with Harry S. Truman. He is well acquainted with ex-President Eisenhower and President Kennedy. He remembers Douglas MacArthur's famous speech as a great thrill.

An unusual incident in the Congressman's life is the time when he interrupted his busy schedule to play cupid. A young man was called for special duty due to the Cuban situation a week before his wedding day. The girl he was to marry was frantic because she was unable to locate her fiance out at sea. Congressman AUCHINCLOSS received a call from her minister asking for his help. Although much classified information was withheld, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS was able to contact the ship and bring that boy home. The couple was happily married, November 10.

Congressman AUCHINCLOSS has firm ideas about American youth and education of today. He is much in favor of the high school system of student council and he believes that its aims are not only to guide students but to guide teachers as well.

EDUCATION STATE RESPONSIBILITY

The Congressman stated that he always voted for Federal aid to school buildings but holds education a state responsibility.

When asked if President Kennedy's physical fitness program is a good one, the Congressman replied, "Why, that's like asking me if sin is bad. Of course, everyone should be physically fit."

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS would enjoy an opportunity to visit Red Bank High School and speak to the student body and faculty. He feels that most Americans do not completely understand the complicated procedure involved in preparing a bill before it becomes a law. He is anxious to explain this procedure.

## Cooperation for Progress: Israel and the Afro-Asian Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the Congress Biweekly of November 26, 1962.

Israel has shown and is showing in Africa and Asia that freedom works. The suspicious attitude toward democracy by some governments will undoubtedy be changed by association in economic cooperation with the dynamic young society of Israel.

The article follows:

ISRAEL AND THE AFRO-ASIAN NATIONS

(By Elias Cooper)

The past 2 years, filled as they were with international crises, also witnessed an expansion of trade and cooperation between Israel and more than 40 African and Asian countries, thus continuing a trend in international relations that began in 1955. Although Nasser is still able to force anti-Israel declarations into the communiques of Afro-Asian political conferences, the continuing practical relations between Israel and the developing nations of those two continents provide concrete evidence of Nasser's failure to attain his dearest objective—the political and economic isolation of Israel.

Considering Israel's limitations in terms of population and economic capacity, the extent to which Afro-Asian countries are mak-

ing use of Israel know-how is truly remarkable. Israel's Department of International Cooperation is conducting an imaginative technical assistance program in Asia and Africa. Students from these continents are trained at Israeli institutions, while Israeli instructors and experts are sent out to the students' home countries to train additional personnel and to initiate complex undertakings. Israeli commercial and industrial firms have pioneered in a novel form of assistance by establishing joint enterprises, in which the host governments always retain a 60-percent interest. The avowed purpose of these arrangements is to have the Israeli establish the enterprise, train local personnel in all phases of the operation, and then allow the local government to purchase the Israeli share on a predetermined equitable rate of return. The exchanges of students, experts, trade and state delegations between Israel and the new nations have been so voluminous as to necessitate reciprocal state visits during the current year by President Ben Zvi, Premier Ben-Gurion, and Foreign Minister Golda Meir.

The outstanding features of the Israeli technical assistance program have been the training of students and civil servants in Israel, and the sending of Israeli instructors and survey missions to countries requesting them. Currently over 1,000 African and Asian students are receiving training in Israel; their tuition costs are covered by scholarships provided by the Israel Government. In addition, there are several nongovernmental programs. The Histadrut (General Federation of Labor) is operating an Afro-Asian Institute for Labor Studies and Cooperation, which opened its doors in 1960. Half of the 120 annual scholarships of the institute are provided by the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organization. The Hebrew University-Hadassah Medical School is training students from Africa and Asia in special classes conducted in English and French for the convenience of students from former English and French colonies. The Technion (Israel Institute of Technology) has inaugurated a similar program for graduated students from the same areas. Unparalleled anywhere is the opportunity provided by ORT (Organization for Rehabilitation through Training), which has made available annual space for 40 African students at its renowned technical high school in Natanya. Israel's major radio station, Kol Israel, is currently training broadcasters from Togo, Dahomey, and Niger.

The bulk of the African and Asian students study the varied branches of agriculture and agricultural marketing. The remainder are distributed in the fields of education, public adminstration, finance, housing, tourism, medicine, sanitation, and the academic disciplines. At the present time there are students in Israel from Ethiopia, Ghana, Nigeria, Burma, India, the Congo (both Brazzaville and Leopoldville), Togo, Liberia, Tanganyika, and the Central African Republic. Israel's pioneering youth groups, Gadna and Nahal, have appealed to some leaders of African and Asian countries. Ghana has fashioned a Builders Corps patterned on and trained by its Israel antecedent, Gadna. Seventy-four young men and women from 11 other African countries attended a 4-month course in 1961 to prepare themselves as youth leaders in their own countries. In 1962, police officers from the Congo (Leopoldville), Dahomey, Malagasy, and Niger attended an Israel course for senior law enforcement officers.

No less impressive is the roster of Israel experts sent to developing countries; during the current year they number over 900. This aspect of the assistance program stresses specific projects, which are given their start by Israel experts and are taken over by staffs trained in Israel. Israel medical experts have served in Ghana, Ethiopia, Liberia, and the Congo (Leopoldville). An Israel engineer and doctor are currently planning a 200-bed hospital in Sierra Leone. An Israel medical team is operating a clinic for eye diseases in Liberia, while training Liberians to take over. Other Liberians are studying medicine in Israel. An Israeli is serving as director of the Technical College in Ethiopa. Over 100 Israel technicians are directing the construction of 13 roads totaling 250 miles in the Abidan area of West Nigeria. Staff members of the Hebrew University and the Technion have been sent on missions to Liberia, Ethiopia, Ghana, and Nigeria. Administrators from the Egged bus cooperative are now establishing a similar cooperative in Nepal. Israel agricultural experts are now serving in more than 20 African and Asian countries. The same countries have also received Israel experts under the auspices of the various United Nations specialized agencies. In the initial phase of the Congo crisis the majority of doctors provided by the United Nations to Leopoldville were Israelis.

The joint enterprise of Israel companies and Afro-Asian government partners have provided another avenue for technical assistance. The undertakings are numerous and include construction companies and merchant marine flotillas. In all cases the Israel partner undertakes to train local personnel to take complete control. The joint companies have increased trade between Israel and the countries involved. The trade has expanded the market for Israel's manufactured goods, drugs, chemicals, and tires, while providing her with sources of raw materials. The investments have also increased employment opportunities for the Israel labor force. In order to spur trade Israel has extended several short-term loans, which are usually applied toward the purchase of equipment from Israel. Impressive as it is, the investments field cannot constitute a major aspect of Israel aid in the foreseeable future. Israel can, however, continue to provide needed expert aid and study facilities in fields wherein she has met with enviable success in the eyes of developing countries.

The factors that led to a flowering of Israel-Burmese relations are representative of the reasons for Israel's successful relations with developing countries. On his 1955 visit to Israel, Premier U Nu was most impressed with the Government's successful efforts to turn arid areas into cultivable land, and with practical Israel improvizations. He wrote: "The people of Israel are hard working and intelligent. * * * Without forests they import African lumber, and export furniture, as they export tires after importing rubber." U Nu was also attracted by the "privilege of choosing any mode of life that one prefers" in Israel; although there are the various cooperative forms of settlements, no one in Israel is forced into communal life as in China, Burma's neighbor. U Thant, the present Secretary General of the United Nations, accompanied U Nu in the capacity of Director General of the Burmese Prime Minister's office. He subsequently noted that he was impressed with the speed that characterized the development of Israel's industry, cooperative agriculture, and the high level of education in the country.

The 1955 visit of the Burmese leaders greatly spurred cooperation between the two countries. To date Israel experts have advised Burma on irrigation, cultivation, the use of agricultural machinery, and the manufacture of products ranging from tires to pencils. Their services were also used to plan an interurban telephone system, a public health system, rice market, and the building of housing projects. The total of Israel specialists in Burma exceeds the number sent by any other country. Israel military personnel have also aided in training the Burmese Army and Air Force. Several groups of Burmese officers and their families underwent training in Israel and have returned to their country to build the first four in a series of Israel-type border settlements in the Shan States, where Burma is vulnerably exposed to Communist China along a 450-mile frontier.

Israel has from the very outset of the African independence movement cultivated relations with the African countries. The development of friendly Israel-African relations followed the pattern set by Ghana. An Israel delegation was sent to the Ghana independence day ceremonies in order to initiate contracts. The following year (1958), a trade agreement was signed between the two countries, and Ghana requested a number of Israel experts in the fields of agriculture, banking, marketing, and road construction. Israelis have also assisted in establishing a pilots' school and a central training camp for the Ghanaian Army. Nearly 100 Ghanaian students enroll annually in Israel study programs. A joint construction company was established in Ghana by Solel Boneh, the Israel building cooperative. Zim, Israel's navigation company, and the Ghanaian Government jointly established the Black Star Line, a merchant marine company that operated four freight ships at its inception. In 1960, as part of Premier Nkrumah's general nationalization program, Ghana bought out Zim's 40-percent investment 2 years prior to the date stipulated in the original agreement. Zim will nevertheless continue as managing agent of the concern until 1967 in order to train local personnel.

There can be no doubt that Israel has gained an imposing array of friends on the international scene as a result of her policies in Asia and Africa. There have been setbacks, but they came from only a few of the more than 40 nations involved. Israel's ties with Burma have caused other Southeast Asian nations (Thailand, Cambodia, and Laos) to pursue similar relations. Burma has remained Israel's stanchest friend in Asia (the ouster of U Nu by the Burmese Army has apparently not resulted in any change in the country's Israeli policy). Burma tried, though in vain, to gain Israel's invitation to the Bandung Conference in 1954, and at last year's Belgrade meeting of neutral leaders, U Nu prevented Nasser from blasting Israel in the final resolutions.

Some setbacks in Israel's relations with Africa and Asia are inevitable since neither Israel nor the Afro-Asian countries are immune from the cold war. Israel's Western connections are undisputable and they are underscored by Egyptian and Soviet propaganda whenever possible. The Soviet Union has officially made known its displeasure over Israel's technical assistance program. On December 12, 1960, Izvestia, the official organ of the Soviet Government, characterized Israel as "fulfilling the role of a Trojan horse for NATO," and accused her of attempting to undermine the new African governments and rendering their armies ineffective by selling them outmoded weapons. Guinea is the only African country that has accepted Moscow's line, but Guinea's Sékou Touré has long ago decided to turn to the Eastern bloc for aid. More forboding for Israel is the neutralist path followed by Ghana and Mali because, as neutrals, these countries are at times forced into a tactical alliance with Nasser. Yet both Ghana and Mali continue their normal relations with Israel.

Israel does have friends in Africa who support her as strongly as does Burma. The most influential of these are Tanganyika and Nigeria. The vast majority of African nations reject the Soviet and Arab conten-

tions and do not view Israel as an imperialist appendage. In the long run Israel's policy in Africa may offset Nasser's ambitions on that continent. In his "Philosophy of the Revolution," Nasser clearly sees Africa as Egypt's burden," just as 19th century imperialists saw it as the "white man's burden." This outlook is not likely to escape the attention of African leaders.

## A Deepwater Port for Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill to authorize the construction of an Indiana port on Lake Michigan. Ever since I began my political life in Indiana, I have been talking to people all over our great State about the potential for development which such a port would present. The people of Indiana know the benefits which can be gained by the development of this deepwater port, and they share my enthusiasm for an Indiana port.

The road by which progress travels is always a hard one. There are always many obstacles, there are always delays, there are always disappointments and the path followed by this progressive proposal has provided no exception. Discussion of the Indiana public port predates concrete development of the St. Lawrence Seaway. A full 80 years before the congressional Deepwater Seaways Commission report of 1896 suggested the development of the St. Lawrence Seaway, the statesmen of early Indiana recognized and protected Indiana's right to a harbor. By having the Indiana State boundary moved 10 miles north of the line established by the Northwest Ordinance, these early leaders laid the groundwork for our port development today.

By the establishment of the 36-mile coastline on Lake Michigan the political leaders of Indiana established our claim to a water access at the time of our introduction to statehood. Now, after years of bipartisan effort on the part of leaders of the State, our plans are formulated, our authority is developing, and we look forward to the early construction of our deepwater port.

The economic feasibility of the operation of a port at Burns Waterway is well substantiated. Scholarly economic presentations developed by Indiana University, various State agencies and private sources indicate that the Indiana deepwater port can become an important transportation center and an economic success. Preliminary work by the Indiana Port Commission indicates, without doubt, that previous estimates as to the economic potential of the port have been very conservative.

The navigational plan developed for this harbor is not only adequate but quite attractive. The approach and entry pattern, I am told, is one of simplicity and ease of management. For example, in tug service alone, a grain-carrying vessel would save $1.055 per trip, for tugs will not be needed at the proposed Indiana Waterway Harbor.

I am proposing the development of an additional transportation facility for my State and for the Nation. History has shown that the access to water routes has, since the advent of recorded history, been a primary determinent in the economic progress of nations. Those nations and states and cities with access to this most economical form of transportation have prospered and have become the trade, population, and cultural centers of the world. Certainly, areas without such water commerce facility have also developed successfully but they have prospered in spite of transportation hardships.

Indiana is a State which has developed richly in both industrial and agricultural productivity. The richness of our soil and the skill of our farmers has combined to make Indiana an important part of America's food-producing Midwest. The industrial ingenuity and the quality of our workmen have contributed to our industrial progress.

Located as we are, at the crossroads of America, Indiana's industrial and agricultural capacity is important to the entire Nation. The food we produce is easily available to feed the people of the country. The goods we manufacture are easily available to fill the needs and wants of all Americans because we are located in the very population center of the continental United States. But to expand our industrial development, to provide further markets for our agricultural abundance and our rich natural resources, Indiana needs access to inexpensive water transportation which can be provided by the Burns Waterway Harbor.

The development of the harbor is consistent with the national transportation policy. Indeed, the national transportation policy dictates its development because the needs of commerce cry out for the development of this additional transportation facility in our State.

Indiana is the only State bordering on the Great Lakes which has no public deepwater port; no door to the trade routes of the world. Since the St. Lawrence Seaway has provided Great Lakes ports with access to the world's great commercial centers, the importance of our harbor has taken on added significance. We now have the opportunity of making the industrial goods, the natural resources and the agricultural products, in which our State so abundantly abounds, available to the markets of the world. The key, of course, is the Indiana public deepwater port.

Let us look for a minute into the world of the future. We are discussing today the potential of the needs of commerce in Indiana and the benefits which an additional transportation facility can contribute to this commercial development.

I believe the greatest hindrance to our clear analysis of this problem lies in the inadequacy of our standards of judgment. I do not question the analyses made by so many learned and competent men, but I question the accuracy of any one of us to completely comprehend the potential for future growth and development of our area.

Who of us will predict, with any confidence in its accuracy, how much the population of our State and its environs will grow in the life of this project? Who will estimate the gross commercial product of our area for the next 50 years, and rest comfortably on that estimate? Who will suggest the maximum agricultural productivity of the great Midwest after the production explosion of the last decade and a half? We are incompetent judges of tomorrow's world because we are tied to the standards of today in making our analyses. We cannot fully comprehend the wonders of tomorrow's life because the frailty of our nature forces us to depend, for our premises, upon sensations which we have experienced.

Our Nation is built on growth and our society, our economy, and our future is geared to grow. Change is the only constant value in our society and the change pattern is one of growth.

Economic need for the Burns Waterway Harbor is clearly established in the world of today. Certainly the unlimited potential for the commercial development of the area adds further impetus to the favorable report on these navigation improvements.

There is clear and evident need for the development of the public harbor at Burns Waterway. The State of Indiana is determined to carry through its development of the facilities which are its responsibility. I trust that the Federal Government will move forward in good faith to initiate action on the navigational improvements which are its responsibility. There are 53 federally improved harbors in the 8 States on the Great Lakes waterways in the United States today. Construction of a second Indiana project to allow the State to develop its only deepwater public harbor seems fair and just.

Mr. Speaker, my State is a great State but its greatness cannot always be measured by its proud history. Its greatness must also be measured by its willingness to meet and accept the challenges offered by the hope of an even greater future. I personally look upon this dream and this endeavor as a step by the people of Indiana to justify our heritage of greatness. It is a real and challenging expression of a progressive spirit.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that, in the very near future, this proposal might receive the approval of this House. Indiana will be very grateful.

## Independence Day of the Republic of Tanganyika

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on December 9, 1962, Tanganyika celebrated

her first independence day, and we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency Mwalimu, Julius K. Nyerere, President of the Republic of Tanganyika, on this memorable occasion.

TANGANYIKA: FROM COLONY TO REPUBLIC

On December 9, 1961, Tanganyika, a United Nations trust territory under the administration of the United Kingdom, became a sovereign member of the British Commonwealth and the 29th African state to achieve independence. The hoisting of the new green, black, and gold Tanganyikan flag marked the emergence of the first multiracial nation in Africa under African government. As such, it aroused considerable interest in a continent where racial problems have taken their place among the difficulties facing governments. The general optimism that the nation's 9 million Africans, 20,000 Europeans, 80,000 Asians, and 20,000 Arabs could live together in peace and order and in dedication to common goals was engendered to a large extent by the leadership qualities of Tanganyika's first Prime Minister, and now President, Julius Nyerere. Prior to independence British officials had called Nyerere "the key to everything in Tanganyika." The American press stated that "the personality, skill, and absolute dedication of Mr. Nyerere to nonviolence and antidiscrimination against Africans and non-Africans alike" was a key factor which would make a multiracial nation possible. In the not always smooth year since independence we have seen Mr. Nyerere's influence at work both in office and behind the scenes to mold Tanganyika into a democratic republic and a model of nonracialism for the rest of the African Continent to follow.

What is this country over which Mr. Nyerere has become President? Located just to the south of the equator on the Nile-Congo-Zambezi divide, Tanganyika stretches for more than 450 miles along the Indian Ocean. It borders on Kenya in the north and on Mozambique in the south. It is comparable in size to Nigeria and is larger than Texas and Oklahoma combined. Substantial portions of 2 of Africa's "great lakes"—Lake Tanganyika and Lake Victoria—lie within the country's boundaries. It is a land of plains and plateaus, with a humid coastal belt. It is the land where Stanley met Livingstone and where, on the Kenya border, the summit of Mount Kilimanjaro, permanently covered with snow, rises over 19,000 feet from sea level to make it the highest mountain peak in Africa.

When Tanganyika became independent under the leadership of Julius Nyerere and his party, the Tanganyika African National Union—TANU—the government pledged, in Nyerere's words, to lead the people in an all-out fight against poverty, ignorance, and disease. "Uhuru na Kazi," TANU's slogan in the campaign for independence, has increasingly become used as a greeting throughout the country. "Uhuru na Kazi," meaning freedom and work, expresses Tanganyika's faith in the future and determination to fulfill the expectations of her people.

The world was momentarily stunned when Mr. Nyerere resigned from his post as prime minister only 6 weeks after independence to devote himself more fully to the chairmanship of the Tanganyika African National Union. Then, in late May the government announced plans to turn the country into a republic, with a president elected by universal suffrage as the head of state. It became clear that Mr. Nyerere's resignation from office had not been an abdication of power but rather the prologue to his reemergence as president of the republic of Tanganyika. On December 9, 1962, 1 year after its accession to independence, Tanganyika became a republic with Julius Nyerere its first President.

In commemorating the anniversary of Tanganyika's independence we commend President Nyerere and the people of Tanganyika for their untiring efforts in transforming Tanganyika from a colony to a republic. We wish them every success for the future.

## Our Heritage of Boldness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the following article "Our Heritage of Boldness" by Catherine Drinker Bowen, was published in the "Sports Illustrated" December 24, 1962, issue, and I believe sets forth in very dramatic fashion the accomplishments under our system which does encourage the boldness of our citizens in their quest for the common good:

[From the Sports Illustrated magazine, Dec. 24, 1962]

OUR HERITAGE OF BOLDNESS

(By Catherine Drinker Bowen)

("We are the heirs of all time," wrote Herman Melville a century ago, "and with all nations we divide our inheritance." In this essay the distinguished historian and biographer, Catherine Drinker Bowen, has analyzed the intangible elements in the heritage of every American—handed on from the circumstances of the discovery of the New World and the perils and opportunities of mastering a continent. It is a heritage of boldness, which has powered the magnificent American accomplishments. Yet it includes something light-hearted and carefree as well, and in the paragraphs that follow there are pictured a few of the innumerable expressions of our native gift: the disciplined endurance of champions, the daring exploits of sky divers and white-watered canoeists, the imaginative audacity of designers and architects—a part of that boldness in the pursuit of happiness that gives enduring meaning to the transient excitements of sport.)

They were bold from the first. Bold in dreaming, bold in persistence. It is no mere boast, because they made their dreams come true. A man stood on the shores of Portugal and looked westward, nearly five centuries ago. From the way the winds blew, from the seasonal steadines of them and the direction, the man conjectured there might be land behind these winds. A mariner might sail, and by dead reckoning—by the log, by the compass—he might find this land.

A wild thought, a bold dream, yet it came true; the land was found. Spain, all Europe, England heard of it. "The breath of hope," said Francis Bacon, "which blows on us from that new continent * * *," adding that Columbus had made hope reasonable. In these beginnings is something symbolic, something the American mind leaps to meet. The ships embarked, captained by freemen, adventurers. At the end of voyage, at the end of hazard, struggle, endurance and high gamble, our country was found. On a perilous horizon America took shape and was realized.

The years passed, and the generations. Not Columbus now but America herself made hope reasonable. Put it in terms of government—1787: "We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union * * * do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America." Europe laughed. "We, the people." What kind of a phrase was that? Nowhere had so big a federation been attempted, nowhere so bold a vision entertained. In high good spirits and in deadly earnest, John Adams, of Massachusetts, wrote to the Virginians: "When, before the present epocha, had 3 millions of people full power and a fair opportunity to form and establish the wisest and happiest government that human wisdom can contrive?"

Europe watched and waited. A government had been erected on the proposition that all men are by nature equally free and independent. Preposterous statement, subverting the established order. Nor did the Americans pause to argue their statement or bolster it decently with citation of ancient authority, after the fashion of the times. They simply declared certain "truths" to be "self-evident." "Novus Ordo Seclorum," they wrote on the Great Seal of the United States: "A New Order for the Ages."

Was ever a country, young or old, so brash? How serious, asked Europe, were these Americans? More importantly, how powerful were they and how long could they sustain this impudent program, which by its mere existence threatened ruling classes everywhere? Europe laid traps, offered bribes, threats, inducements, hoping to divide these United States and bring them low. A federation so large, embracing such diversified regions and interests, would surely fail, disintegrate, slip and slide of its own weight in one quarter or another. In the Old World only an occasional statesman saw into the future, as Edmund Burke in the House of Commons. "America," he said, "which at this day serves for little more than to amuse you with stories of savages and uncouth manners, yet shall, before you taste of death, show itself equal to the whole of that [British] commerce which now attracts the envy of the world."

It is a story often told, yet to Americans it does not grow stale. Threats from without only helped to solidify the Union. It was from within the real danger came. Ours was a country founded in a religious era by men of fierce fighting piety and dogma. Religion could have divided us; we had seen the religious wars of Europe and we were forewarned. From the first, Americans made a separation of church and state that was to remain profoundly significant, giving citizens a scope and a hope which nowhere else was entertained. "There is no argument," announced the Presbytery of Hanover, Va. (1776), "in favour of establishing the Christian religion, but what may be pleaded with equal propriety, for establishing the tenets of Mahomed by those who believe the Alcoran."

A bland statement, satisfied with merely setting forth. Thomas Jefferson, writing the Virginia "Statute of Religious Liberty," said

it more urgently—but this was a man who could not put pen to paper without leaving a trace of fire down the page: "Whereas Alighty God hath created the mind free * * * our civil rights have no dependence on our religious opinions, any more than our opinions in physics and geometry."

What did these statements, these documents and declarations do for Americans individually, and how were men, singly, motivated thereby? Nowhere had these documents mentioned "the individual" or addressed themselves to him. Yet by this government and this system the American individual was freed exactly as if fetters had been struck from him. In Europe since time immemorial men had been divided into classes, "some to toil and earn, others to seize and enjoy." The U.S. Constitution provided for neither class nor privilege. All was mobile, a man could move up or he could slip down. It was a wholly unprecedented departure, and to Americans, both immigrant and native born, it gave extraordinary scope. Neither the Declaration of Independence nor the Constitution claimed to make timid men courageous, lazy men active or stupid men bright. But these documents allowed bold men to be bold; they unlocked doors, let Americans walk through, each one to his destiny.

Take it in terms of those men who opened up our western territory. In 1804 President Jefferson dispatched the Captains Lewis and Clark westward to map out a land route to the Pacific. For some 16 months the two traveled the wilderness, rode turbulent river waters, broke trail—careful always to draw their maps, record their meticulous pictured reports of birds, fishes, wild animals. On a rainy November morning of 1805 Clark looked westward from his mountain camp above the Columbia River and wrote, in his own phonetic spelling, "Ocian in view! O! the Joy."

Trappers, fur traders, the long hunters and the mountain men. The Mormons carried fiddles across the plains, and there was dancing within the circle of wagons below the dry Western mountains. Bold men and women; scared, hungry, sick, yet surmounting. Daniel Boone with his yellow eyebrows and sharp blue eyes ran the forest trails in Kentucky, fast as an Indian. A quiet man, serene and easy, who ended up with an appalling series of debts paid, 50 cents left over, and a reputation for rifle shooting that would inspire American boys for a century.

These were Americans, the American type. And they developed not alone because the frontier stretched before them, limitless and inviting. Other countries possessed virgin lands, timber, rivers, mines, rich plains. Yet could Daniel Boone be imagined anywhere but in America? "All power is vested in, and consequently derived from, the people." The impact of such ideas, entered upon unitedly, set down on paper, signed and sealed, can send a man on a very far journey.

But political ideals, like law, are of no use unless implemented. It was union which gave us power; it was the Federal idea which gave us scope. Nevertheless, even in America the doubters still spoke out. National federation on such a scale was impossible, they said; it was impracticable altogether. The country had grown too big for union. In 1828, an election year, Harvard College had a debate: "How can one man be President of the United States when it is eventually settled from Atlantic to Pacific?" The noes were victorious. The Nation would have to be cut up into republic, each with its separate president. Andrew Jackson could be president of Tennessee, John Quincy Adams of New England.

Thirteen States became twenty, became thirty-four. Through the terrible years, 1861–65, the Union held. When Richmond fell and the Civil War was over, citizens celebrated. In Boston, New York, Philadelphia, men stood on soapboxes, stood in pulpits to orate. But it was not the word victory that stirred them. "The United States," they said, life a refrain. At the word united, the crowds went crazy. Tears poured down men's faces. "Yes, sir!" they shouted. "Yes, sir, you bet! The United States of America!"

"I have often inquired of myself," said Lincoln, "what great principle or idea it was that kept this [federation] so long together. It was that which gave promise that in due time the weights would be lifted from the shoulders of all men, and that all would have an equal chance." To Americans an equal chance means a chance to excel, get ahead, win the race, beat the other fellow to the prize. Consider the year 1865, and a transcontinental railway to be laid. The scheme had been authorized by Congress. Two companies contracted for the work: Central Pacific, Union Pacific, the one to start laying tract at Ohama, the other in California, and the tracks to meet eventually at Promontory Point, Utah. (A federation needs, above all, communication, interchange of commerce.) The railway has been called a work of giants; it was sparked and spurred by giants; Leland Stanford, Collis P. Huntington, Mark Hopkins, Charles Crocker, the engineer.

In whatever spirit the project had been conceived, before 2 years were out it had become a race and a competition, unequaled for magnitude in sporting circles or business circles before or since. It was a game, an epic, an American legend:

"At the head of great Echo,
The railway's begun.
The Mormons are cutting
And grading like fun."

Thousands of Chinese laborers from the West, Irish laborers from the East, competed under their bosses as to which gang could lay the most track, matched skill and endurance, or even fought it out on occasion with charges of dynamite and killed each other in the doing. Snow in the Sierras, higher than a man's head. Night storms in the hot Nebraska plains, the water foul to drink. By May 1869 the two companies were within a dozen miles of meeting. The whole country watched, getting the news by telegraph where it could. On May 10 the tracks came together, the last spike was hammered. In the cities cannon boomed, firebells rang, citizens paraded. Nobody remembered who had won, they only knew the goal was reached.

There was a joyousness about it, a shouting, lusty braggadocio. Competition. The great reckless, expensive American game had begun. Followed now the captains of industry: steel kings, oil kings, railroad manipulators. In their day they were called promoters, and the word did not bear a pretty connotation. A rich land lay ready to their hand and they took it over: Astors, Vanderbilts, Rockefellers, men who founded dynasties that are powerful today. Choose the names as you will: Gould, Jay Cooke, Carnegie, Schwab, E. H. Harriman, J. J. Hill, J. P. Morgan. Bold men who, for the most part, came from plain beginnings, men whose imagination was limitless, who worked the country for what it was worth, using and discarding human material as they chose, and who built America into the greatest industrial productive system the world has ever seen. Pause for a moment on only one of them: Cornelius Vanderbilt, of New York Central and Hudson Railroads, who made himself an empire. Observe him at 73, still powerful, erect, pink checked, with an opulent spread of whiskers, and boasting a young southern bride and a stable of fine trotting horses. "Law?" said Commodore Vanderbilt. "What do I care about law? Hain't I got the power?"

These men seized opportunity and used it; such a chance would never recur. Over against them rose the labor leaders, Americans made bold in their turn by desperation. Uriah S. Stephens and Terence V. Powderly of the Knights of Labor, Samuel Gompers and, much later, the towering, scowling, well-nigh symbolic figure of John L. Lewis. Pushing along with them on the road came the bold men and women of moral protestation, fighting corruption in business and politics, fighting the evils of a too rapidly expanding industrialization. Ida Minerva Tarbell attacked the princes of Standard Oil, drove her lance against giants and lost the fight, but made her voice heard. Governor Altgeld, of Illinois, dared to pardon the anarchists after the Chicago Haymarket riots. Henry George, the visionary, promoted his single tax, ran for mayor of New York, and polled more votes than Theodore Roosevelt. Jane Addams, Jacob Riis fought the city slums. The suffragettes and the temperance ladies marched with their banners: Susan B. Anthony, Lucy Stone, Anna Howard Shaw, Frances Willard, Carrie C. Catt, and Carrie Nation.

Saints or crackpots, America had room for them all. In so vast a country, so polyglot a population there is always a powder keg somewhere, in our own time the grave problem of racism. James Meredith in 1962 walks into the University of Mississippi through a hostile mob. (Can anybody say young Meredith lacks the essential quality of an American, and the essential boldness?) "If Governor Barnett keeps this up," says Meredith, "I may not vote for him." A beautiful understatement, wry, hard as Vermont granite.

Wrote Walt Whitman:

"I swear I begin to see the meaning of these things.
It is not the earth, it is not America, who is so great,
It is I who am great, or to be great—it is you up there; or any one;
It is to walk rapidly through civilizations, governments, theories,
Through poems, pageants, shows, to form great individuals."

The quiet men, the thinkers, writers, philosophers who knew how to express the American spirit—these also proved bold in their time. Emerson, Thoreau, Mark Twain; William James, John Dewey, Hemingway, Faulkner, Robert Frost; each name conveys an American era. Consider also the builders, the innovators who altered the face of our cities: Louis Henry Sullivan, father of the skyscraper. We see him as a youth step from an eastern train to the open shed of the Chicago station after the great fire of 1871. He looks toward the city, ruined and in ashes. He raises a hand, stamps his foot among the crowd and cries out loud, "This is the place for me." We remember, too, the Roeblings, father and son, engineers for the Brooklyn Bridge. Washington Augustus Roebling, the son, at 35 was carried out unconscious from the caissons beneath the East River, suffering from the bends. He did not recover and suffered constant pain. Yet for 10 years he directed work from his room overlooking the river, struggling not only against illness but against the corruption of contractors and city politicians who sought to defeat him and the bridge. Roebling saw his work completed, saw the cables swing from tower to tower and fireworks zoom across the sky on the night the bridge was opened.

Since the first American beginnings, bold men have been allowed to build, to invent, to roam the country at will. No passport, no redtape halts them from State to State. Through two world wars the system has held; the Union has held, and the vision. Under it our country has grown so great that we find ourselves embarrassed, apologetic. We stoop our head like a man too tall for a doorway; we talk ourselves down and experience twinges of guilt at our own size and power. We are materialistic, we say further,

and look embarrassed. We want to be comfortable, live well—and not only the rich want it and claim it, but everybody. And is that then evil, is that a betrayal of trust, the final American irony? Impossible to believe it. True, we have betrayed the fathers more than once. In fear, in greed or mere human cussedness we betray them every day. But still we know the dream is there, the vision and the opportunity. We would fight for it, die for it.

And what a springboard to rise from, this notion of government by consent of the governed. It is like a trampoline. Jump, and you are in the air. A distinguished American physicist, director of a radiation laboratory in California, lately expressed it in his own way, succinctly, as becomes a scientist. "There are very few things in this country that really can't be figured out," said Dr. John Stuart Foster, Jr., "You can excel. You just can."

America's role is global, now. The United States has won to a sophistication the world finds surprising; we are a little surprised by it ourselves. Not Paris, not London or Rome or Berlin or Madrid is today the center of the world's art and music—but New York. When astronauts compete they compete not with Californians or Nevadans but with the world. The great steel companies look over their shoulders not to see if Pittsburgh or Bethlehem is overtaking them but if Japan or Germany is catching up. Thirteen States have become fifty. At each new domestic crisis we ask ourselves in momentary panic if among these diverse sovereign interests our Union can hold, and if our constitutional democracy is equal to such a strain. Yet we know that it is equal and will hold.

America's role is global. Yet we have not lost our good provinciality, the qualities which make our strength and which define the genius of our independence. The bold men still go their way. Europe knows it. Even while expressing contempt (or is it envy?) of our material welfare, from time to time Europe perforce acknowledges the American quality. In 1958–60 the United States sent an exhibition of paintings to Europe. "The New American Painting," the show was called; it went to eight countries. Comments ranged from Berlin to Barcelona to London. And the critics might have been writing not of painting but of skyscrapers or of Charles Lindbergh or Henry Ford I, or the launching of space rockets. "Americans are world travelers and conquerors. They possess an enormous daring." "The quality of adventure is here, a pioneering sense of independence and vitality." "The exhibition offers that climate of unconstraint which never fails to strike anyone traveling to the United States for the first time." "These," said a final critic, "are other myths, other gods, other ideas, different from those prevailing in Europe."

Long ago, Americans found these gods, these myths and made them their own. Surely it is these myths and these gods which still propel us, still inspire and send us on our journeys? Commander Schirra in his space capsule; Scott Carpenter, the onetime hot rodder, problem boy from Colorado who was given his American chance and grew to heroism—these are bold men indeed. Yet without the "climate of unconstraint" that Europe speaks of, they might never have found their opportunity. Two hundred years ago this climate was deliberately created and confirmed by men brave enough to launch a revolutionary government, men wise enough to create a constitution expedient, workable, elastic—a government under which the bold American still finds scope.

## A Bill To Eliminate Labor Union Monopolies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. DAVE MARTIN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation designed to eliminate labor union monopolies. This legislation embodies amendments to the Sherman, Clayton, Norris-LaGuardia, and National Labor-Management Relations Acts. This is the identical bill which I introduced in the 87th Congress.

Under existing court interpretations, antitrust statutes apply only to industry—prohibiting monopolies; prohibiting price fixing; and prohibiting collusion, but only on the part of management.

We do have monopolies in the field of labor. For instance, the United Automobile Workers Union represents all organized labor in the manufacture of cars, trucks, and farm implements, and so forth, a monopoly in this industry. One union bargains with all of the firms in this field—a monopoly. The same thing applies to steel—the United Steel Workers; coal—the United Mine Workers, and so forth.

Jimmy Hoffa has stated that he intends to have all teamster contracts end on a common date beginning in 1964. Do you realize the power which would be vested in the hands of this one man? He could tie up the economy of this country within a matter of hours. Metropolitan areas would be without perishable foodstuffs, in addition to necessities too numerous to mention. He could bring every city in the country to its knees at his command.

We now have a costly maritime strike in progress which covers the entire Atlantic and gulf coasts. This strike is preventing the shipment of goods to foreign countries, lowering the prestige of the United States in the eyes of other governments; causing American industry to lose business because it cannot make deliveries—leading perhaps to permanent loss of our customers to other countries. With an already serious imbalance of trade, this further complicates the entire situation.

My proposal, for instance, would put an end to this longshoremen's strike which is having such a catastrophic impact on the Nation's economy. Under my bill, bargaining between the parties would have to be conducted by a single employer and the representative of the employer's employees, or as provided in some cases, group bargaining where not more than 25 percent of an industry is involved in the labor negotiation. Also, the featherbedding demands by unions as indicated in the dockworker's strike could never become a labor issue since such restrictive practices are prohibited by my bill.

I wish to emphasize that my bill still allows strikes. It restores union power to the local labor unions and takes it out of the hands of the international unions. I repeat—this bill does not interfere with any legitimate labor objectives but only eliminates those activities not in the public interest. Industrywide bargaining would be eliminated. It would be illegal for two unions to confer with one another in regard to the settlement of a wage dispute; and, likewise, it would be illegal for the management of two companies to confer with one another in regard to a settlement. You have to treat both sides fairly.

The evil of present industrywide bargaining is that identical labor costs throughout the industry further lessen competition and increase the chances for similar pricing. Bargaining increases costs of production which further place the American manufacturer at a disadvantage in competition with foreign firms.

Recent Department of Labor statistics on strikes and man-days idled in 1962 vividly demonstrate the need for legislation which would eliminate national labor disputes. Figures released for 1962 show that there were about 3,550 strikes, involving some 1,250,000 workers. About 19 million man-days were lost, compared with 16.3 million in 1961.

The Nation can ill afford a continuance of these labor disputes. The passage of my moderate approach to curbing union monopoly power and the abuses resulting from this power would, in most cases, eliminate the ever-growing chaos in the labor relations field. Yet, the remedy would not interfere with any legitimate union activity nor destroy unions or their welfare and pension programs. My bill will put an end to only those abuses we have been facing daily in our Nation; it will maintain collective bargaining without granting further authority to the executive branch of the Government to dictate the terms of a labor contract through such weapons as compulsory arbitration and seizure, which, in my opinion, lead this Nation down a dangerous path of socialism.

Is there a demand for this type of legislation over the country? Yes. The Institute of Public Opinion of Princeton, N.J., in a recent survey found that 62 percent of the people throughout the Nation favored this type of legislation. In a recent questionnaire circulated in my district, 84 percent replied in favor of curbing union monopolies. The average American citizen, the man and woman on the street, wants this legislation passed—the voice of America without a lobby. Who would like to see this legislation defeated? The heads of the international labor unions whose monopolistic powers would be checked by the passage of this bill.

I can think of no better recommendation than that which appeared in the International Teamsters magazine for September 1962, in which it was stated that my bill was the worst of the lot on this subject; to me, that means it is the best.

# Appendix

## Society of Magazine Writers Honors Editor of Harper's Magazine With Annual Richard L. Neuberger Award—Plaque Presented to John Fischer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH**
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, each year the Society of Magazine Writers selects from the world of journalism the publisher or editor who, in the society's judgment, has done most to raise the standards of magazines as a medium of democratic communication. This worthy individual is chosen from among distinguished nominees by a panel of society presidents, past and present, and the choice is made known at a pre-Christmas gathering.

Known as the Richard L. Neuberger Award, this honor is named in memory of our late colleague from Oregon, and in a short span has become a nationally respected recognition of excellence and dedication in the field of magazine publishing.

We here in the Senate who knew and loved Dick Neuberger are indeed gratified that this meaningful presentation carries his name. We recall vividly the steadfastness and integrity which were the hallmarks of Senator Neuberger's energetic efforts in behalf of conservation and improved health facilities. And, we recall that his cause was ever ably served by the keen perceptions and facile expression of the professional writer, a calling which was his first love. It is noteworthy that Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER now serves in the Senate. She shared with her late husband a unity of purpose.

As a member of the Society of Magazine Writers it was my privilege to be present on December 21, 1962, at their annual Christmas gathering, and to present to John Fischer of Harper's magazine the Richard L. Neuberger Award.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from my remarks in presenting the Society of Magazine Writers Richard L. Neuberger Award to John Fischer of Harper's magazine be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT, OF WEST VIRGINIA, PRESENTING THE SOCIETY OF MAGAZINE WRITERS' RICHARD L. NEUBERGER AWARD TO JOHN FISCHER OF HARPER'S MAGAZINE, HOTEL ASTOR, NEW YORK, N.Y., DECEMBER 21, 1962

The invitation of our president Gerald Walker, to share in the second annual presentation of the Richard L. Neuberger Award of the Society of Magazine Writers has provided me a most pleasant assignment. Participation is especially meaningful, not only because of my cherished membership in this society and 40 years of dedication to journalism, but also because of my personal admiration and understanding friendship for Dick Neuberger.

You have acted wisely in naming this significant recognition of excellence in the magazine editing and publishing field for an American who contributed so much to broadening the base of thought and conscience in this country and the world. A career as an author brought real satisfaction and merited achievement to Senator Neuberger. As his seat mate in the Senate we often talked of his years as a writer, and of the incisive and purposeful journalists with whom he labored.

Throughout his service in public life Dick fought for the integrity of the individual, for preservation of our vast natural resources, and for improved health facilities for our citizens—and ever was his cause ably served by the keen mind and facile expression of the professional writer.

It is extremely appropriate therefore, that this coveted honor of the Society of Magazine Writers be conferred in his memory, and as a memorial to the courageous contributions he made to the better way of life.

We recognize this evening the magazine editor or publisher who, during this year, has done most to strengthen the standards of magazines as a medium of democratic communication.

The selection of the award recipient has been committed to a panel of SMW presidents, past and present, and the decision has been difficult. The choice is a man known to all of you and one whose beneficial influence has long been identified in the world of magazine production.

As editor of Harper's he has been instrumental in bringing forth in this publication a rare combination of readability and candor which has insured it a position of eminence among our sprightly and yet serious magazines. When John Fischer has needled with words the net result has been affirmative. If he has sometimes seemed to accent the negative it was not intended to be in reverse. Criticism has never been a capricious or carping instrument in his hand or heart.

He is an exponent of noncliche thinking. He has been conscientious in fashioning a forthright forum in which major problems of our Nation and the world can be discussed by men of experience and knowledge.

Among the merits of this monthly magazine is its penchant for attacking current and familiar controversies from wholly unexpected angles. Another objective has been to intelligently define what is fundamentally at issue in various current questions. And, governed by these admirable and remarkably well achieved goals, Harper's and its editor have amassed a truly enviable record of articles which have contributed substantially to the awareness and understanding of the reading public, and which have stimulated wholesome original thinking.

America has faced problems of a material nature often in the past, and being blessed with the natural resources, physical wealth, initiative, and strong economy with which to surmount them, we have survived. However, it is in the area of creative thinking that our most far reaching challenges now exist.

And so, for his cogent and courageous contributions to Harper's magazine, and to its stature as a leader in American thought we honor the editor and that which he has wrought.

Acting as your intermediary I present the 1962 Richard L. Neuberger Award of the Society of Magazine Writers, to the distinguished editor of Harper's magazine, Mr. John Fischer.

## Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson Tours His Native State of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE**
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the speeches delivered over a 3-day period by the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Vice President of the United States, in his native State of Texas.

I was privileged to be in attendance at several of the meetings, and I was happy to witness the acclaim given his appearances and the reaction to his remarks.

The speeches referred to are as follows:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, AUSTIN ROTARY CLUB LUNCHEON, AUSTIN, TEX., TUESDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1962

If you look at a globe of the world, you will see that the 30th parallel passes Austin and San Antonio. I suggest that some time you put your finger on that parallel and spin the globe—to see the others of the people on earth who live in climates much like our own.

The 30th parallel crosses the Pacific slightly to the north of the Midway Islands, passes south of Shanghai, over Chungking, north of New Delhi, near Tehran, over Kuwait, and south of Jerusalem. It crosses the Suez Canal and Cairo, runs on through Algeria, across the Atlantic, near Jacksonville, Fla., south of Mobile, through New Orleans and back across central Texas.

Over the past 2 years, at the request of the President of the United States, I have traveled to many of the lands traversed by that parallel; and I have been impressed many times by the similarities of climate and topography of those faraway places and our own country here in central Texas and the Southwest.

But there is another similarity which is even more impressive. In all those lands—as here in our own State—the free peoples who live along that line share a common determination to build a better, more prosperous and more rewarding life for themselves and those who come after them.

In each of the free world countries along that parallel efforts are being made—as such efforts are being made in Texas—to secure new industry, create new jobs, bring in new payrolls. It is not difficult to understand why. Of all the peoples who live within that line, including those of other States in the United States, the people of

Texas enjoy by far the highest standards of living, of income, and of opportunity.

Our per capita income in Texas last year was $1,972. In most of the countries along the 30th parallel per capita income would not exceed—and usually not even approach—$360 a year, $30 a month.

Compared with our fellow men—who share this latitude with us—we are rich. But we in Texas are not content. We know that our per capita income is still only 85 percent of the average for all Americans. We understand that there is a gap to be crossed. We are making that effort today—as we have never made it before—in Texas.

If our motivation is as great as it is to cross the gap of 15 percent, the realization of this helps us to understand how great are the motivations—and how intense are the desires—for those who face the challenge of crossing a gap of 500 percent or more.

What is happening in this world—in which you and I live—is that billions of people no longer accept the fate of living at the bottom rung of the economic ladder. They aspire to a better way of life, a better standard of living, a floor under their feet, a roof over their heads, milk for their babies, a cupful of water they can drink without fear of disease, schools their children can attend to learn to read, and some kind of a job which frees them from tilling the soil.

This explosion of aspirations, as it is sometimes called, is a great and awesome thing, it has unloosed a powerful force in the world, a force which is bound to reshape the world into a better, freer, more just place for men to live out their years on earth.

But in saying this to you it is not my purpose merely to talk about other lands and other places. The underdeveloped world is not exclusively a foreign world. Here at home—in our own vast United States—we have our own areas, our own regions, our own States which are still underdeveloped.

I believe that the greatest single force at work in the United States today is the gathering momentum for growth and development in these long underdeveloped areas, of which our own State of Texas is one. Throughout the world, in this last half of the 20th century, there has appeared a new momentum—a shift of population and of economic development to the warmer latitudes. This is occurring in Asia, in the Middle East, in Europe and Africa, and in our own United States.

Today in the United States the major growth States are those in the warmer climates which, until now, have been passed by in terms of full development—Florida, Arizona, California, and Texas. Population is shifting this way at an accelerated rate. Economic investment is shifting this way at an accelerated rate. For our own immediate area it is clear that during the next several decades the States which rim the gulf coast will experience expansion, new activity, and growing industrial importance on a scale never achieved in the past.

There are many developments of importance to this trend. The single most significant such development is the laying of foundations in this region for the technology and industry associated with the age of space. In Texas the location at Houston of the Manned Spacecraft Center is the most important business development since Spindletop.

I wish it were within my capabilities and purview to foresee fully and accurately for you the eventual meaning of this installation. Certainly it will mean growth of business activity in all of the conventional sectors. But there is a more important meaning. Because of the nature of the industries which will grow around space technology, the next 20, 30, or even 50 years will bring to Texas and the Southwest a new kind of industrial force.

Unlike the past, space technology requires employees with advanced college education. Strong backs and stout arms are not enough—one degree is a necessity, two or more college degrees are commonplace. This means higher income levels, higher social standards, higher living standards on the part of the working force of the principal industry.

We cannot foresee exactly what this means because nowhere else on earth has a major industrial force had these characteristics. But there are certain responsibilities we can foresee.

The chief of these is in the realm of education. Make no mistake about it: the NASA Center at Houston was not located there because Houston is Houston or Texas is Texas. The decisive force attracting the choice of the Manned Spacecraft Center site was the public support of higher education of the first class in the public institutions of this State.

If the space industry is to grow and expand in Texas continued steadfast public support of higher education—and of public education at all levels—will be required. The standards of public services of all kinds must be maintained at a high level. The quality of municipal and county government—as well as State government—must measure up to new expectations on the part of the people served.

The challenges facing our State will be great and demanding. The requirements for public leadership and for civic-mindedness on the part of this generation of Texans will be the highest any generation has ever known. As Texans in the past have been concerned with the rights of States, Texans henceforward must be especially concerned with the responsibilities of States.

I say these things to you in a spirit of hope and confidence. Over the years, it has been my high honor to work for you and with you in the many tasks in developing the resources of central Texas—and all of Texas. Much has been accomplished. Good and strong foundations have been laid.

We now come to the time in history at which we stand to realize the fruits of those labors. The foundation developed over the last 125 years—and especially in the last 25 years—is the foundation on which we can complete the development and fulfillment of the Texas potential.

In doing what we can do—and are privileged to do—here, we must remember the millions of human beings who live along the parallels of the world aspiring to achieve for themselves and their children even a small measure of what we ourselves have already achieved. Our Nation is strong and great. But neither our strength nor our greatness lies in our military might, nor in our plants and factories. Nor in the productivity of our farms. The strength and might of the United States is that of leadership—moral leadership—for a world of peace and freedom and justice.

If we are to hold what we have, if we are to enjoy more in the future than we have in the past, we must continue as a responsible Nation to uphold the pursuits of peace as we adhere to the necessities of power.

As Winston Churchill once said, "The first victory we have to win is to avoid a battle. The second, if we cannot avoid it, is to win it."

The United States stands strong, firm, and steadfast in its role in the world today. Where we have drawn the line of freedom—and pledged ourselves to its defense—we shall remain firm. We are determined that line shall never be crossed.

But the very purpose of our firmness is our determination to maintain peace with honor. As we shall always stand up to those who threaten the peace, we shall never refuse to sit down with those who seek sincerely to assure peace for mankind.

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, ANNUAL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE BANQUET, FORT WORTH, TEX., TUESDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1962

When the U.S. Constitution was adopted in 1789, there was a king in Paris, a sultan of the Turkish Empire in Constantinople, a czar in St. Petersburg, an emperor with the mandate of "heaven" in Peiping, and a mikado on the throne of Japan.

Today, neither those royal offices nor royal empires exist. But the Office of President of the United States remains the same Office—presiding over the same form of government—as George Washington knew 173 years ago. The revolution of freedom which began on these shores at that time has swept the globe, touched every continent, and brought liberty, independence, and self-determination to tens of millions of people everywhere.

Among us, there are many who—easily, casually, and critically—make statements about how communism is winning everywhere, and that we are ineffective and impotent in checking its spread.

This is simply not so. For us to poison ourselves—to blight our own pride in our own country—with such fearful fatalism is one of the greatest disservices we can render to ourselves, our country, or our cause.

As long as there have been nations on earth there have been totalitarians and aggressors. As long as there have been totalitarians and aggressors the weak and small have lived in fear and danger of armies of the forces of evil among mankind. Fifteen years ago, in the wake of World War II, all of the civilized world seemed to lay at the feet of the greatest tyranny and strongest aggressor the world has ever seen.

The Soviet Union added to its empire the brave Republic of Czechoslovakia. Nothing of consequence stood between the Soviets and the English Channel or the western shores of Europe. At the eastern edge of the Mediterranean the brave people of the barren lands of Greece and Turkey saw the bear of the north threatening their borders. In the south of Asia the vast land of Iran likewise lay exposed.

As Winston Churchill described it, in one of his historic speeches, thousands of years ago the Mongol hordes of Genghis Khan had come across the steppes of what is now Russia into the heart of Europe. On the same day, decisive battles were fought near Vienna and Poland, and the most able defenders of Western civilization were vanquished. Nothing stood in the path of the conquerors. But then the aging Khan died. The tribesmen turned eastward to their homes to choose a successor. And, as Churchill put it 12 years ago, "They have not returned until now."

Twelve years have passed and not an inch has been added to the perimeter of the Soviet domain. Three months ago, at the request of President Kennedy, I visited those lands where—beginning in 1947—the United States began a great experiment and a great gamble on the belief that men who want to be free will stand up for their freedom if they know the strong stand with them.

In Iran, in Turkey, in Greece, only a line drawn on a map separates those people from the Russian armies. But that line—through all these years—has not been breached. It was my proud privilege to take to those peoples and to their leaders a solemn reaffirmation of the determination of the leaders and the people of the United States that those lines will never be breached.

What I am describing is one of the most noble achievements in the history of the human race. It is an achievement in which each of you has had a part—and of which every member of this generation should be proud: proud of his country, proud of his country's leadership under administrations of both parties, and proud of his own individual participation in this achievement.

This generation of Americans drew a line in the path of the great aggressor and made it clear that line could not be crossed without the aggressor paying a fearful price. For ourselves, for our families, and our businesses, the price of courage has not been cheap—in dollars and cents.

From 1949 through 1961, Americans have paid $498 billion for defense and security. We have paid $47.5 billion in foreign economic aid. What have we gotten for our money?

On Sunday morning, October 28, the answer was provided when the message came from Moscow that Khrushchev had, in the face of unmistakable American determination and might, agreed to the withdrawal of his missiles and bombers from the island of Cuba.

Only 10 days before, when the intelligence photographs had first confirmed the Soviet installations, I was looking over maps in the meeting room of the National Security Council. On these maps had been plotted the range and possible targets of the missile installations under construction in Cuba. Various distances and times were being cited. I pointed my finger to Fort Worth, knowing the strategic importance of the installations here. A military expert at my side anticipated my question and answered it before I asked: "Less than 5 minutes, sir."

Less than 5 minutes. Except for the $500 billion spent to keep America strong, Fort Worth—like most of our cities—would be living under that threat tonight, instead of living as we do in a world at peace from which this grave threat has been removed.

America got its money's worth from the B–24 Liberator bombers built here in Fort Worth. America got its money's worth from the B–36. America will get its money's worth from the TFX.

And the world—and the cause of freedom—has gotten full value from faith in America.

I do not know—no man on earth knows, on either side of the Iron Curtain—what the meaning of recent events will ultimately be. We can believe, however, that a time of turning has come in the destiny of this century. The recent events leave no doubt about two crucial points.

First, there is no doubt that the assumptions of Communist strategy—about the eventual collapse of ability or will in the West—have been proved failures.

Secondly, at the same time, the concept, purposes, and conduct of the policies of the West—initiated by the United States—have been proved correct.

Communism has been contained. It has been contained in Europe. It has been kept from establishing a land frontier with the Arab world. It has been repulsed and rejected by Africa. Six guerrilla wars in southeast Asia and the far Pacific have ended in five defeats for communism and, with the support of the United States, the tide has been turned in the sixth such war in Vietnam.

Unlike Khrushchev, we of America—and we of the free world—seek to bury no one. Our purpose is peace—a peace in which the hopes of man may rise from the graves of poverty, illiteracy, disease, and injustice, to common aspirations and expectations of a life of freedom.

This year of 1962 is a year in history of which all Americans can be proud and can feel new pride in themselves and their associations with the cause for which their country stands.

Where the Communist bloc is surrounded by enemies, we of the United States can count as our blessing that we are surrounded by friends. We can believe, at this moment of history, that the revolution of freedom which began in this land is the tide of the future—a tide still running, a tide which will bring the ultimate triumph of freedom everywhere before this century ends.

It has been our lot and our fortune to become the richest people in the richest nation the earth has ever known. In only five other nations does the per capita national income exceed $1,000 per year—for most of the nations and peoples on earth, annual income is less than $40 per month and some only $60 a year. For us the average is $2,800.

As, in the writings of the ancient Greeks, the Corinthian ambassador told the mighty Spartans, "Supremacy has its duties—leaders are required to show a special care for the common welfare in return for the special honors accorded to them by all, in other ways."

We enjoy what we have today, at home and in the world, because we have applied the precepts of our moral teachings and beliefs to the policies by which we conduct our Nation's affairs. We have shared with others. We have cast our bread upon the waters—to the humble and the lowly at home, to the exhausted and vanquished abroad. From 1949 through 1961 we sent to Europe $18.7 billion in economic aid. In just the last 4 years the prosperous Europe of today has bought from us $23.2 billion of our goods, products and services, and will soon be purchasing from us each year as much or more than the total of the aid we have sent.

The bread we have cast upon the waters is coming back manyfold.

I say these things to you in a spirit of optimism based on the practical realities of confidence. Ours is a strong and mighty land. Our might lies not in our arms and armor but in the character of the American soul and in the determination of the American will that men everywhere shall have the right to live as we live in freedom, justice and equality.

The first Americans to reach the moon will, when they return to earth, land at Houston—although, I suppose, they might land in this vicinity if Fort Worth and Dallas ever got together on an airport.

This region—reaching from the Atlantic coast of Georgia to the far edge of the Arizona desert—will be a principal center of growth for the technology of the age of space.

What older sections of the United States have been to our national development in the past two centuries, this region will grow to be during the next century to come.

If it seems far-fetched to describe such potential for the State we know now, I remind you that you live and attend school now amid one of the great wonders of the Western World. In the Dallas-Fort Worth metropolitan complex, there is the greatest concentration of population—anywhere in the world—not located either at the edge of the ocean or on a navigable stream. It is not so wild a dream to envision Texans of your generation working even greater wonders in the future which lies ahead.

Since the beginning of this century, one of the great problems of this portion of the United States has been the annual loss of talent and skills on the part of the most able graduates of our public institutions of higher learning. Between 1900 and 1930, 3.5 million persons left the Southern States—including Texas. Sociologists have estimated that the economic loss—even in terms of the prices of that era—amounted to between $5 and $10 billion.

---

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, ARLINGTON STATE COLLEGE, ARLINGTON, TEX., WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1962

I realize that most nonacademic visitors to college campuses these days come in the role of recruiters—if not for major corporations, seeking talent for their jobs, then, at least, as recruiters for the Young Republican League. Needless to say, I am not here in either role.

I would, however, like to do some recruiting—the recruiting of your talents, or if not your talents then your faith, for the great opportunity which faces you and your generation. For where other generations of Americans have met their destiny—and their opportunity—in winning wars on the battle fields of the world, it is your destiny and the opportunity of your generation to win the battles of peace on the battle grounds of the world today.

Among my duties, at present, I serve as Chairman of the Advisory Committee to the Peace Corps. One of the great satisfactions I have had in my public life has been the chance to see your generation disprove the libels and dispel the doubt that has been cast upon the idealism of young Americans today.

Too many people have the habit of equating idealism of youth with political labels of their elders. If young people on college campuses adopt for themselves the label of conservative, there are cries raised that "the college generation is not idealistic." This I refuse to accept. The division of political sentiment on our campuses today—the debates between factions labeling themselves conservative or liberal—reflects, I believe, a healthy interest in the directions of our national policy and it reflects, also, a necessary sense of protest on the part of the young for the way in which their elders are running the affairs of the country.

At Peace Corps camps around the world, I feel that these views have been confirmed. In the training camp at Puerto Rico—out in the jungles of the island there—I have seen young men and women who were both Goldwater Republicans and Kennedy Democrats up before 6 in the morning, running up and down jungle hills, swimming a river with their hands tied behind their back, living 3 nights on the land carrying only compasses, pocket knives, and canteens.

I don't worry about the politics of the college generation when I see such evidence of idealism motivating young Americans to prepare themselves for the work of building a better world.

But, in saying this about one of my favorite subjects—the Peace Corps—I do not mean to overemphasize the world abroad. There is work to be done here at home. There is work to be done in the Southwest—and here in Texas.

The moving finger of history is writing large on the future of this part of the United States. In the past 50 years, a strong and stable foundation has been put in place. In the next 50 years, there is every indication that Texas—and the other States of the gulf coast and Southwest—will emerge as one of the major centers of industrial, economic, and social leadership in the world.

The first Americans to reach the Moon will, when they return to Earth, land at Houston—although, I suppose, they might land in this vicinity if Fort Worth and Dallas ever got together on an airport.

This region—reaching from the Atlantic coast of Georgia to the far edge of the Arizona desert—will be a principal center of growth for the technology of the age of space.

What older sections of the United States have been to our national development in the past two centuries, this region will grow to be during the next century to come.

It it seems farfetched to describe such potential for the State we know now, I remind you that you live and attend school now amid one of the great wonders of the Western World. In the Dallas-Fort Worth metropolitan complex, there is the greatest concentration of population—anywhere in the world—not located either at the edge of the ocean or on a navigable stream. It is not so wild a dream to envision Texans of your generation working even greater wonders in the future which lies ahead.

In this context, I think it can be said to you as it could not be said to any generation before you: Your greatest future and

opportunity is in Texas—and in the cities of our State where you may now live.

Since the beginning of this century one of the great problems of this portion of the United States has been the annual loss of talent and skills on the part of the most able graduates of our public institutions of higher learning. Between 1900 and 1930, 3.5 million persons left the Southern States—including Texas. Sociologists have estimated that the economic loss—even in terms of the prices of that era—amounted to between $5 billion and $10 billion.

Today many of our leading industrial corporations, financial institutions, educational establishments, and other major centers are headed by people who were born in this region, but who have lived their lives since college outside the region. For you there is ahead the special promise and opportunity that the major opportunities in the Nation will be here in this region.

To say this is not to speak provincially but to speak factually. But it helps in maintaining perspective to remember this: much of the future for this region will lie in trade, commerce, and travel in other lands.

The largest single trading market in the free world in the latter half of this century will be the world of Latin America. This will be a major outlet for your energies and talents whatever line you may pursue.

But the enterprise of Texas in the future will not concentrate solely on the Latin region. Already airlines are flying from Texas points to Europe. In the not too distant future, we may anticipate sufficient speed in the air for such flights to Europe to be completed round trip in a single day. Africa and Asia will neither be a day's travel away.

You will live and you will work from a Texas base, but the world itself will be yours to help develop, to help lead, to help bring to its feet.

No generation has ever had such broad horizons or such great promise. Because of this, no generation has ever needed stronger ideals or a more fixed determination to right what is wrong, give attention to what has been neglected, to give heed to directions which ought not to be followed and to define new goals and new directions for the future.

Whether you label yourself "conservative" or "liberal"—whether "Democratic" or "Republican"—the proudest label you can bear is that of "American."

In the world for which you are preparing yourselves now, there is a warm and friendly reception for those who bear that honored name. Many generations of Americans—much effort, much toil, much sacrifice—have gone into the image which the world bears of us and what we stand for. But the essence of the favorable image that the world holds of us is the belief among men in every land that Americans are, in some special way, people who are at heart idealistic.

From what I have seen of your generation—from the many fine and inspiring visits that I have with many of you from time to time—I know that you are heirs of that tradition.

---

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, STUDENT CONFERENCE ON NATIONAL AFFAIRS, TEXAS A. & M., BRYAN, TEX., THURSDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1962

In the world of undergraduates, and in the world at large, one of the chronic sources of tension is speeches. This is especially true of speeches by public figures on topics covered by your agenda for this eighth Student Conference on National Affairs.

The 20th century has brought explosions of population, of aspirations, and of nationalism. But the impact of these has been equalled, if not exceeded, by the monumental explosion of statistics—about those explosions. As a results, in our speeches—and, perhaps, in our policies, as well—statistics are sometimes substituted for substance.

In these remarks this afternoon, I hope to keep statistics in their place, remembering Mr. Dooley's comment on a public figure of his day who over-used facts and figures. "All he needs," Mr. Dooley said, "is an index and few illustrations to make himself a bicyclopedia of useless information."

I make this point about statistics for a purpose. On your agenda for the study of "Sources of World Tension," there are listed the four most commonly accepted topics for such discussions: the population explosion, economic problems, nationalistic aspirations, and the arms race.

Our solution of a problem will be no better than our definition of it. In this context, I would like to begin by raising what may seem to be a surprising question: are these forces the real sources of world tensions?

Are these the real problems? Or do these merely happen to be the problems which are easiest to measure with our statistics—and, hence, most convenient to discuss and debate? Frankly, certain personal observations and reflections have led me to question whether our accepted diagnosis of the causes of world tensions is as precisely accurate—or as fully comprehensive—as we have thought it to be. Over the past 2 years I have traveled nearly 100,000 miles on official missions to Asia, to Africa, to Latin America—to the places where the forces you are discussing are now at work. I have gone to the emerging nations, to the centers of population explosion and poverty, to the lands where undeclared wars and counter-insurgency actions are in progress to the nations and the headquarters of the anti-Communist alliances—NATO, CENTO, and SEATO.

Generalizations are hazardous. But if I were to list the sources of tension identifiable in those lands, the listing would differ in both details and emphasis from what our computers and many of our commentators tell us. This is not to say that population, economics, nationalism and the arms race are unimportant or overrated. But it is to say that relief for those tensions involves more than providing the underdeveloped nations with pills, payrolls, prestige, and peace talks.

If, our perspective is to be realistic—and if our efforts are to be fruitful—we need to include certain additional realities in our list of sources of world tension.

First, we must recognize that many of the most explosive tensions worldwide are generated by local issues, rather than global forces.

Second, we must recognize that in most areas, animosities of race, religion, caste, and inequality are central sources of tension.

Third, another source of tension is the restriction on free movement of peoples. This is not only a problem of geographical movement but is also a problem of movement, up or down, within traditional social structures.

Fourth, in most of the emerging portions of the world, a very real source of tension—with many ramifications—is created by a lack of tradition and experience in organizing for mutual effort on a basis of mutual trust.

These factors are often overlooked by peoples of the developed nations—especially Americans. We concentrate on the conspicuous. We neglect those sources of world tension which are not conveniently measured by statistics. Hence, we know the impact of south Asia's birth rate, but not the impact of the area's border disputes. We concentrate on Africa's nationalism and miss the significance of its localism. We identify Latin America's poverty but we fail to identify its problems of class and resistance to social mobility. The world over we predicate both our efforts and expectations on the assumption of a capacity for social and structural organization which is, in fact, absent from and alien to the traditions of many peoples.

In our approach to the tensions of our times, we tend to treat the 20th century as an entity—as though human history were the sum and substance of our achievements and our failures since the year 1900. This is not realistic. In many instances, the tensions most dangerous for our 20th century world today date back to the 12th century—or earlier. The emerging nations have been bypassed by the industrial revolution. But many of their problems result at least as much from having been bypassed by the political revolutions of and since the 18th century.

We have recognized the necessity for what is called the infrastructure of a modern economy—the necessity for roads, communications, sanitation facilities, hospitals, and all else. The developed nations of the West have committed themselves to long-term programs to provide such facilities. But the question we need to ask—and to answer candidly—is whether these measures are genuine first steps or intermediate steps? Are we beginning at the beginning, so to speak, or have we begun at a point of economic development in our programs somewhere beyond the actual point of social readiness or political capabilities?

The world today has—by economic reckoning—a major, capital deficit. If a 5-percent annual increase in the income of emerging nations is to be sustained throughout this decade of the 1960's—the decade of development—it is estimated that $70 billion of capital investment will be required from the capital-producing countries of the world. On the basis of performance thus far, this means about $8 billion each year from 1963 to 1970.

The present annual capital investment in such development is $5 billion. The annual deficit is, thus, $3 billion. How and where that deficit is to be overcome would lead us into a discussion far longer than the time allotted.

The particular point I wish to emphasize is the existence not of a capital deficit, but of a political deficit. Technically, we have the solutions to the world's development problems—the engineers, the scientists, the economists, and all the other technical people, have done their jobs. The gap that remains open measures our failure in the political realm.

If the capital investment of this decade of development is to take root and flower into a full harvest, there must be more attention concentrated on these neglected political deficits. In terms of human population, for example, the world has a carrying capacity of possibly as many as 16 billion people. Our political systems, however, are doing a poor job of providing for the needs of only 3 billion people.

If we are seriously to undertake the relieving of world tensions, a greater degree of political courage, political imagination, and political innovation will be required—in both the developed and underdeveloped worlds.

This begins at home—in our own country and in other developed countries. We, too, are experiencing population explosions. We, too, have our underdeveloped regions and resources. We, too, have poverty, changing social structures, shifting populations, and much else which requires political courage today as much as 30 or 50 years ago.

The Western nations—including the United States—are not so far advanced, not so free internally of sources of tension in their own society, that the permanent necessity for reform, for progress, for responsible change can be ignored.

We of the capital-producing industrial nations of the West must not permit the burdens of security to stifle either our initiative or capacity for internal innovation

and reform in our domestic political responsibilities.

The same is true with regard to the assistance we offer emerging sections of the world. If material objectives are to be reached, moral objectives cannot be left behind; 20th century technology simply will not function or serve its intended purpose when imposed upon 20th century or 17th century or even 19th century values about human life or the worth of human labor. In fact, such conditions might only produce greater tensions for the world—not fewer.

We have, I believe, a responsibility to be certain that we define the sources of the world's tensions correctly and fully.

The population explosion, the aspirations explosion, the nationalism explosion—and all the other forces of our times—may intrigue us and occupy us. But tensions of the world will not be relieved until the world experiences a genuine explosion of human justice and recognition of individual rights. We must have the political courage and imagination to work for and achieve this objective at home and abroad.

The tensions of our world result not because couples are having too many babies but because political leaders are having too few new ideas for answering the world's ancient problems with the capabilities of today's modern technology.

I speak as I have because my assessment of the future is one of optimism and confidence—confidence inspired in no small degree by the high sense of responsibility being shown on campuses everywhere by your generation. You are concerned—as no generation has ever been concerned—about building a better world, and the capabilities at your command permit such a world to be built. Your talents are great, and they are needed. That is why I would like to conclude with a question to you, from the writings of the contemporary philosopher, Will Durant:

"Why should not every man, rich or poor, give 2 years of his life to the state, not for the purpose of killing other people, but to conquer the plagues, and drain the marshes, and irrigate the deserts, and dig the canals, and democratically do the physical and social engineering which builds up so slowly and painfully what war so quickly destroys?"

---

## Remarks by Mayor James H. J. Tate, Emancipation Proclamation Centenary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I had occasion to participate in a luncheon in the city of Philadelphia at the Bellevue Stratford Hotel in connection with the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation.

The main speaker was the mayor of the city of Philadelphia, the Honorable James H. J. Tate. His talk was very inspiring and his suggestion that the children of the city participate in acknowledging the centenary of this outstanding American document is so interesting that I feel the Members of the House will read it with great profit.

I, therefore, have included the address of our distinguished mayor in my remarks:

REMARKS BY MAYOR JAMES H. J. TATE, EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION CENTENARY, JANUARY 2, 1963

One of the peculiarities of American life in this day and age is the fondness we seem to have for celebrating all sorts of occasions—some of which are profoundly important.

It's a fine thing to celebrate the historical events. It's a healthy thing that we can draw sustenance from our own inspiring history.

As we consider our national history and observe its anniversaries, as we give a measure of remembrance to those chronological landmarks along our pathway to greatness—there is usually no burden of obligation to be found in them. To be sure, history has its moral lessons, but from most of these commemorations, we elicit no new responsibilities, we derive no new obligations or challenges. The acts have been accomplished. The dead have been buried. The specific issues have altered. The objectives have, for the most part, been achieved.

But today, we here acknowledge a historical anniversary that does call out to our public and private conscience. This is an anniversary we celebrate which cried out loud and clear across the years for action.

On September 23, 1862, the newspapers of the United States carried a draft of a proclamation that the then President of our country had drafted. It was an amazing proclamation—a powerful proclamation. It stated that on January 1, 1863—almost exactly 100 years ago—all slaves held in a State or part of a State which was in rebellion should be "then, thenceforward and forever free."

With the drafting and signing of this proclamation, which we now know as the Emancipation Proclamation, President Abraham Lincoln had brought a new dimension into the terrible grinding war that was consuming so much of the vital substance of this Nation. Instead of being merely a war for the preservation of the Federal Union—which was certainly a just and mighty cause in itself—the war became a struggle for human freedom. In taking a resolute and public stand on the slavery issue, the Government, in a sense, sanctified the war by harnessing to it one of man's noblest aspirations—the desire for freedom.

The Emancipation Proclamation, though it rang out across the land in 1863, has still to be fully implemented in this great country of ours. The chain that has shackled human dignity has been only partly broken. The link has been only partly cut. There remains a great deal of unfinished business still to be done.

We live in an incredible age—an age of such enormous complexity that our forefathers of recent generations would be completely shattered if they were here today.

And yet, my fellow citizens, we are still haunted by the same ghost that Mr. Lincoln sought to kill in 1863 with the silver bullet of the law. It is a sad but inescapable fact that we have not yet put the ideals of the Emancipation Proclamation fully into practice. The chains must still be struck from the legs of 1 in every 10 of our fellow citizens.

It seems strange—even sad—that civil rights should still be spoken of in terms of "the question of civil rights." Going back even further in our Nation's history, the Declaration of Independence—written right here in Philadelphia—should have resolved things adequately and taken civil rights out of the "question" category. The Emancipation Proclamation should have completed the job.

Those documents were merely good beginnings. They were the sign posts to show us the way. Their letters should be splashed in great characters across the horizon. They should be emblazoned on our public buildings for all to see. Most importantly, they should be written—indeed carved—on our hearts.

We in Philadelphia should draw particular inspiration from the anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation, for it was here that freedom to those of every race, and creed, and place of national origin, was implemented from the very beginning. Our city has always been a place of refuge for those who fled persecution. In the dreams of William Penn, Pennsylvania and Philadelphia would stand always as beacons of inspiration for all the land to see. And so it has gone down from Penn's day.

Philadelphia was the first municipality in the Nation to include an official human relations agency in its fundamental law, the home rule charter. It has been a trail blazer in working toward equal opportunities in employment, in housing, in education, in public accommodations, in civil service. Our great commonwealth has also been in the forefront of this struggle to bring real meaning to Lincoln's great ideal.

But partial success is not enough. Self-congratulations must not be allowed to strangle the great challenge of that which must still be done. And more than legislation is required. We also need to educate ourselves to the significance of emancipation. We need to learn to take Lincoln's Executive order to heart, to make it a conscious part of our daily lives.

With this in mind, I would like to propose that we mark this centenary observance with something more specific than words and sentiments. It has been said with great truth that only in giving do we receive—that the physical act of giving carries with it a spiritual symbolism that is deep and everlasting.

I propose that a suitable monument be erected to the Emancipation Proclamation—a monument that will be paid for not by the stroke of a pen from some philanthropist, or by a public or private subsidy of funds. Rather, it should be paid for by the children of our public, private and parochial schools here in Philadelphia. They can in a great and moving campaign donate one modest Lincoln's head penny each, and thus make this monument possible.

That this single tiny act of good will and brotherhood—this single act of giving something of value, however small—will carry with it a sense of the great spiritual message of the Emancipation Proclamation. I believe this modest contribution to a physical monument can help to bring about, within each child, an awareness of the even greater spiritual monument that will finally enable our Nation to dispose of this unfinished business.

And surely it cannot be said that this is too much. In this modest way our debt to history can be acknowledged by the schoolchildren of Philadelphia who are now learning of the importance of the Emancipation Proclamation.

The Civil War snuffed out hundreds of thousands of lives—soldiers, sailors, civilians of the North and of the South. It ruined millions more, and destroyed an incredible amount of private and public property.

Was it all for nothing? The Union was preserved, and happily so. But what of the work of emancipation that Lincoln incorporated into the very hardest years of that war? Is this to remain half done? Can we allow this to go to waste from our safe vantage point in the 20th century?

And what of the toll of human suffering since then? What of the unfortunate consequences of slavery—watered down to unfair employment practices, inequitable housing, and the millions of little humbling, discourteous acts that have separated races, one from the other despite common citizenship?

What will we do in the next 100 years? Will we have to mark the second centenary with these same thoughts, the admission of these same half successes?

Perhaps the pennies of our schoolchildren, and the acts of good will to flow from our own hearts, will make the next centenary observance of Lincoln's great executive act just an appreciative memory. I trust we will be able, within the next generation, to finally close the books and lay this volume to rest, along with the other great events of our Nation's history.

Let us resolve to finish, once and for all, the great work which Lincoln started 100 years ago. We here in Philadelphia have shown, by our enormous progress of the past decade, that it is possible to solve many problems once thought to be insoluble. That progress, and those solutions, were made possible because we had the wholehearted support of all the diverse elements of our community. With your continued cooperation, I believe this additional great challenge is also capable of solution.

We owe it to ourselves, as well as to generations yet unborn.

## The 50–50 Picture in TV and Radio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a recent issue of the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner contains an interesting and informative discussion by its noted columnist, George Todt, on the ever-present problem of how privately owned and federally authorized radio and TV outlets can best serve the public interest.

Since it is obvious that a news and information medium which enjoys a Federal franchise to protect it against excessive or destructive competition requires a somewhat different approach in the development of appropriate policies of objectivity and equity from those of a newspaper which is not only privately owned but also required to provide its own protection against potential or actual competitors, it is important that the Congress continue to concern itself with the evolvement of optimum laws and regulations relative to the radio-TV industry. In this connection, I believe George Todt's comments merit careful reading.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the column written by Mr. Todt on this significant subject be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION: THE 50–50 PICTURE

"Noisy commercials really are not louder—they just sound that way."—Newton Minow, Town Hall address, December 18, 1962.

One of the best of Bill Miller's consistently good programs at Town Hall took place last Tuesday noon when Newton Minow, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, was guest speaker.

He is bright, intelligent, and seems dedicated to turning TV into something besides the "vast wasteland" he called it a year ago.

The FCC headman is only in his mid-30's, but don't let that fool you. His mind is a storehouse of factual information and he knows what he is talking about. I liked him very much. He is on the ball.

In the first portion of his well-received address, Minow told of the tremendous advances now being achieved in the field of satellite communications. Much more is to come. Bodes well for our future.

The second part of his informative remarks concerned the new educational TV station in Los Angeles which Dr. Lee DuBridge, of Caltech, and his group have been quietly working on for some time. Very commendable objective.

In the regular question-and-answer period which followed, I asked Minow this basic question: "In the interest of fairness and impartiality, what are you doing to guarantee that conservative and liberal voices will balance out on a 50–50 basis in the areas where FCC has control?"

Minow replied that the FCC, by law, has been given a very difficult but necessary job. When controversial issues are before the public, it tries to see that a fair share of time is allotted both sides.

"The FCC does not monitor programs," Minow told us. "It only listens to complaints from the public—then acts on them.

"If complaints come in to us, we call them to the attention of the concerned station. Whenever the public believes it is only getting one ideological side of the picture, we want to know about it.

"As long as both sides are heard, then there should be no complaint. But if both sides are not being heard, then the FCC can step in and require fair treatment.

"If the American people think they are not getting fair balance between liberal and conservative ideological viewpoints, please let us know."

I talked with this fine young man for a few moments afterward. Would he welcome letters from my readers who had views on this subject? By all means, he told me. Just address your letters to him in care of the FCC, Washington, D.C.

He is anxious to give the public what it really wants.

We agreed that what our Nation needs is balance between the liberal and conservative viewpoints. Just as a human needs a right and left hand, our Republic requires 50–50 opposition for best results.

## Thanksgiving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the following article on the true meaning of Thanksgiving was written by Yolanda Clegorne, a junior at Crestview High School, and read at the annual Thanksgiving banquet of the Wesleyan Service Guild of the Crestview (Fla.) First Methodist Church.

Because of the timeliness of the theme, and the excellence of the thoughts which it contains, the article is reprinted here. I am very much impressed with the excellence of this article. I have known Yolanda all of her life. She is a very fine young lady whose parents are my very good friends of long years.

The article follows:

THANKSGIVING

(By Yolanda Clegorne)

Thanksgiving is an American holiday. There is nothing like it elsewhere in the world. It does not commemorate a great battle, or the birthday of a great leader.

Thanksgiving is the expression of a deep feeling of gratitude by our people. It is a day set aside to recognize God for all His goodness He has bestowed upon us.

We should try to recognize that Thanksgiving should be a way of life, not a once-a-year occasion.

HUMILITY

Humility. This Thanksgiving Day, as in years past, the Americans are enjoying it in a marvelous state of prosperity.

The Americans are creating it an ugly image abroad. People in other countries think of America as a puffed-up capitalistic country.

Americans must learn humility. Humility is a virtue. Humiliation is an evil. Those who are on the giving end must be humble so that those who are on the receiving end are not humiliated.

Americans are to often prone to say, "Those foreigners should be glad to get that." We should be thankful for the opportunity to give. One day the tables will be turned, if by nothing but time itself, and America will be on the receiving end.

GRATITUDE

Gratitude. A Catholic has a string of beads called a rosary to keep count of his prayers, so each of us should keep a mental rosary of his blessings.

The beauty he has seen, the fellowship he has enjoyed, his life and the gifts it has brought him. These are but a few. Look back into your memories, and think of the many forgotten reasons for gatitude.

The times your mother sat up with you when you were ill, and so many things we think about that we received in our homes.

BLESSINGS

When we start thinking about our many blessings, do you recognize the rights we take for granted in the free countries like the United States—freedom of worship, freedom of speech, press, public schools? Americans never think of what it would be like to live under a dictator.

A noted Christian teacher suffered much at the hands of the Nazis in Czechoslovakia. Finally, he was able to flee with his family to the United States, leaving all his possessions behind. Many times he would stop during his lectures to American students and say with tears in his eyes, "I love your country."

That man could appreciate freedom and he gave genuine thanks for it because he knew what it was like when freedom was taken away.

FREEDOM

Freedom led to the first Thanksgiving. In England many of the people desired a simple church service. A service different from the service of the Church of England. They were treated terribly and many were imprisoned and fined.

Finally, unhappy and restless, they banded together and came to the new land of America. No one would be able to say when the first Thanksgiving took place. Ancient Greeks and Romans had days to give thanks for harvest, but the Pilgrims are usually given credit for the Thanksgiving as we know it today.

The settlers (especially in Virginia) had several days per year for giving thanks. The first Presidential proclamation of a National Thanksgiving Day was made by a Virginian, George Washington, in 1783, and the matter bobbed up irregularly for the next 10 years.

Finally, in 1863, President Abraham Lincoln urged that all work be suspended so that everyone might give thanks to God.

Not all of Lincoln's Thanksgivings were in November, although his last official proclamation placed the date as the last Thursday of that month, and this became more or less official.

At last in 1941, by congressional action, the fourth Thursday in November was made official.

As we might think of our blessings, our thoughts should go all the way back to Calvary. Here our hearts should fill with an unexpressable gratitude. We should realize that we are all on the receiving end. No one of us is paying his full way through life.

GIVERS AND GETTERS

People could roughly be divided into two groups.

The first are those who think they are giving more than they get.

The second are the people who feel they are getting more than they give. The first group are restless and discontended, no matter what they have. The last group have peace of mind, and contentment with whatever they have.

How much do we have? Thanksgiving as many other things has become commercialized. It has become associated with the familiar scene of a family sitting around a table filled with turkey, cranberry sauce, hot rolls and mincemeat pie.

This is a season of personal thanksgiving not a time of physical indulgence.

THANKSGIVING PSALM

"I love the Lord, because He hath heard my voice and my supplications. Because He hath inclined His ear unto me, therefore will I call upon Him as long as I live. The sorrow of death compassed me, and the pain of hell got hold of me; I found trouble and sorrow. Then called I upon the name of the Lord: O Lord, I beseech Thee; deliver my soul. Gracious is the Lord, and righteous; yea, our God is merciful. The Lord preserveth the simple; I was brought low, and He helped me. Return unto Thee. For Thou hast delivered my soul from death, mine eyes from tears, and my feet from falling. I will walk before the Lord in the land of the living. I believe, therefore have I spoken; I was greatly afflicted; I said in my haste, all men are liars. What shall I render unto the Lord for all His benefits toward me? I will take the cup of salvation, and call upon the name of the Lord. I will pay my vows unto the Lord now in the presence of all His people. Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of His saints. O Lord, truly I am Thy servant, and the son of Thine handmaid: Thou hast loosed my bonds. I will offer to Thee the sacrifice of thanksgiving, and will call upon the name of the Lord. I will pay my vows unto the Lord now in the presence of all His people. In the courts of the Lord's house, in the midst of Thee, O Jersusalem. Praise ye the Lord."—Psalms 116.

PERSONAL MESSAGE

This is a psalm of personal thanksgiving. It tells two things. First the story of the psalmists own experience, giving the circumstances that brought this thanksgiving. And second, the account of how he paid the vow he made to the Lord in the moment of his deep distress.

The story is told of an ancient Isrealite (poor, family dead) who offered his "sacrifice of thanksgiving." During an illness the dark and dismal abode of death became very real to him. Now, he sang his hymn of praise for restored life. Christ by his coming freed us from the disgrace of sin and took away the sting of death. In its place he gave us eternal life in him. What is our sacrifice of thanksgiving?

LOVE

Love. The greatest gift of love was that of Christ. This is the greatest reason anyone could have for being thankful. A small boy is a country school daily shared his lunch with a little boy who had none. One day the giver found a note on his desk which said in childish simplicity and sincerity, "I love you." That was an expression of thanksgiving from the heart. When it comes to expressing true appreciation and thankfulness a small child often puts us to shame. When a little child suddenly looks up into his mother's face and says right out of his heart, "Mother, I love you," you know it is sincere.

We all do extol Thee, Thou leader triumphant and pray that Thou still our Defender wilt be, let Thy congregation escape tribulation, Thy name be every praise! O Lord, make us free!

HISTORY MESSAGE

America is a strong and powerful nation, but she must not forget God in her struggle to remain first. The path of history is strewn with nations who forgot God. One of the books of the Bible tells the story of God's children, His nation. Because they forgot him, they were captured and placed in bondage. Don't think that He does not have the power to do it again.

Every day is a new page in the book of life and it is our duty as a nation and as a person to put something new and beautiful there.

George Washington summed up this day as a time for "Devotion to the service of that great and glorious Being who is the most beneficent author of all that is good, of all that was good, and all the good that will be."

"GOD IS THERE

"When thy heart, with joy overflowing,
Sings a thankful prayer,
In thy joy, O let thy brother,
With thee share.
When the harvest sheaves ingathered
Fill thy barns with store.
To thy God, and to thy brother,
Give the more.
If thy soul with power uplifted
Yearns for glorious deed.
Give thy strength to serve thy
Brother in his need.
Share with him thy bread of blessing,
Sorrow's burdens share.
When thy heart enfolds a brother;
God is there."

THEODORE C. WILLIAMS.

## U.N. Action in the Congo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. BURT L. TALCOTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, persons across the Nation are very disturbed by the action of the United Nations in the Congo and the role of the United States in backing this policy. This is expressed clearly in the following editorial from the January 8, 1963, Monterey Peninsula Herald. I know that the editor speaks for many and therefore include it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

As the efficient, well led, superbly equipped United Nations soldiers, all of them professionals, shot their way through Katanga—

U Thant held his court and did his business in the United Nations building in New York;

President John F. Kennedy rocked in a chair as he discussed world affairs with his viziers as they were called from Washington to Palm Beach;

Nikita Khrushchev watched from the Kremlin with smug satisfaction as the only stronghold of independence, productivity and anticommunism in the Congo was bludgeoned to its knees.

So far as the U.N. military action was concerned, it may be summarized by the expression: "Like shooting fish in a bucket." The number of casualties will never be known, because neither the U.N. nor the United States, chief Western sponsor of the U.N. in Katanga, will let the truth be known.

The truth is that the highly trained professionals of the U.N. forces—Indians (mostly Ghurkas), Ethiopians, Ghanians, Irish, and Swedes—ran through the raw Katanga troops like a hot knife through butter. They had plenty of tanks, plenty of modern planes, plenty of artillery, and plenty of food, ammunition, and transportation.

Behind these fine troops were many millions of dollars of U.S. taxpayers' money.

These troops should have done well. They killed hundreds, more likely thousands of black people. They killed an unknown number of whites. They riddled two white women in a small automobile because unfortunately the car was caught in a crossfire. That, of course, is not true. There was no crossfire. A picture taken at the time proves that there was no crossfire. U.N. troops were simply shooting at everything that moved. Callous troops that don't give a damn for human life, especially where most human life is black, do that sort of thing.

The American people should feel deeply disturbed at this tragedy in Katanga.

Why do the people of Katanga hate Americans more than they hate the people who have been shooting them? Because they know that American policy and American money have uprooted their lives. For principle? That's for the funnypapers. It has been for loot.

Moise Tshombe could truthfully say this at an MPC forum in Monterey: "Gentle readers of the Monterey Peninsula Herald, you have been shooting a lot of people in Katanga by proxy, all of them innocent of having done any harm to you or to any Congolese outside of their borders. You've killed women and children with the fine weapons you have given the civilized troops that had already invaded my country and that had wanted to occupy all of it. You killed those Belgian women in a 'crossfire' that wasn't any crossfire because no one was firing back at the U.N. troops. You were urged by the great missionary, Albert Schweitzer, to let us alone. Why didn't you let us alone? * * *"

The reason why the U.N. did not let Katanga alone was that it wanted to loot Katanga.

The U.N. said that Katanga seceded, and U.S. State Department equivocators inferred that this was like the secession of States that marked the beginning of the U.S. Civil War.

Unfortunately for the American side, that is untruthful. Katanga was a province of the Belgian Congo, which was not at any time a state or an independent state, but which was a grouping of tribes put together by the Belgians for administrative purposes.

When the Belgians quit the country as colonial rulers rather than face civil disorders directed and financed by Soviet Russia, they turned the reins of government over to a pseudogovernment in which anarchy almost immediately prevailed.

The Katangan leaders refused to put their lives and the wealth of their province under the direction of the Leopoldville politicians, and their land under occupation by the troops of Leopoldville.

It is ridiculous to consider the tribes of the Stanleyville and Leopoldville areas to be

the fellow countrymen of the black tribes of Elisabethville. In fact it is unheard of.

Unfortunately for the Katangans, they had skills, jobs and resources. The U.N. wants these things incorporated into the Congo to make that sad country viable. And U Thant, Director General of the U.N. by virtue of the satisfaction he renders Soviet Russia, doesn't care how many blacks are killed to force the surrender of Katanga to the looters.

All of this wretched, morally degrading operation has been approved and egged on by the United States in order, it is said, "to keep the Russians out of the Congo." How many black people will we have to kill in order to keep the Russians out?

This folly, smeared with the blood of innocent people, is American folly. That is why the name American is the most hated name in Katanga; and Americans supporting such policies are hell-bent to make America the most hated name in Africa.

How do we get that way? Because we let ourselves be conditioned by the Soviets. Because we are playing like amateurs for the Afro-Asian vote in the U.N. Because our policy has been influenced by men like Assistant Secretary of State G. Mennen Williams, Presidential Adviser Chester Bowles, by half-ditched Adlai Stevenson, and by U Thant, whose most recent formal, prepared speech was an apology for the Communists and an attack on the free world.

What becomes of the character of a great country that tolerates, let alone supports, such an outrage?

A. G.

## "Low-Road" Literature in Our Homes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appears in the present edition of Variety magazine. It was written by Mr. Lawrence J. Quirk, a nephew of Mr. James R. Quirk, the founder and editor of Photoplay. He is also the nephew of our late and beloved colleagues, William P. Connery, Jr., and Lawrence J. Connery who successively served so ably in the House from 1923 to 1941.

The Members of this body who so fondly recall the high principles upheld by both Billy and Larry Connery will be pleased to detect that the same moral characteristics and values of our former colleagues are manifested by their nephew. It gives credence to that old adage that "the fruit does not fall far from the tree".

The article is timely and its essence born of experience. The lesson is vital and revealing. Its challenge is great. Its commentary is alarming. Are we really exercising our duties as parents when we permit "low-road" literature to enter our homes.

The article follows:

Fan magazines have been under considerable fire in the last year or two. National magazines, newspaper columnists, the trade press, recent books on Hollywood—all have had a go at them.

The gist of the accusations seems to be that the fan magazines revel in rehashing current scandals about prominent film and television personalities, lending to their treatments a saccharinely mendacious and circusy tone.

Religious publications denounce them. Studio publicity executives hold them in contempt. Stars, allegedly unhappy over distorted quotes and tasteless story slants, duck interviews with them.

What is behind all this journalistic sound and fury?

There are currently some two dozen movie and television fan magazines with an estimated total circulation of 8 million. Motion Picture, Modern Screen, and Photoplay—the so-called big three, claim circulations of well over a million each. The remainder, some of them bimonthlies and quarterlies, trail with circulations averaging 250,000.

In the 1920's and early 1930's (some readers may be surprised to learn) the better fan magazines were highly respected and influential journalistic mediums with a predominantly adult readership. Today's readers are chiefly teenagers.

Thirty years ago, Photoplay, whose then editor-publisher, the late James R. Quirk, was known as the inventor of the fan magazine, led a field of about a dozen publications. Photoplay's then circulation, quite respectable for its time, was 500,000. Its nearest rival, Motion Picture, boasted a readership of several hundred thousand. The others, led by Picture Play, New Movie, and after 1930, Modern Screen, averaged 150,000 copies each per month. The total circulation of the fan magazines in 1932 hovered at about 3 million.

These 3 million constituted, however, a quality readership, an eager, adult public enthralled by the then fresh, novel and vital film medium. This public, especially that of Photoplay, sought information about all phases of movies, and tended to concern itself more with clean romance than with morbid sexual experience. Certainly it was at that time more enthralled by wholesome dreams and fine ideals than the later generation of readers, who sought sensational revelations and vicarious eroticism.

STRICTLY AURAL

There was no TV, of course, in those days, and radio had the drawback of being strictly an auditory medium. Movies, accordingly, enjoyed a monopoly on the attention of the entertainment-seeking public. The movie magazines of that time monopolized the field journalistically, for the newspapers and magazines on the national level were slow to accord space to a medium that was just beginning to develop its own peculiar literature and was only just commencing to engage the attention and respect of more intellectual folk.

As the 1930's advanced, however, the nationals and review weeklies began giving the movies more and more coverage, the adult film public began turning, especially after the tasteful James R. Quirk's death, from Photoplay to the metropolitan newspaper critics and review weeklies for advice as to what films were worth seeing, and for intelligent, informed information about picture people in general.

The fan magazines, which up to the midthirties had been feeding the public equal doses of romance and information content, found themselves accordingly at an impasse.

Photoplay and its rivals resolved this by lowering their cultural sights and aiming at younger, more impressionable audiences. They proceeded to cultivate the readership allegiance of these youngsters by providing them with romantic escapism and soapy, semifictionalized articles on stairs—to the gradual exclusion of more informational, analytical and documentary type material covering every aspect of films, and which Photoplay, especially, had formerly stressed.

The transformation was dramatic. Photoplay within a few years had regressed from a highly respected journal of the screen to a plaything for teenage girls. The other magazines followed suit. This debasement continued, with minor variations, from the midthirties to the midfifties when Confidential's gaudy success forced the fan magazines into still another "agonizing appraisal" based strictly on the dollar sign. For fan magazine editors and managers found to their consternation that the hitherto moneymaking saccharinities and escapist pipedreams were beginning to pall on their young readers.

In a desperate effort to retrieve a declining circulation and tap some of Confidential's ever-growing audience, the fan magazines began aping that publication's scandalous format, with, however, somewhat more caution and restraint than their high-flying model.

NATIONALS COMPETE

Once engaged on this cycle, however, they shortly found themselves vying with some of the franker, more incisive national magazines when it came to collecting their fair share of libel suits brought by enraged stars. In late 1960, Elizabeth Taylor and Eddie Fisher brought suit against seven fan books, the total damages asked being some $7 million.

In justice to the fan magazines, it must be stated that certain stars proceeded to forfeit popular sympathy by public carryings-on, leading to the suspicion that they secretly relished the lurid publicity that they sometimes publicly deplored.

Incongruously enough, the stars often rap the fan magazines for intensively briefing the public on scandals that these undisciplined, mercurial personalities bring on themselves becaus of untidy personal lives, which, being exhibitionists by nature, they have a compulsion to project on the public.

Some of these personalities, especially the ones who are slipping or have slipped, have even carried their essential hypocrisy to the point of instituting unjustified libel suits against fan magazines as a publicity gimmick, later quietly droping, or eeling out of, suits they know they can't win, once their specious publicity aims have been achieved.

Without unduly whitewashing the questionable taste of the fan magazines in some instances, it must be pointed out that they have often been treated with rank ingratitude by stars they helped to fame—stars who, once arrived, scorned the lowly fan magazines whose coverage they had once eagerly sought, and which had made them national names. Deploring highly personalized stories that they themselves had once eagerly cooperated in preparing, they belatedly found expedient to seek a dignified public image—often losing public favor in the process.

Most glaring current example of fan magazine bad taste, of course, is the frequent use of Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy on fan covers, accompanied by often tasteless cover lines. The White House is reported increasingly irritated over the exploitation of the President's wife in this crass and infantile manner. The misuse of a noncinematic personality of exalted background and exemplary private life smacks of execrable taste and editorial desperation, and has caused a number of observers to ask if circulation chasing is superseding commonsense along fan mag row these days.

The current scene finds these 2 dozen fan magazines serving an audience that has changed vastly over the past three decades—an audience which they helped cultivate and whose tastes and intelligence they have often underestimated and insulted. But it

is also true that most of the teenagers who read these magazines are more concerned with romance and glamor and self-indulgence than with the culture and artistry of films.

The attempts of the fan magazine editors to mix the scented water of romantic mendacity with the murky oil of confidential-type (albeit watered-down) scandal has currently produced an uneasy, tightrope-walking editorial compromise between the two once successful formats. Still, as their healthy circulations attest, they have retained the loyalty and interest of their young readers. Chief reason: their constant and detailed and highly personalized coverage of young personalities that teenagers want to read about.

Studios consequently owe the fan magazines a considerable debt. For there is no denying that they have been more responsible than any other journalistic medium for the emergence of new young stars like Troy Donahue, Connie Stevens, and Vince Edwards.

Fan publications have invested these personalities with a glamorized, personalized (albeit often phony and overblown) public relations gloss that has no parallel since the old days when studio contract lists (now largely nonexistent) sustained mammoth publicity staffs who kept the public star conscious. The fan magazines are serving this function today—and doing no mean job of it.

Some analytical observers feel, however, that if this same loving attention and image fashioning were accorded more intelligent and talented younger players coming up, that the fan magazines would really be a first-class publicity outlet.

Since adult readers have now, it seems, permanently turned to other publications for their entertainment news, criticisms and personality profiles, and since the fan magazines still engage their young readers heavily, what, then, should their function be henceforth if they are to grope their way to some sensible medium between healthy circulations and editorial self-respect?

As one shrewd observer put it: "They can point a good moral for immature minds, sugar-coating it to order. They can subtly uphold right values for courtship, marriage, and later family life. And if you add to a basically moral content (and by "moral content" I don't mean preachy, antiseptic, puritanical Pollyannaism) the values of literacy, taste, originality, and liveliness (all geared, and stirred in, for teenage palates)—and above all, truth and commonsense, then fanmag editors might feel a greater sense of fulfillment and creativity than they have for 30 years now."

Will the fan maggers follow such wise advice? It is possible they may have to, and soon, for young people of the sixties are less easily hoodwinked.

## Interview With Mr. Justice Tom C. Clark Over NBC Radio Network

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert a portion of the transcript of an interview broadcast Sunday, January 6, on the NBC "Monitor" program, in which correspondent Russ Ward questioned Mr. Justice Tom Clark regarding the founding of our judicial system as we know it today. This was the first in a series of programs the NBC radio network is carrying, in cooperation with the Federal Bar Association, to help promote respect for the law and those who enforce it.

The interview, in part, follows:

Mr. WARD. Mr. Justice, we are often referred to as a nation of laws, not of men. Could you tell us what this means?

Mr. Justice CLARK. Well, that comes from the politics of Aristotle, which was simply that in any well-ordered community it is not man who should govern but law that should govern. Now, you notice I did not say laws, I said law, the singular law. And that is because, as they conceived it, and as we carry it out, man, once he has power, is apt to abuse that power. "Power begets power" is a phrase that is used. While the law is usually immutable.

Now, of course, there are those who say that the law is but, well, words and paper. That you have to have some hand, some sword in that hand, in order to carry it out. And that is true. But that hand and that sword are under the law, and that is the beauty of that phrase and of our system. As Theodore Roosevelt said: "No man is over the law; no man is below the law." And we ask no man when we come to enforce the law; we enforce it as it is written.

Mr. WARD. Mr. Justice, if the Bill of Rights were being drawn up today rather than 200 years ago would it include anything new or different? Is the Bill of Rights still the keystone to individual freedom in this country?

Mr. Justice CLARK. Well, I would say that the Bill of Rights is the primary source, the primary source of our freedoms. But in the body of the Constitution there are quite a few rights and privileges that are created that are most important. For example, the right of habeas corpus, one of our most sacred rights. Also the right of a jury in criminal cases. Separation of the powers of the Government. The dual federalism that we have between our State and our Federal system. But as far as changing the Bill of Rights, or whether it would be the same today if it were rewritten, I think that depends on the draftsmen.

Now the Chief Justice several years ago said that from the sources that came to him there was some doubt as to whether the Bill of Rights would be adopted if it were put to a popular vote today. And he said that because so few people had an understanding, a complete understanding, of just what is in the Bill of Rights or what the conception of the founders of our Government had when they wrote those words.

Now I think myself that there would not be too much change if they were rewritten today. Of course, there would be some, in order to get away from some of the concepts that they had at that time, such as every person has to be charged by indictment. Now we charge by information, and things like that, formal matters.

But I think where we fall down is in the improvement and development of public understanding of just what the Bill of Rights is and what it stands for, and just what our responsibilities are under it.

Mr. WARD. Mr. Justice, in the weeks ahead "Monitor" will be exploring in greater detail such Government departments as Treasury, Defense, Post Office, and others, to see how individual rights are protected. Would you say that we as individuals are overly dependent on the Federal Government? Or is this Federal regulation necessary in our increasingly complicated world?

Mr. Justice CLARK. Well, I rather think the former. I believe we are becoming more dependent upon our central or national government, and that is something that President Adams way back there abhorred. He said that that would possibly be a tendency, and he was prophetic when he said that.

I think it's been brought about possibly because of the great change that has come about in our national formation of our beliefs and our transportation and our communication and things like that.

Way back there, you know, we put more power, you might say, in rural communities. And, for example, the case that we handed down last year on reapportionment, you remember, out of Tennessee. It was shown there that for many years, over 60, these small communities had controlled, in fact had more power in legislative assemblies, than did the larger cities. And I think that the reason for this, you might say more control in Washington, is because the cities and the States have not taken advantage of their opportunities in grasping a problem and trying to solve it.

Now some of it is being caused by the fact that this failure at apportionment, their vision has not been as clear. The necessities of a large urban population have not been seen by the man who is representing a small community and who has a larger vote you might say than the urban community.

So I think as an answer to the problem is that the States and the cities have not sometimes had the money, sometimes they have not had the foresight. Sometimes they have not carried on their plans and programs as well, and so some of them would suggest why don't we get the Federal Government to help us out. And the first thing you know the Federal Government is in housing and all sorts of things of that type.

Now I am not saying that it should not be there at all. I think it has been a very healthful evolution. However, I am a firm believer in having as much government as possible at the local level, and that the National Government should only come in where it is necessary in order to make a cohesive whole of our national association that we have.

## Award to Ronald Staffieri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the greatest natural resources of our Nation today are the youth of our country. As has been said many times before the young men and women now in our schools and colleges will be the future leaders of another era and upon their proper development depends the welfare of this great Nation of ours.

Thus I am extremely pleased to report to you on the activities of a young man; a constituent of mine; a resident of Bronx County and an outstanding student. His name is Ronald Staffieri and he resides at 1019 East 179th Street, Bronx, N.Y. This young man is an advanced-class student at the School of Visual Arts in New York City. He is to graduate this June. In addition to this, he is active in community affairs so that he is now a captain in the Washington Grey's Cadets whose headquarters are in the King's Bridge Armory, also in my district. He has risen from a cadet in

8 years to the position of captain. This group of young men drill weekly and learn not only the discipline of the military but how to become good citizens for the future.

Last November Ronald was the recipient of an award from the National Committee on Employment of Youth for his outstanding cover design for that organization's magazine American Child. I congratulate Ronald for his accomplishments to date and I extend my congratulations to his fine family as well. I am certain that in future years Ronald Staffieri will make an excellent contribution to the well-being of his community, his State and his country.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the press release wherein Ronald was named the winner of the National Committee on Employment of Youth contest:

Nineteen-year-old Ronald Staffieri shows his award-winning cover design to Eli E. Cohen, executive secretary of the National Committee on Employment of Youth. The cover is for National Committee on Employment of Youth's magazine, American Child. It was judged best of a selection submitted by advanced-class students at the School of Visual Arts in New York City. Ronald hails from the Bronx, where he majored in commercial art at Dodge Vocational High School.

Interestingly, the first issue of American Child using Ronald's cover is on the theme "Automation: Outlook for Youth." According to Mr. Cohen, Ronald is in the rare group of young people today whose working future will not be complicated by advancing technology. No machine has yet been invented that can design a cover, write a poem, or take over any of the creative arts. "But," said Mr. Cohen, "most other youngsters will indeed have to consider the dynamic changes ahead in planning their futures." To help them keep pace, Mr. Cohen urged an immediate and vast improvement in counseling and vocational training programs, as well as increased research and information on the occupations and training needs of tomorrow's labor market.

## Honorary Citizenship for Sir Winston Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, on January 9 the opening day of the 88th Congress, I introduced House Joint Resolution 109, authorizing the President of the United States to issue a proclamation declaring Sir Winston Churchill to be an honorary citizen of the United States of America. As the son of an American mother and an English father, Winston Churchill, more than any other, truly epitomizes the union between the two great English-speaking peoples. His courage and devotion to the cause of freedom and human dignity have served to challenge and inspire our Nation as well as his own to victory in war and to achievement in peace.

The gift of honorary citizenship of the United States of America is one honor, one token of rare esteem and love which is within this Nation's power to bestow, and which is worthy of Winston Churchill's place in history. It is my hope that the Committee on the Judiciary will move swiftly to get the joint resolution to the floor where I believe it will meet with unanimous approval.

The Washington Post carried an editorial on January 9 endorsing citizenship for Sir Winston and also a letter to the editor from Miss Kay Halle of Cleveland, Ohio, and Washington, to whom much credit must be given for making the suggestion that we honor Sir Winston Churchill in this way. Under unanimous consent I include the editorial and Miss Halle's letter as part of my remarks. The editorial and letter follow:

CITIZEN CHURCHILL

The Congress of the United States, which gathers in Washington today, can demonstrate in a thousand ways and by a hundred legislative acts, the power and wisdom and virtue of what has become beyond all doubt the world's greatest legislative body. These demonstrations will not startle or amaze a world grown accustomed to the might and authority of this august assembly of the chosen representatives of the world's foremost republic.

There is one way, which all may hope it will not neglect, of demonstrating besides, its subtle, sensitive and perceptive appreciation of those mysterious forces above the ordinary objects of legislation. There is one action by which it can show how truly it reflects the sentiment, the gratitude, and the understanding of the American people. There is one way of demonstrating to the world that representative government is moved by impulses rising in the hearts of common people, springing from their instincts of generosity and affection, and having nothing to do with the expectation of future gain. There is one means by which it can stir in our minds old memories and in our hearts new hopes.

This Congress should swiftly move, by appropriate legislation, to confer American citizenship upon the former Prime Minister of Great Britain, Winston Churchill. Such legislation, to be sure, will only affirm in the law what already prevails in the essence of things, but it will be an affirmation that will brighten the twilight that slowly gathers about the aged man whose inspired union of noble words and great deeds was our salvation and solace in dreadful days.

Only once before, in the case of Lafayette, has Congress been moved to this unique expression of national sentiment. It is the most appropriate gift and token that it is within its power to convey and the one that more than any other symbolizes the warmth and affection and reverence that a grateful people feels toward a noble friend.

It is such a gift as we may safely think will inspire the aged hero to turn once more toward the West, to murmur again the magic lines of Arthur Hugh Clough with which he lifted Great Britain from despair in the darkest days of the war:

"And not by eastern windows only,
When daylight comes, comes in the light,
In front, the sun climbs slow, how slowly,
But westward, look, the land is bright."

ONE OF US

When Sir Winston Churchill cut into his 15-pound birthday cake last November celebrating his 88 years, he found the most heartfelt of his memorable utterances inscribed on its icing. "I am an English speaking union." One of his proudest boasts is, "Among Englishmen I have a special qualification, I am directly descended through my mother from an officer who served in Washington's Army. And as such I have been made a member of your strictly selected Society of the Cincinnati. I have my pedigree supported by affidavits at every stage if it is challenged * * * I feel on both sides of the Atlantic. In my mother's birth city of Rochester, N.Y., I hold the latch key to American hearts."

Not long ago I spent a day with Sir Winston at his beloved Chartwell in the beautiful countryside of Kent. During lunch I watched him rise from the anesthesia of his great age, lift his glass of hock and propose a "toast to the good health of your leader and ours." He spoke often that day of "undying fraternal association of your great country and mine." He said that if we are together nothing is impossible as a special relationship exists between the British Commonwealth and the United States. He mused on the eventuality of common citizenship but was "content to leave that to destiny whose outstretched arm so many of us can clearly see. I feel eventually this will come."

The 88th Congress has just begun. It could perform no more rewarding or auspicious first act than to pass with unanimity Senate Joint Resolution 215 already introduced into the Senate by Senator STEPHEN YOUNG, Democrat, and House Joint Resolution 866 by Congresswoman FRANCES BOLTON, Republican, into the House proposing honorary American citizenship for Sir Winston Churchill.

Some might consider this setting a precedent. If it were anyone but Sir Winston the point could be argued. Sir Winston is a precedent. Once before we so honored a Frenchman, the Marquis de Lafayette who fought by our side to help us win freedom. There is little time to lose if we are to make one of the greatest of our blood brothers, Sir Winston Churchill, truly one of us.

KAY HALLE.

WASHINGTON.

## Another U.S. Installation Goes South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it is a well-known fact that the State of Illinois has something of everythng, yet it ranks 50th among the States in return of money from the Federal Government. Federal funds Federal projects, and Federal installations have an amazing habit of going over, under and around to everybody but us. The biggest economic barrier this State faces is the draining off of its wealth by the Federal Government while such funds go pouring into the economies of other States.

The Government is about to launch a new rocket test center costing $500 million for construction alone, not to mention the sums that will continue to go for its operation. Once again, the funds are not going to Illinois, but from Illinois, and not borrowed money but real cash. Where is it going? Right smack in the same State where the Federal

Government has been defied and the Governor himself is under Federal charges. We no not believe in pork-barrel politics. We do not believe in doling out projects on the basis of political favoritism. But when folks in Illinois are good for nothing except paying more taxes than almost anybody else, it is time something was done by way of self-protection.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Journal Star under date of January 11, 1963, in the Appendix of the RECORD.

ANOTHER U.S. INSTALLATION GOES SOUTH

The United States is about to launch a whole new rocket test center. It will involve pouring into the State concerned $500 million for construction alone, not to mention the sums of Federal money that will flow there constantly for its operation.

Where is this money going do you suppose? To the great State of Mississippi.

Here in the North, the Federal Government makes a big to-do about forcing integration in the South by means of troops, contract rules, housing moneys, and so on. By golly, you can't borrow Federal money to build segregated housing. This sounds good to the Negro vote districts of Chicago and New York, presumably.

But when it comes to pouring in real money, not borrowed, on a fantastic scale, where does Uncle put it? Right smack in the same State where Federal marshals and Federal troops and Federal courts have been defied, and the Governor himself is under Federal charges.

All the strokes of the pen made to bring economic pressure on the State of Mississippi are wiped out and more by bestowing upon them half a billion of our dollars, outright—for a start.

It looks as if somebody is playing both ends against the middle.

And you know who is in the middle—we folks in Illinois, who Washington obviously figures are good for nothing except paying more taxes than almost anybody else.

## National Bargain: The FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, if any reminder is needed with respect to the efficient operation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation under the distinguished leadership of its Director, Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, such a reminder is provided by issuance of the Bureau's latest annual report.

A well-merited tribute is paid to the FBI and Mr. Hoover in connection with this annual report in an editorial appearing in the January 2 Detroit Free Press.

Under permission to extend and revise my remarks, I include the editorial:

NATIONAL BARGAIN: THE FBI

The annual report of the FBI has come along and, as in previous years, leads us to conclude that the agents who work under the direction of J. Edgar Hoover put out more energy than anybody else on the Federal payroll.

There is the never ceasing war against the Communists, whose endeavors in this country have been augmented in the past year by the Cuban situation.

As Mr. Hoover puts it in his report, "During even the most critical moments of the Cuban crisis, the party openly proved its loyalty to the international Communist cause. Its members stood unwaveringly opposed to our country's efforts to stop the Soviet Union's buildup of offensive military equipment in Cuba and to assure the removal of weapons already there."

Then there was the need to inquire into civil rights violations aimed at dissuading southern Negroes from voting. Identification work had to be done at scenes of disaster, including one airliner tragedy in France. FBI men assisted at more than 3,600 police schools, and gave instruction to police officers at the FBI's academy.

Felonies in violation of the Federal bank robbery and incidental crimes statute had a boom year, with 25 percent more investigated than in 1961.

With all this work to be done, and with the job done so well, the United States can well afford to lay out the money it costs to keep the FBI running.

But the fact is that the FBI costs American society nothing. Instead, it brings in a profit. The organization's operating appropriation is considerably less than the fines and recoveries its work produces.

This year the FBI's getback was over $200 million, which is even higher than the figure we hailed a year ago. In 1961 it was $148,421,690.

With a government so open to accusations of waste and inefficiency, it's greatly satisfying to read Mr. Hoover's report. The taxpayer gets his money's worth from the FBI, and no doubt about it.

## A Resolution To Establish a House Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, in reintroducing my resolution to establish a special House Committee on the Captive Nations, I must point out that one more country has been added to the list of captive nations since I introduced similar legislation a year and a half ago.

Cuba must be regarded as a captive nation. We have seen firsthand what has happened to the Cuban people under Communist tyranny—the heartache, the loss of liberty and property. Some have even sacrificed their lives. It should serve to remind us of the obligations we have to them and to enslaved peoples everywhere to aid in all practicable ways in their quest for freedom.

The Congress has a special responsibility to provide leadership in this vital freedom movement. And it must be more than mere lipservice in the form of resolutions and declarations and observances. It must take the form of action.

The purpose of a Committee on the Captive Nations would be to conduct inquiry into and to study satellite countries and captive non-Russian nations to help them to regain their national and individual freedoms.

In faith the people of the captive nations of the world are looking to the United States for guidance. In giving it, let us never forget that the future of the free world is linked with the future of these captive nations.

It is my conviction that a congressional committee devoting itself to the study and recommendation of ways to further promote a peaceful offensive in the cold war would contribute tremendously to the prosecution of the cold war and to ultimate—and necessary—victory.

## REA Mailing Privileges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the Glasford Gazette, one of the many rural weeklies in my district, can always be counted upon to have an excellent editorial in each issue.

In the December 6, 1962, issue, the front page of the paper contained an outspoken editorial on one aspect of the REA program which has not received a great deal of attention to date.

Along with many other critical comments concerning this power hungry agency which will be forthcoming in this session, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to this article. The editorial follows:

UNJUSTIFIED KID GLOVES

One of the difficult domestic problems with which the last Congress wrestled was the huge post-office deficit. The result was a postal service bill creating increases in various classifications of mail rates. Newspapers, for example, will pay three 10-percent increases with the first to take effect on the first day of the coming year.

However, Congress wore kid gloves when it came to publications of the rural electric cooperatives. Formerly, according to Editor and Publisher, these publications paid a one-half-cent rate. The new bill gives them a special rate of about one-eighth of 1 cent per copy.

The general manager of the American Newspaper Publishers Association states that there is "no justification for this special privilege." Another comment says, "so REA groups will now be able to enjoy a financial advantage which for propagandizing against their prime target, the investor-owned private power industry. Meanwhile, the publications of the private power industry will be compelled to pay the regular rates to tell their side of the story."

There are 28 REA publications. Their circulation is about 3 million. They carry advertising. They are all actually engaged in attempting to extend the REA scheme. And no one can say the REA co-ops, or anything connected with them, are poor and struggling enterprises in need of special help. The REA movement is big business—and it is a big business conducted with Government loans at below-cost interest rates, plus other special privileges, including tax

advantages, which are denied to private enterprise.

The least one can ask is that the REA co-ops operate on precisely the same basis as do comparable utilities in the production and distribution of electric power. This means paying the same costs—whether those costs be taxes, interest rates on borrowed money, or the mail charges on their publications. This country's rural electrification problem was solved long ago—more than 95 percent of all farms are using central station power or have it available. There once was but is no longer an excuse for giving the co-ops special privileges.

## Asbury Theological Seminary Inaugurates New President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN C. WATTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I wish to incorporate herein an editorial appearing in the Lexington Herald, under date of October 19, 1962, relating to the inauguration of a new president at the Asbury Theological Seminary, which is located in my congressional district.

The growth which the institution has enjoyed over the years speaks for the ability and dedication of its leaders.

Under Mr. Frank Bateman Stanger, Sr., the new president, I have no hesitancy in stating that the seminary may look forward to a continuation of the outstanding leadership which it has enjoyed over the years.

The editorial follows:

GROWING THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY INAUGURATES ITS NEW PRESIDENT

Asbury Theological Seminary, which in its 39 years has sent its graduates to pulpits throughout the country and mission fields around the world, has inaugurated a new president. Dr. Frank Bateman Stanger, Sr., who has filled the presidency since last May, was formally inaugurated the seminary's third president last week. He succeeded Dr. Julian C. McPheeters, who now is heading the school's 5-year expansion program.

Founded in 1923 by the late Dr. Henry Clay Morrison, Asbury Theological Seminary by 1942 had 89 students, four professors and one building. It now has grown to a student body of 300, a faculty of 22, five major buildings, an annual budget of more than a half million dollars and an endowment of $5 million, and the expansion program already has made possible the planning of other buildings.

Dr. Stanger, a graduate of Asbury College, Princeton University, and Temple University and for 25 years a Methodist pastor, called attention in his inaugural address to the theological tenets of the interdenominational seminary he heads.

"This is a seminary with a confessional theology," he said. "We hold firmly to the basic beliefs of historical evangelical Christianity. We believe in the full inspiration and absolute authority of the Word of God. We affirm a trinitarian view of God."

He spoke, too, to the necessity for training the ministers of today for the "new society," the modern world in which they serve. "Theology, to be useful, must speak to the contemporary situation," he stated. "But even then, theology is not the chief thing. Jesus Christ is. Therefore, theology must interpret Jesus Christ to each generation."

The Leader extends its congratulations to Dr. Stanger and its sincere wishes for his success and his school's continued growth.

## The New Bronx Post Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, on January 5 last, in Bronx County, there was officially dedicated the new Bronx post office, a completely separate facility for the use of the citizens of Bronx County. I was a participant at these dedication ceremonies and took pardonable pride in the fact that the creation of this post office was in a large measure due to my efforts over the years to obtain this badly needed public facility for the residents of Bronx County. The dedication ceremonies were impressive and among those present were such distinguished citizens as the former Postmaster General of the United States, the Honorable James A. Farley, the present Assistant Postmaster General of the United States, the Honorable Frederick C. Belen, along with the Honorable Sean P. Keating, regional director of the New York region of the Post Office Department. In addition to these present and former postal officials there was also present the president of the Bronx Board of Trade and an outstanding Bronxite, Donald Darcy. The invocation was delivered by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Bernard J. Fleming, principal of Cardinal Hayes High School and the benediction was pronounced by Rev. William J. Kalaidjian, pastor of the Bedford Park Congregational Church. The present postmaster for the new Bronx County post office, the Honorable Louis Cohen, pointed out in a few short sentences how important and how needed this new agency would be when in the course of his remarks he stated that this office would handle over 2 million pieces of mail daily and do more than $12 million worth of business a year.

I have always been proud of the fact that I have been a lifelong resident of one of the finest communities in the country, Bronx County, and I was deeply proud to participate in these ceremonies on January 5, both as a citizen of that community and as a Representative in Congress from Bronx County.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include an excellent editorial from the Bronx Press-Review, of January 10, 1963.

THE BRONX POST OFFICE IS ESTABLISHED

An important and historic move was celebrated on Saturday, when the establishment of a Bronx general post office was celebrated in the former Bronx Central Annex post office.

Ceremonies signaled the start of a separate post office for the Bronx, which formerly had been serviced through the New York, N.Y., general post office in Manhattan.

Under the direction of Postmaster Louis Cohen, the Bronx post office will manage its own affairs, routing 2 million pieces of mail a day, at a total business level of $12 million annually.

The dignity and importance of the Bronx deserved such a move. Even more, it made good commonsense in terms of service and economies, to have the Bronx handle its own mail directly instead of transshipping it through the downtown general post office.

This piece of status building of the Bronx comes at a time when the whole direction of government is toward a centralization that has some objectionable features. The office of the borough president just last week suffered certain diminutions under charter reform. Added efficiency and administrative shortcuts are good in metropolitan and megapolitan areas, to be sure, but the sustenance of local pride and identity is being overlooked in the process.

We're glad that the new post office for the Bronx not only brings to us an activity that rightfully belongs here, but that in the midst of all of the talk of centralization it is recognized that this exception in decentralization is recognized as being impelled by indices of efficiency.

## Pay of the Military

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, the following letter from L. R. Heron, commander, U.S. Navy, retired, clearly, unselfishly, and objectively sets forth pay and related problems of the military. I commend it to my colleagues:

VENTURA, CALIF.,
*January 2, 1963.*

Hon. CHARLES M. TEAGUE,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The purpose of this letter is to bring to your attention, my views on the matter of proposed increases in military pay, which I understand will be considered during the forthcoming session of the Congress, together with the related matter of military exchanges and commissaries, the continuation of which is again being attacked by powerful nonmilitary pressure groups.

Although the Department of Defense recommendations to the Congress have not been made public, considerable data in this connection has been printed in the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal, which is normally both accurate and authoritative.

With respect to the pay measure, it is understood that the traditional tie-in between active duty and retired pay may be ignored in the recommendations. With respect to the issue of exchanges and commissaries, it is understood that the Department of Defense is not unsympathetic to the idea of imposing further stringent restrictions on the operation of these.

I must emphasize at the outset that my protests are not generated because of selfish reasons. As a highly trained engineering specialist in the Navy, I found it not too difficult to obtain a very satisfying and lucrative engineering position in industry upon my retirement. Consequently, the 1 percent per annum cost-of-living increase which

may be suggested by DOD, amounting to $4 per month in my own case, would have little effect on my standard of living, neither would the $95 per month realizable if my retired pay were based on the to-be-suggested active duty scale for an officer of my grade make substantial difference, however pleasant the increase might be.

I am vitally concerned for those of my colleagues possessing no such technical skills, for those who retire at an age when a transition into a civilian position is difficult, if not impossible, and, equally important, to the effect on young career officers now in service, or the future recruitment of such officers, in the face of the ever-continuing whittling away of service fringe benefits.

It is a matter of practical fact that reasonable increases in military pay are essential to the national security, to insure retention of the type of people necessary to operate and maintain the incredibly complex weapons in use today, and the services are not altogether successful in retaining, let alone obtaining, such personnel. I am not amused when I reflect that junior civilian engineers now working for me earn about 10 percent more than I did as an active duty commander in charge of 2,200 personnel at the time of my retirement in 1958. Company paid health and life insurance benefits, plus noncontributory retirements benefits equal, or in most cases exceed, those offered by the service. Per diem, payment of actual movement costs and realistic relocation allowances, and similar benefits, more than offset the lack of exchange and commissary priviliges which accrue only to the military.

As a consequence, the armed services today attract two types of personnel, the highly dedicated and the mediocre or incompetent.

We do, fortunately, have many, many dedicated personnel in the services, who, as one senior officer said a few years ago, "live on in genteel poverty, moderately indifferent to money."

The many inconveniences and the general instability in family life experienced by service families are too well known to recount them. Their income is in the middle to low group, so along with the instability, they must forgo many of the conveniences available to their civilian contemporaries. In spite of this, most prefer to stay with the services, although many weaken in the face of the constant whittling away at fringe benefits and most particularly, as the result of broken promises.

The tangible values of fringe benefits are highly touted by officer and enlisted procurement officers, and equally acclaimed, if not overstated by officials of the Department of Defense. Typical examples of benefits which are fast disappearing are:

1. Post exchanges and commissary stores: These are now no more than simple conveniences as a result of restrictions imposed in recent years. Severe limitations are placed on the type of item that may be stocked, and in many areas, chainstore operators actually provide such items to the civilian population at substantially lower costs. Only on such staples as fresh milk, bread, and the like, are any real savings realized. To impose further restrictions at the bidding of selfish pressure groups would be tragic.

2. Medical care: Despite medicare, the medical care available to military personnel, more particularly to their dependents, is very poor, except in certain selected areas, simply because facilities and medical officers are lacking or do not exist. Retired personnel are in a few cases treated very well, but only at the expense of active-duty personnel, but in most cases, receive very shabby treatment because of the shortages which exist. (In our area, Port Mugu has only 4 medical officers for some 5,000 military and civilian personnel, and for 7,500 military, civilian, and dependent personnel, Port Hueneme has only twice that number.) As a result of this, many active-duty and retired personnel are literally forced into paying for medical care out of pocket. Thus, promised medical care during active duty and upon retirement is a paper promise which often cannot be met.

3. Retirement opportunities: In the case of officers, conflict-of-interest legislation, interpretations by the Comptroller General, and so forth, impose serious restrictions on employment of retirees. As the result of accusations by certain Members of Congress, action by the executive department at the behest of pressure groups, individuals with years of service in honorable careers find themselves accused of perfidious conduct, and many employers discourage hiring them out of concern for the possible trouble their presence will generate. Employment opportunities are decreasing as the number of retirees increase. The real estate, securities, and insurance fields are glutted, and few qualify to be teachers. As a result, more and more retirees are forced to live primarily off retired income, supplementing this as best they can. Failure of the pre-1958 retirees to receive pay equalization that year is now to be further complicated by the offensively low suggestion of 1 percent per annum cost-of-living increase, although it is hoped that there will be an adjustment for some to the 1958 scale.

Realistically, substantial pay increases for the ever-increasing number of retirees could be fiscally unsound for the Nation—yet all concerned were promised the tie-in between active-duty and retired pay. Some form of contributory retirement may be desirable for the future to insure economically sound programs. Resorting to a 1-percent-a-year increase is not the answer, and may have retirees looking forward to the drab existence of pensioners.

I would like to believe my statements are truly representative of the situation which exists today. Although retired, I am based at Port Mugu for my company, live with the military, understand their problems, and of course, as a retiree, have firsthand experience with the problems in this area. The local commands do all they can to help, but they have limitations imposed by higher authority.

After reviewing the foregoing, I hope you may find it possible to support all or part of my viewpoint in the Congress, and to call the contents of this letter to the attention of your colleagues.

Your consideration and cooperation will be much appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

L. R. HERON,
*Commander, U.S. Navy (Retired).*

## The Seeds of Fascism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, in the moves toward greater government domination of our lives are the seeds of fascism, Curtis Boeder, editor of the Arlington (Minn.) Enterprise warns us in an editorial which so impressed me that I include it, under unanimous consent, in the Appendix of the RECORD. Truly we must be on guard if our free institutions are to survive.

The editorial follows:

THE SEEDS OF FASCISM

Some thoughtful people have expressed a fear that a form of fascism may, in time, reach power in this country. If it ever does, it will be the evolutionary consummation of a trend which has been subtly and insidiously undermining free institutions for many years.

The matter is not an easy one to discuss with any precision. For one thing, the meaning of words often tends to blur, and the problems and situations they are intended to describe often lose contrast. One totalitarian state—whether it be called Fascist, Communist, or anything else—is very much like another in its fundamentals.

That aside, the causes of fascism, and the tools which are used to create it, are spotlighted by history. The technique is to bring about a marriage of the instruments of power in a nation—its government, its industries, and its labor in cases where the unions are strong and yield vast influence. The ambitious leader uses these instruments with utmost care—and the utmost cynicism—to achieve his purposes. He woos industry, by convincing it that by going along with him it will achieve an advantage over labor. And he woos labor with precisely the same siren song in reverse.

The stage is set for fascism—or totalitarianism of any kind—when the resources of a nation become overly dependent on its government. And, certainly, we have moved far in that direction. The Government is the principal customer of many huge companies. Beyond that, Government, by its laws and regulations, its bureaucracies, its thousand and one departments and agencies, and its own business operations, plays a dominant role in the life of the Nation that would have seemed both impossible and intolerable even half a century ago.

Wars—hot and cold, past, present, and possible—have been enormous forces in producing this trend. A $50-odd-billion defense budget alone is a continuing threat to fundamental liberties. All we can do about this is to minimize that threat in every way possible, by working to prevent government domination of our lives in every area where the national security does not clearly demand it.

Beyond this, the Fascist danger lies in areas which have no connection with our safety in a chaotic world. These areas we describe with a general term—the welfare state. This, carried to its logical conclusion, is a state in which government is all things to all men, offering a dubious cradle-to-the-grave security. The cost in dollars—tax dollars—is exceeded only by the costs in loss of liberty, self-reliance, and individual pride and responsibility.

So the seeds of totalitarianism exist. Only an informed and determined public, dedicated like its forebears to the principles of freedom, can make sure that they will not sprout into choking weeds.

## The FBI: Where Would We Be Without It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. H. ALLEN SMITH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has an enviable record in its service to the citizens of the United

States. The Hartford Courant, of January 4, 1963, has pointed this out in an editorial that I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues. I submit it herewith:

THE FBI REPORTS

Among the more interesting recapitulations of the old year is the statistical statement of the FBI showing an increased activity in almost every phase of its work. J. Edgar Hoover calls particular attention to the sharp increase in bank robberies. "An average of 100 robberies, burglaries, and larcenies of banks and other financial institutions covered by statute have been reported to the FBI each month this year," Mr. Hoover reports. This represents better than three a day, and is an increase of more than 25 percent over the previous year.

As usual the FBI has during the year dealt with a wide variety of malefactors ranging from murderers to spies and saboteurs. One of the more spectacular feats was the arrest of the Cuban gang, complete with their arsenal, before they set out on their mission of destruction and terror. The FBI has assumed an extra load because of the civil-rights conflict in the South, and has spent much time and energy tracking down the church burners in that section.

The figures of the report are staggering. More than 1,400 fugitives were apprehended, and 12,700 convictions were obtained. Fines amounting to more than $200,000 were assessed, compared with $148,000 last year. Another feat was the recovery of 19,000 stolen automobiles under the Interstate Transportation Act.

This, of course, represents only the highlights. The day in and out work of laboratory testing, identification in tragedy as well as crime, the local and regional police schools are all integral parts of this picture. Perhaps Mr. Hoover's greatest achievement is the fact that he has built up this tremendous organization without ever letting it become one that treads on civil rights. Instead the FBI is respected and admired, as a matter of national pride and satisfaction. Don't know what we could do without it.

## America's Basic Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, at the suggestion of our former colleague, Hon. John H. Ray of New York, I am pleased to present an address delivered by a distinguished rabbi, who has been a faithful shepherd of his flock and who, by his wisdom and erudition, educated parishioners in his temple in the ways of peace and righteousness. This message, delivered by Rabbi Charles E. Shulman, of the Riverdale Temple, New York City, before the covenant breakfast at Staten Island, N.Y., on December 9, 1962, is as inspiring as it is appealing to the human heart. The address follows:

AMERICA'S BASIC RIGHTS

Mr. Chairman, this breakfast attended by hundreds of men and women of the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths is a significant testimony to the validity of the process of American democracy. It could not happen on the scale manifest here in other lands because the United States, being an amalgamation of different racial stocks, religions, and nationalities under one flag, has long pointed the way to countries more rigid in social living than this country and far less spontaneous in friendly recognition and respect for differences than societies in other parts of the world. This is the 17th year that these breakfasts have been held in the Staten Island community, and in that time awards have been given impartially to Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish citizens, colored and white alike, who served this community with distinction. On this occasion you are honoring Thomas Ryan, an outstanding Catholic layman who has contributed unselfishly and nobly to the welfare of your borough on so many occasions with his heart, his spirit, and his means. He richly deserves the honor you are bestowing upon him, and his family gathered together with us this morning may be justly proud of him as we all are for his meritorious display of citizenship in your midst.

I might add that I would consider it a great compliment if his little daughter Gina applauded my remarks as vigorously as she did her daddy's just a few minutes ago when he acknowledged the B'nai B'rith Award to him for the year 1962. It is this type of citizenship embracing a total community rather than a particular sect or church or organization which makes America a unique nation among the nations of the world. We have our faults. We have our unsolved problems. But when we Americans live up to our potentialities as a free people we display the human values that ofttimes bring us the admiration and the envy of those not so fortunate as we are to breathe the air of freedom daily.

There are lands in our contemporary international society where people would gladly change their vaunted material possessions for the intangible values under freedom which are ours—inalienable and enduringly so as long as this Republic lasts.

Communist dictatorships in Russia, China, and the satellite countries never tire of boasting that the future belongs to them, and not to the democratic lands. But nothing in their program—neither their achievements in space nor their efficiency in controlling the channels of public communication—substantiate their claims. In fact, we have many stories that seem to indicate the reverse of their public boasts and show that they are far less secure in their hold on the people than they would have the world believe. One of those stories concerns the party boss of one of the Communist satellite countries who was making a tour of the State institutions with his secretary. They came to an orphanage. The secretary asked the head of the institution how much was allocated daily for the care of each child. "Ten zlotys," was the reply. "Cut the amount in half," the secretary ordered the official. They visited a prison. The secretary asked the warden how much was allocated daily for the prisoners. "Six zlotys per prisoner," was the reply. "Make it 25 zlotys," he secretary ordered. The party boss called the secretary aside and whispered to him: "Are you insane? You reduce the care of each child in the orphanage and you raise enormously the sum for each prisoner. Why do you do this?" "I know what I'm doing," the secretary answered, "I'm looking out for our future. And it isn't going to be spent in an orphanage."

America is still growing despite our shortcomings. Next year is the 100th anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's immortal Gettysburg Address recalling to his fellowmen the dignity of their heritage stemming from the American Declaration of Independence. The unfinished tasks of our democracy will be fulfilled as we grow to a greater understanding of the basic rights inherent in our citizenship. These rights have never been absent in our national existence. Were they ever to be lost sight of by Americans, serious harm would befall our way of life. It is good on such civic occasions as these to recall the principles which draw the allegiance and respect of every generation of Americans.

I. THE RIGHT TO BE DIFFERENT

America is essentially a nation of differences, differences of religion and ethnic patterns, differences of sectional thinking as reflected in the Halls of our Congress in Washington, differences in economic views and social views and educational views. Yet it is a remarkable fact that all these differences are harmonized in both war and peace in our land. In war the call to the colors to protect and defend our Nation from external foes brings every stratum of our society into uniform. But the differences in background and culture are not lost even in the military organizations in time of war. I recall my service as chaplain in the U.S. Navy in the Second World War. Both here in this country and in the far reaches of the South Pacific Islands where I was on the staff of the commander of our 7th Fleet, religious services for every religious denomination proceeded apace on the sacred days of worship without let or hindrance. Through them each American boy was enabled to find his own social and religious outlet in company with his own. And in peacetime life of our Nation it would be difficult to match the example of differences of origin and nationality with those say of a Notre Dame football team whose names cover ancestries from many lands of the world.

II. THE RIGHT OF OPPORTUNITY

One of the wonderful gifts which America offers its people is the chance to advance in life. The Horatio Alger society which represents every section of our country is an interesting illustration of the march from rags to riches. Here in this very audience in Staten Island citizens are many examples of people who have climbed the ladder of life from humble beginnings. Your guest of honor today and his family earned their present status not through inheritance but through taking advantage of the American opportunity and working hard to achieve the rewards of honest industry. In contrast to people in other countries, each individual here has the equality of opportunity. Each can make his life what he wishes it to be. The stories of our immigrants are legendary in the unfolding of their accomplishments. A refugee from European tyranny comes to our country only 25 years ago, and in that short span develops a sewing machine industry to fantastic proportions.

A Jew by the name of Albert Einstein, forced to leave the European continent by German intolerance, finds a new home here and gives America the secret of atomic energy. The illustrations can be multiplied indefinitely to cover every walk of life. Few have expressed the quality of American opportunity better than a former President of the United States, Herbert Hoover, who said:

"I have traveled the world over. Every homecoming was for me a reaffirmation of the glory of America.

"Each time my soul was washed away from the relief of grinding poverty of other nations by the greater kindliness and frankness which comes from the acceptance of equality and the wide-open opportunity to all who want a chance. It's more than that. It's a land of self-respect born of free men. I have had every honor to which any man could aspire. There is no place this whole earth except here in America where the sons of man can have their chance in life that has come to him * * * The mention of the word 'America' flows from one perfect source. Within the soul of America is freedom of mind and spirit. They alone are the open windows through which pours the sunlight

of human spirit. Here alone is human dignity, not a dream but an accomplishment. Perhaps it is not perfect. But it is more full of its realization here than in any other place in the world."

III. THE RIGHT TO DIGNITY

The greatest value of American citizenship is its dignity. No matter how great the wealth or power, how comfortable the existence, how successful the enterprise, if a man is not granted his dignity as a human being, as a child of God, he is incomplete and he suffers the status of inferiority of both position in life and citizenship. Our problem with regard to opportunity for the Negro is difficult because we fail to measure it in terms of human dignity. This is why we often lack understanding of what the Negro wants. He is not satisfied solely with opportunity to be on a material footing with his neighbors. Nor is he satisfied with equal but separate facilities for his growing children in the schools. He knows that money cannot buy respect. And he has long realized what the U.S. Supreme Court enunciated so clearly in 1954 that when children are educated under conditions which keep them apart from their neighbors' children they grow up strangers in their own environment. When a member of the Senate of the United States expresses a personal opinion while on a visit to Africa that no black person on the African continent has made progress in terms of Western civilization except under the guidance of Europeans he conveniently overlooks the fact that for over three-quarters of a century when the Belgians ruled over the Congo they never permitted a black person, no matter what his education and intelligence, to hold a higher officer rating than a sergeant in the Congolese Army.

Given the opportunity there is no reason why colored people cannot achieve any status in life comparable to white people. The trouble is that we are often blinded by a priori judgments which render us incapable of granting others the capacities we own. The Negro poet, James Weldon Johnson, in his lines "We to America" challenged us to answer his questions:

"How would you have us? As we are
Or sinking neath the load we bear?
Our eyes forward on a star?
Or gazing empty at despair?

"Rising or falling? Men or things?
With dragging pace? Or footsteps fleet?
Strong, wiling sinews in your wings?
Or tightening chains about your feet?"

The colored people in our country are, in essence, saying to us: For over 300 years we helped to light the fire of American life. All we wish is to be permitted to warm our hands beside that fire.

Here in this audience representing a cross-section of an American community we rehearse the American values as they are demonstrated in the respect we show for the basic rights which distinguish American life and give it such a high position among the peoples of the world—the right to be different, the right of equality of opportunity to make our lives worthy of our years and the right to the dignity of a human being, Jew or Christian, black or white, as a child of God. We have not always shown our capacity to advance these rights. But as citizens we are conscious of their presence or absence in our lives because they are the foundations of our national life. With them democracy flourishes. Without them democracy dies. No matter how far we may be from our goal we have never lost sight of it. As the Attorney General of the United States, Robert Kennedy, has told us:

"It is an unfinished society that we offer the world, a society that is forever committed to change, to improvement and to growth, that will never stagnate in the certitudes of ideologies, or the finalities of dogma. A hundred years from now there will be new ways of making life better or giving man fuller opportunity to fulfill his hopes. We have no infallible party, no infallible creed, no all-purpose blueprint. We do not propose to chain mankind to a system of false logic. We have instead faith in human intelligence, human will and human decency. And we know that in the long run these are the forces which will make history."

## Urban Mass Transportation Act

SPEECH
OF
## HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge that the 88th Congress enact the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963. This day I have introduced legislation providing Federal grants and loans for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems. This measure will authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to provide additional assistance for mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas in the Nation.

It is my firm belief that if our urban areas, both large and small, are to escape strangulation by traffic congestion, the efforts of all levels of government are needed to solve the critical transportation problems now confronting them.

The transportation problems of the urban areas are of true national concern. Seventy percent of the Nation's population live in urban areas and it is here that the highest rate of population growth is occurring. It is evident that because our Nation is predominantly an urban nation, the solution of urban problems is very much a part of the current worldwide race for economic, scientific, and cultural leadership. The strength of our very Nation will be demonstrated in the cities. These core cities of 50,000 or more and their surrounding urban and suburban territory have been the fastest growing sections of the country since the start of the century. Over two-thirds of the population of the Nation today resides in urban areas.

One of the key and unique pressures that faces the city today is the burden of handling a daytime population 30 to 50 percent greater than the residential population. The continuing decline in the use of mass transit facilities is making this task enormously more difficult. Within recent years heavy emphasis has been placed on building or planning freeways to the central cities and by adding to the supply of parking spaces. It strikes me as apparent that a highway program alone will fail to solve the problem of accessibility for many cities as they are constituted today. The question of accessibility has a great deal to do with the decision of the businessman to stay downtown or the decision of the shopper to go there. In fact, the very question of accessibility to the modern city is closely tied to the question of the survival of the central city.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it to be a fact that the movement of the great masses of people into and out of the central city can be accomplished only by a mass rapid transit program. Nationally, it makes little difference what form this transport takes—elevated trains, subways, surface trains, buses, or a combination of any or all of them. What is clear is that the fact of galloping congestion in our urban areas must be met—and with dispatch.

Our highway programs, our urban renewal projects, and all urban planning assistance programs will become more effective with the enactment of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963. Under this act Federal aid will be given to State and local government agencies. They are in the best position to keep abreast of the trends which indicate need for specific transportation facilities and the best ways to meet local problems.

Mr. Speaker, I feel we have come to a point in the development of our Nation at which neither the Federal Government nor the American economy as a whole can afford the expense and damage if metropolitan areas fail in their productive function. Enactment of the Urban Mass Transportation Act will do much to insure the good health of the American city.

## Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, the issue of medical care for the aged financed through the social security system will confront the 88th Congress during the ensuing months.

Undoubtedly, the majority of Members of the U.S. House of Representatives have formed an opinion on the controversial program after much study of the issue.

Likewise, many millions of Americans have strong sentiments, either pro or con, on the proposal offered by the administration.

One of the most thorough and well-documented studies of the entire compulsory health insurance program brought to my attention is a 40-page research paper authored by Mr. John B. Moody, a college preparatory senior student at Waveland High School in Montgomery County, Ind.

This outstanding Indiana student has managed to grasp all facets of the controversy and presents a brilliant study of the dangers and pitfalls in such a program, together with a detailed list of alternatives to the Socialist approach.

It is a privilege to present Mr. Moody's conclusions and general summary, which follow:

MEDICARE SUMMARY BY MR. JOHN B. MOODY

U.S. medicine matches any in the world. With all of our medical advances we can see where we have gotten a rise in the cost of medical care. Our people over 65 have twice as many medical expenses, with two to three times as much chronic illness. Yet, they have less income a year.

Compulsory health insurance is a possible solution, and may be the easiest answer. This would be in the form under social security. It would cause a rise in social security taxes of one-half of 1 percent of the first $5,200. This would cover 14.25 million of the aged. This insurance would cover hospital bills and would leave the other medical expenses to the patient. Under this insurance, we would have 3 million of our aged still not receiving benefits.

Every European country, with the exception of Finland, provides health protection for all its people. But Britain's NHS cost $2,520 million in 1961. To put it another way, they are living in a welfare state which costs them one-half of all taxes, or one-sixth of the nation's output. This is penalizing enterprise and initiative. These countries are truly socialistic, and I think most Americans don't want this type of government in our country.

One thing which is developing very fast is our prepayment medical plans. This can be less expensive with even better medical care. Several plans are being opened to people over 65, which can be a helping factor to them. Voluntary health insurance is growing faster than ever before and covering 135 million Americans. Health insurance plans are now open to all age groups with no physical examination. Our American aged can get complete medical care coverage for about $15 a month. With still other plans, the aged can get coverage for those in the very low-income group.

Doctors fear compulsory health insurance because it will be a form of socialized medicine, and will take the power in providing medical care for Americans away from the doctor. They also fear it will lessen the quality of the world's best medical care. Federal legislation and intervention cannot educate people to practice preventive medicine. Persons with imaginary ills, lining up to receive their "free" Government-prescribed medical care will not result in a healthier nation. Rather, it will make us have a shortage of hospital beds such as happened in Britain and Canada. Doctors have introduced a new health-insurance plan which covers doctors fees and hospital fees for $13 a month, and much more than the administration's plan does. The AMA has urged its physicians to adjust their fees not only in relation to the proposed Blue Shield plan, but also in relation to any proposed health-insurance coverage for people over 65. It is also been a custom of our doctors to treat patients who cannot pay. They take care of these patients just like any others.

The compulsory health-insurance plan has many things wrong with it. It would cost millions in payroll taxes to pay for medical care for a few who do need it and for millions who could be self-reliant. What would keep it from being made to cover all people under social security, such as widows and dependent children? Why stop at the age 65? Why not 50 or 40? Under this plan the road is wide open to socialized medicine.

Doctors are doing all that's possible to provide for the best medical care coverage. Voluntary health-insurance companies have also been working hard to provide low-cost plans with complete coverage. There are several aged who cannot afford even these. For them let's use the Kerr-Mills law, which is now in effect in 38 States and completely under State control.

For many aged they would have to skimp to pay for this insurance. But that is what our country is built upon, free enterprise and freedom. If they can't afford this small amount, the children should help out. If 1 mother can support 12 children, surely 12 children can help support 1 mother. Let's keep our freedom in American medicine; even better, let's keep out freedom in all things. Millions don't want compulsory health insurance for the medical care for our aged, but are they willing to fight against it to save medical freedom and theirs? As Michael B. Petrovish said:

"Most people don't want freedom, or at least find it very painful. A freedom which becomes too easy and ceases to demand loses its value. Freedom is not at all easy. Freedom is difficult."

## Hon. Robert S. Kerr

SPEECH
OF
## HON. WILBUR D. MILLS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the profound shock which came to all of us on learning of the sudden and tragic passing of ROBERT S. KERR cannot be expressed in words. This sad and distressing news reached us as the new year was dawning, but the impact of the tragic event will be felt for years to come.

From the wellsprings of the earth of the Oklahoma frontier a towering oak arose. This giant of the forest was BOB KERR. He arose from humble beginnings to great heights. From the log cabin of the western frontier to the highest councils of State and Nation ROBERT S. KERR blazed a trail of leadership which few have ever matched. In conflict and in peace, on the battlefields of World War I and during the cold war of these last decades, he rendered devoted service to his Nation.

BOB KERR's passing is a profound personal loss to me. He was my close friend. I came to know him quite intimately, particularly so in recent years. I have worked with him on literally hundreds of legislative projects, both large and small. The most recent of these was the Revenue Act of 1962. The extent of his contributions to the public interest cannot be described here today. Who can, in the metes and bounds of a few words, show how this great man labored over the minute details of legislation and refused to face even the possibility of defeat? I can with sincerity and vigor offer my testimony wholeheartedly to all those qualities and characteristics which have been associated with him by those who have spoken before me. Above all, I can testify to his character, his complete dedication and singleness of purpose in accomplishing great objectives, and the enormous capacity for successful leadership which was his.

The tremendous power of his intellect and innate brilliance of mind, combined with his driving energy, his diligence and great strength of character, propelled him to the forefront of every endeavor which he ever undertook. His legislative talents and his enormous capacity for reaching solutions in the public interest—matters to which he had devoted himself especially since coming upon the national legislative scene in 1948—are known to all his colleagues and especially those of us who were privileged to work with him on particular projects of great significance and importance to the Nation.

The loss to the Nation in the passing of BOB KERR can only inadequately be described by those of us who speak today. Historians will, I am confident, accord him a very large place and high stature in the account of these years in the life of our great Nation.

To his family I offer sincere and heartfelt condolences. They can take solace from the abiding knowledge that his life and works contributed great and good gifts to the lasting service of mankind.

## Rules Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, now that the vote has been taken, I take this opportunity to make a brief résumé of and express my deep disappointment in the vote on the House Rules Committee for the millions of Americans who voted for the Republicans in this last congressional election. It is impossible for me to comprehend the principles upon which the majority party has voted, for it was the majority party which usually voices its desire for the right of the minority. Now most of them have voted against giving to the minority in this House equitable representation. The Republican conference on Tuesday, January 8, 1962 adopted a series of three fair play amendments which were presented by the Honorable Mr. FORD.

First. An increase in the size of the House Rules Committee to 15 members based upon numerical apportionment of the House of Representatives, which in the 88th Congress, controlled 3 to 2 by the Democrats would mean a committee of 9 Democrats and 6 Republicans.

Second. An increase in minority staffs of House committees to a total also proportional with overall House minority membership thus giving Republicans 40 percent of committee staffs in contrast to the current overwhelming and unjust control of the staffs of a number of important committees by the majority.

Third. A guarantee of equal time for the minority in debate or consideration of the joint House-Senate conference committee reports on the House floor. The majority party in the House now has the power to completely dominate time in this regard and has in the past abused

this power. The amendment did not ask for 48 percent, but just 40 percent based on the actual number of Republicans in the House and they have now denied our request and given us the unjust 33 percent. The fact remains now that the Rules Committee will be nothing more than an open door for the liberals in the National Capital without proper representation for the millions of American people who voted for the Republican congressional Members. The theory that without the enlargement of the Rules Committee the majority would be unable to obtain their wishes in the House is a fact unfounded since everyone knows that by the use of the discharge petition, a simple majority of the House can bring a bill to the floor.

## Remarks by B. M. McKelway, Citizens' Crime Commission Dinner, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D.C., December 10, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, in the past year I have been fighting for the passage of legislation necessary to correct the ever-increasing crime in the District of Columbia. This matter is well known to every Member of Congress.

I am inserting herewith, a speech made by Mr. B. M. McKelway at the Citizens' Crime Commission dinner on December 10, 1962.

The statements contained in this speech need no elaboration by me but it certainly lends impetus to the necessity for immediate action by the Congress and hope that it will help speed necessary and far-reaching legislation.

No one knows better than I, that we do not stop this ever increasing wave of crime by merely enacting legislation to punish lawbreakers and that other steps must be taken to cure the cause, and create a decent atmosphere in which law-abiding citizens can live without fear. But until such time, legislation to punish the evildoers is vitally necessary and Mr. McKelway's speech points up without a doubt the urgency:

I am not a spokesman for the public. I am here merely as a humble member of at least that portion of the Washington public which is becoming conscious of the frightening loss of certain rights hitherto regarded as unalienable—the right to walk in safety on the public streets of this city and the right to security in our homes or places of business.

These rights are being constantly violated in Washington. And one of the most insidious dangers accompanying the loss of these rights is that the loss may become taken for granted as inevitable, and regarded merely as the symptom of the diseases of poverty, ignorance, and environment.

It may be true that alarming forms of singularly depraved, vicious and even sadistic crimes against the public are merely the symptom of a disease that afflicts our urban society. It may be true that it is more important to attack the disease than to become too much concerned with the symptoms.

But if this philosophy becomes widely accepted; if the commission of vicious crime against innocent people is rationalized and even condoned as merely the symptom of a disease, and that it is futile to attack the symptom as long as the disease remains, we face yet another danger, for the symptom may become more fatal to our society than the disease diagnosed as producing it.

In fighting disease, the medical profession does not fail to treat the symptoms with all available knowledge and vigor merely because the prevention or cure of the disease is yet to be discovered.

But in crime we are sometimes advised to take the opposite course. We are told, in connection with some outrageous crime, that its commission is not really the fault of the criminal but the fault of society, or of the community. I doubt the wisdom of this generalization, or that it is supported by the truth. It is a negative and self-defeating approach to the problem of violent crime. It implies a readiness to condone crime as long as others among the numerous ills that beset mankind remain unremedied.

The logical fruit of this tacit condonation of crime is acceptance of the idea that crime is the unavoidable product of conditions for which the criminal is not responsible. That idea encourages crime, by persuading those inclined to commit crime that they are, in effect, blameless, having been forced by society to go out on the streets and rob or maim the first person who comes along.

At any rate, the doctrine of public responsibility for violent and unprovoked crime produces an interesting anomaly.

We are members of a society which has seen fit to compensate the victims of destitution and unemployment; to lighten, by provision of cash, the burdens of the blind and unemployable; to recompense the worker who through no fault of his employer is injured on the job; to pay the disabled veteran for his sacrifice; to reimburse the farmer who sticks to assigned allotments and refrains from planting more than his Government tells him to plant. We spend substantial sums (as Mr. Clemmer has indicated) in attempts to rehabilitate criminals and return them to normal life. Much of the time of our civil courts is occupied in fixing damages due to the victims of mishaps, in which provable negligence by somebody else has played a part.

The really forgotten men and women of this same society are those innocent and law-abiding citizens who, through no fault of their own, are robbed, raped, beaten, or murdered in cold blood on the streets, in their homes—or even in church. If they survive, sometimes carrying their injuries to the grave, they must get along as best they can. If financially able to do so they must pay the hospital expense for treatment of their injuries. After brief notice in the press of what happened to them, they drop from public notice and are forgotten.

But if the community, rather than the criminal, is held responsibe for their misfortune, should not the community be held financially liable for its negligence?

The question is rhetorical. Yet the discrimination against victims of unprovoked attack is a realistic condition. The existence of this condition is leading to a growing belief, by laymen as well as able lawyers and judges, that something seems to have gone awry in adjusting the delicate balance of justice, and that a growing preoccupation with the rights of the criminal has been accompanied by a growing neglect of the rights of the public.

Now I suppose that at this point I should offer the trite observation that the rights of the criminal are rights that also extend to decent, law-abiding citizens, and that to ignore the rights of the criminal is to endanger as well the rights of decent citizens.

The observation is true and I do not debate it.

It may also be necessary to remind ourselves that this question of balancing the rights of the accused as against the rights of the public has been under debate for at least 2 centuries by able and conscientious judges, all of them searching for the truth that must support the administration of even-handed justice.

It is dangerous for a layman to trespass too far into these sacred precincts reserved for learned men of the law, such as our able U.S. attorney.

But while laymen may be incompetent to join in discussion of those philosophical and legal concepts and principles which are the root of this continuing debate over the balancing of rights, some of the immediate conclusions reached by judicial majorities in the District of Columbia should be challenged by the laymen who must live with those conclusions. One of those conclusions appears to be, to use an old expression, that we should punish the constable for what some judges may regard as the constable's misconduct in the investigation of crime, leaving the misconduct of the criminal as a secondary consideration.

It is high time that more laymen got down to cases on what is taking place here in the District of Columbia, and indignantly echo the classic pronouncement of Mr. Bumble that "if the law supposes that, the law is an ass, an idiot."

We find our upright judges hopelessly split among themselves. They stop at the edge of name calling. But some of them accuse their brethren of such grave offenses as striking "a grievous blow at the administration of criminal justice"; of rendering futile, by their decisions, the rights of society to protect itself; of going beyond what the Supreme Court or the statutes have ever meant or said, and of writing new law to conform to their personal predilections.

If this acrimonious dispute between our highly placed judges were merely academic, if the judges were only indulging in some rarefied form of intellectual recreation such as trying to decide which ought to have come first, the hen or the egg, the public could go happily about its own business and leave the judges to stew in a juice of their own making.

But the dispute is not academic. It involves hard realities affecting law enforcement. An indirect, or perhaps a direct result, is that one of the cleanest police departments in the country finds itself on the defensive.

It is condemned by implication as practicing methods associated with the inquisition, of persecuting citizens on whimsical suspicion, of deliberately trampling on the individual rights of defenseless people.

Is it any wonder that there is thus created a public psychology, or state of mind, which regards the Metropolitan Police Department as public enemy No. 1, rather than as the thin blue line of courageous men who stand between the public and the depredations of vicious desperadoes?

The confusion of the police under conflicting opinions as to what constitutes legal and illegal procedure is shared to a lesser if more sophisticated extent by some of the trial judges and the prosecutors. If you doubt that, ask them. The precise location of the line dividing legal and illegal investigation of crime seems not to depend, as it should, upon the circumstances in each par-

ticular case, but upon the identity of the judges assigned to survey it.

This unhappy condition is not conducive to good law enforcement at a time when failure or inability to enforce the law has become an intolerable menace to public safety. Nor is it conducive to respect for the courts, an element that is essential in an orderly society.

Some of the confusion stems from broadened interpretations of a rule of evidence or procedure in the Federal courts—rule 5(a). It was recommended to the Supreme Court by an advisory committee some 16 years ago and approved by Congress.

The need for its clarification became evident several years ago and an attempt to amend the rule in Congress failed—not because the votes were lacking to amend it. The votes were there. A lone Senator's threat to filibuster, in the closing hours of a Congress ready to adjourn, prevented completion of congressional action.

The Citizens' Crime Commission should take the lead in mustering community support for two undertakings in the next Congress.

One is to amend rule 5(a), to clarify its intent and its meaning. Mr. Acheson may be against this. He may be right. But rule 5(a) has been interpreted by the courts to an extent that was never contemplated by those who drafted it.

Whatever the remedy for existing conditions—we need the accommodation that Mr. Acheson so correctly says is needed.

The other is to be sure that when the Horsky committee recommendations to abolish the practice of arrest for investigation are adopted, the abolition of the practice be accompanied by more precise laws or regulations, spelling out the valid procedures available to police investigation of crime.

Attainment of these objectives is desirable, even if there is no guarantee that any substantial decrease in crime would quickly follow.

But something else seems to be needed, which, if supplied, might reduce crime. The overwhelming majority of citizens of Washington are law abiding. They are frightened and dismayed by ugly crime. They share a common danger. What seems to be lacking is a spirit that will bind this majority together as a whole; a spirit which finds us all united in awareness of the fact that this is our community, and that beset as it may be by various forms of distress, including the rancor of old grievances and injustice, it is still our community and our community is now threatened by anarchy that finds expression in violent crime.

If that spirit is lacking, if we must delay a greatly needed, all-out war on crime until we can perfect a society that is agreeable to everybody, we are sunk.

---

## West Virginians Gather for Emancipation Proclamation Centennial Anniversary Banquet in Charleston—Governor Barron, Other Leaders Speak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the citizens of West Virginia have long been justly proud of their State's record in the area of civil rights and human relations. Our aims have ever been to recognize the worth and dignity of the individual and toward securing for one and all equal rights and responsibilities under the law.

In keeping with these traditions, a banquet was held at the First Baptist Church, of Charleston, W. Va., on Friday, January 4, 1963, as a part of the yearlong observances of the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation. A large and distinguished audience gathered for this meaningful program. West Virginia's Governor, the Honorable William Wallace Barron, spoke of the State's commendable record in school desegregation and equal employment opportunity.

Also speaking to those assembled were former Governor Cecil H. Underwood, and the executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Roy Wilkins. The latter told of legislative goals and stressed national problems.

Instrumental in the success of this observance was Rev. C. Anderson Davis, chairman of the West Virginia Emancipation Proclamation Committee. Dr. Davis and his coworkers are to be commended for their energetic efforts in bringing about this memorable evening.

Mr. President, originally scheduled to take part, I was necessarily absent due to the passing of our late colleague, the Honorable Robert S. Kerr, at whose funeral I served as a member of the official Senate delegation.

I ask unanimous consent that an article appearing in the Charleston Gazette of January 5, reporting on the Emancipation Proclamation Centennial anniversary banquet be printed in the Appendix, along with excerpts from my own message prepared for delivery on that occasion.

There being no objection, the article and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette, Jan. 5, 1963]

IN RACE RELATIONS: BARRON CITES STATE HARMONY

Governor Barron said Friday that "West Virginia is a prime example of the harmony that can be achieved" when race relations are handled in an atmosphere of mutual trust.

Speaking in Charleston, Barron said the State firmly believes in the principle that "all men are born free and each is deserving in his own right of an opportunity equal to that of any other person."

Barron spoke at a dinner in the First Baptist Church which was held as part of observances of the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation.

Other speakers were Roy Wilkins, executive secretary for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and former Governor Cecil Underwood.

Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, originally scheduled to appear, was unable to attend because he was a member of a Senate delegation at the funeral of Senator Robert Kerr in Oklahoma. Excerpts from his prepared text were read.

Barron said the State is particularly proud of "our fine record in the desegregation of schools," and that the total number of Negroes working in State government probably is at an all time high.

In his prepared remarks, Senator RANDOLPH said the future task of emancipation is extending the scope of freedom to white as well as Negro Americans.

"For when the American Negro has full equality of education—when color no longer bars him from equal opportunity and when he becomes a full participant in the American community—then also will all Americans be emancipated from the foreboding, fear, anxiety and misundertanging which yet block the fuller realization of the American dream," RANDOLPH said.

---

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT, OF WEST VIRGINIA, PREPARED FOR THE EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY, FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH, CHARLESTON, W. VA., JANUARY 4, 1963

Reverend Davis, members of the Emancipation Proclamation Committee, and ladies and gentlemen, perhaps no other action in the history of the American Presidency serves better to illuminate the nature of American history itself, than does the Emancipation Proclamation.

For this action, which President Lincoln exercised as a "military necessity" to save the Union, has in the balance of history become his greatest claim on the affections and respect of his countrymen. And in the eyes of much of the world, President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation outshines the original justification of preserving the Union itself.

Lincoln's first and last concern was to save the Union. As he wrote to Horace Greeley shortly before the publication of the preliminary proclamation in September, 1862, "If I could save the Union without freeing any slave, I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing all the slaves, I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone, I would also do that."

The Emancipation Proclamation of 1863 took the last of these three alternatives. It limited its application only to the secession States and expressly excluding from its provisions those "48 counties designed as West Virginia," as well as other sections of Virginia held by Union forces.

However, it detracts neither from the significance of the Emancipation Proclamation nor from the greatness of Lincoln to acknowledge that in its inception the Proclamation was issued on the grounds of political and military expediency. For this covenant was committed to ideals and values of the English-speaking world which were much older than the conflict between the North and the South—ideals which achieved their most noble expression in the American Declaration of Independence.

The Proclamation was a successful measure of expediency because it reached into enduring and ultimate values which extended beyond the civil strife of the Nation at that time. For, though active abolitionists were in a minority even in the Northern States, probably no adult or civilized person in any section of the country was entirely free from guilt concerning the enforced bondage of his fellowman. Jefferson, perhaps saw more truly than Lincoln in this respect, when he questioned, "Can the liberties of a nation be thought secure when we have removed their only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of people that these liberties are of the gift of God? That they are not to be violated but with His wrath? Indeed I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just; this His justice cannot sleep forever * * *."

The Proclamation thus succeeded in its aim because it turned again the soil of liberty which had been cultivated in the Anglo-American world since the Magna Carta. It provided—for adherents to the Union—a moral cause deeper than that of State pride or regional loyalties or even preservation of the Union itself.

Ralph Waldo Emerson, the leading philosopher of that day, spoke for this cause when he wrote, regarding the proclamation, that

"The force of the act is that it commits the country to justice, that it compels the innumerable officers, civil, military, naval, of the Republic to range themselves on the line of this equity * * *. The first condition of success is secured in putting ourselves right. We have recovered ourselves from our false position and planted ourselves on a law of nature."

Thus, Lincoln, who campaigned for the Presidency largely on the issue of preventing the spread of slavery to the new States and territories, became the agent for a force greater than himself in the act of abolishing slavery from the established States.

Jefferson spoke of this force as a "gift of God," Emerson, as a "law of nature," and Justice Learned Hand, as the "spirit of liberty." But by whatever name we call it, whatever the theological or philosophic foundation we ascribe to it, it is this thrust that has given direction and meaning to American life for more than three centuries.

And it is this spirit of liberty—dedicated to the unfinished task of emancipation—that gives meaning to our gathering here. In this regard, we do not celebrate—we commemorate the centennial anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation. We commemorate Lincoln's action by rededicating ourselves to the goal of emancipation—emancipation of all Americans—not only those of color—in body, mind and spirit.

The enforcement of the original Proclamation not only freed the slave from physical bondage. It also freed the master from the bondage of his own despotism. Very often he did not realize his transgression.

Thus, the future task of emancipation is further to extend the scope of freedom for white as well as Negro Americans. For when the American Negro has full equality of education, when color no longer bars him from equal employment, and when he becomes a full participant in the American community, then also will all Americans be emancipated from the forebodings, fear, anxiety and misunderstanding which yet block the fuller realization of the American dream.

Our progress during the 100 years has been stumbling and faltering. But progress there has been; and it is safe to say that no other race has equaled the advancements of the American Negro in the past 50 years. And if a clear view of history reveals to us certain facts, it also provides us with the vision of an ideal which illuminates the way and will help us to achieve a better and brighter future for all Americans.

## Farm Bureau Policy for 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, as the U.S. Representative of the 18th District of Illinois, which includes a large rural population, I am naturally interested in the Farm Bureau which is very active in my district.

Listed below is the official text of the Farm Bureau's policy for 1963 on rural electrification and telephones as adopted by the delegates at their 44th annual meeting in Atlanta in December.

I have studied carefully all of the Farm Bureau resolutions adopted at that meeting, but due to many disturbing developments which have been brought out in the hearings before the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee on which I serve, I made particular note of their REA policy.

In view of the interest that was focused upon this problem during the last session by the Members of the House on both sides of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the following statement will be keenly scrutinized by my colleagues.

The text follows:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND TELEPHONES

We support rural electric and telephone cooperatives organized and operated in accordance with accepted cooperative principles and practices. Further development and growth of these cooperatives call for the active and loyal support of member patrons who understand their responsibilities for supporting and helping finance them. Local ownership by well informed members is the best safeguard for true cooperative principles.

It is time to make certain that the members of rural electric cooperatives can obtain full and complete member ownership and control. Ownership and control should be clearly secured in the hands of the patrons. We recommend that member equities be made transferable to eligible persons on the books of the cooperative at any time.

We urge members of rural electric cooperatives to study the bylaws of their associations and to make certain that they contain provisions that make it mandatory to (1) allocate annually the equities of individual members and inform each member of the amount in his equity account and (2) require approval by a majority of patrons before the principle assets and business of the cooperative can be sold.

Power shortages and inadequate grids or transmission lines continue to be a major problem in supplying adequate power to farmers in some areas. We support sound and economic developments to assure farm people adequate electric service.

We urge power companies to expand their facilities to meet the increasing demand of farm people at reasonable cost. We urge efforts on the part of the rural electric cooperatives and other private power companies to reach agreements that will be in the best long-time interest of all concerned.

If satisfactory agreements cannot be reached for necessary amounts of energy for farm use at competitive rates, we support the use of Rural Electrification Administration funds to finance the generation and transmission facilities farmers need. We oppose any efforts to change the present law which makes this possible.

Where further expansion or improvement of power production is contemplated, serious consideration should be given to the possibility of seeking funds for the program on an investment basis from members of the cooperatives. If revisions in legislation or regulations are needed in order to permit such procedures, we will support the necessary changes.

Rural electric cooperatives have performed a valuable service for rural America, but many factors affecting their operations have changed materially since Congress authorized their establishment. Any future loans made by the Rural Electrification Administration to established rural electric or telephone cooperatives and other borrowers should be made at not less than the cost of money to the Federal Government.

We oppose any plan or effort to convert rural electric cooperatives into a public power system.

Rural electric cooperatives should not participate in financing the rural areas development program. We recommend that they confine their activities to the purposes for which they were organized.

## Let's Balance the Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, Webster says a pendulum is a device used to regulate the machinery of clockwork and other machinery. There are times when adjustments become necessary.

For many years the labor-management pendulum was swinging too far in one direction. Adjustments were made and the machinery appeared to be operating reasonably well.

Gradually and imperceptably, foreign matter accumulated, causing that same machinery to malfunction to a greater degree than it had previously. The newspaper and longshoremen strikes furnish ample evidence to support that statement.

The President of the United States has been defied. Irresponsible action is threatening our entire economy, including our national defense. The machinery of collective bargaining is threatened. The public welfare is completely ignored by certain leaders. The patience of the public is wearing extremely thin.

Repercussions of the strikes are being felt in the 19th District of Pennsylvania. This has been attested to by communications from district residents, in the past few days. Some means must be found to again regulate that pendulum so that it may again swing in the interest of the masses rather than for a few irresponsible leaders.

The following editorial from the January 6 edition of the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot expresses similar concern:

WE NEED A BALANCING ACT

By warning that the dock strike "is bound to have an effect on the future of collective bargaining," Labor Secretary Wirtz has lent weight to reports that President Kennedy, angered by the flat union rebuff to his personal plea to head off that strike, is considering some form of antistrike legislation.

But even before the President became disturbed about this, it was apparent that the new Congress would be considering legislation to curb what some Members believe to be excessive union powers that are against the national interest.

One reason is that the years ahead promise to be extremely difficult ones in labor-management relations. The resulting strikes could have wide national impact, like the current dock strike.

Currently, Lockheed workers are under a Taft-Hartley injunction that will keep them on their jobs until sometime in March. A strike after that, which is not unlikely, would stall vital defense production. Then there's the danger of a crippling nationwide railroad strike over the featherbed issue, a dispute that almost has exhausted legal appeals.

Whatever the administration finally does, Senator MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, already has said he'll resubmit a bill to put unions in the transportation industry under the same restrictions as the antitrust legislation for business.

"There is too much unrestrained and uncontrolled power vested in the transportation unions across the country," he claims.

This ability of a single union to close down an entire industry, or cripple all the ports and transportation facilities of the country, concerns many Americans these days. It's time for Congress to consider again where labor's power has gone beyond the bounds of reason and what can be done to curb the excesses.

Whether the answer is some form of antitrust law against labor monopolies or legislation giving the Government broader power to intervene in major labor-management disputes, or something else, it won't come easily in the 88th Congress. All of the passions and pressures on both sides will be brought into play. They always are when labor legislation is considered.

But there's one important reason why the issue should not be put off. A grave imbalance in labor-management strength can harm the entire Nation.

That was true earlier in this century when management's power was so lopsided that workers didn't have a chance to make their weight felt on such subjects as wages and working conditions. But business has no monopoly on the ability to grow ever larger. Unions today no longer are underdogs. They are every bit as widespread and powerful as the industries with which they negotiate. And the relative freedom from Government controls makes many of them even stronger. Unchecked, this union power can prove as bad for the country as the excesses of management decades ago. In some instances, it already has reached that stage.

There is a third force to be considered today—the public interest—when it comes to labor negotiations in defense industries, in transportation, in any field where long, nationwide strikes can cause serious inconvenience.

Congress has a responsibility to make sure that this interest is protected, whether the threat comes from the excesses of business or of labor.

## The President and Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a reader's letter which appeared in the January 8, 1963, edition of the Baltimore Sun. This well-thought-out letter is one of the best statements I have seen regarding the attempt of the administration to take over the rights and prerogatives of the Congress:

PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS

SIR: How much do we, the American people, expect of a President? As he is head of the executive department of the Government we hold him responsible for the management of all the branches of the Government except the legislative and judiciary. This would seem enough for one man to be responsible for. But our Presidents are not satisfied with this, they put pressure on our legislators in Congress to bow to their wills and legislate as they, the Presidents, want them to.

Members of Congress have always welcomed the opinions and suggestions of Presidents. Almost as soon as Congress convenes the so-called President's message is presented.

Formerly the Presidents merely sent their messages which were read to Congress by clerks. Now the President appears in person and tries to impress his wishes on Congress by force of argument and by his eloquence and personal appeal. There is nothing wrong in this, even though it represents a change from what used to be.

However, Presidents no longer limit their attempts to influence Congress by eloquence and argument. Members or the executive branch of the Government, the President's political family, spend much time on Capitol Hill subjecting our legislators to many types of pressure. An example of this is the fight now being waged by President Kennedy to change the number of members on the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives.

The number of members on this committee which will give this country the best service may be 12 or 15 or even 10 or 20, but this is something for the Members of the House of Representatives to decide for themselves. It is their decision to make.

Except for Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung, President Kennedy has control over the lives and happiness of more millions of people than any man living today. In view of this it seems only right for him to permit the Members of the House of Representatives to decide for themselves the number of their Members who should be on a committee which is theirs, not one appointed by the President.

The American people did not elect President Kennedy head of the legislative branch of their Government. To limit his activities to running the executive branch is something the American people have a right to expect of a President.

LEO BRADY.

BALTIMORE, *January 6.*

## Future of the ROTC Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DURWARD G. HALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks it has become evident that a move is underway in the Department of Defense to reorganize the ROTC program in our Nation's high schools and colleges. Although the details of the plan have not yet been made public, the effect of previous reorganized plans such as the one involving the Nation's National Guard forces causes one to be uneasy about the possibility that this program will be scuttled for all intents and purposes. Many high schools of the Seventh Congressional District of Missouri which I am privileged to represent have felt the ROTC program a vital force for good citizenship. I call the attention of the House to the following editorials from the Carthage Missouri Press:

A FORCE FOR GOOD CITIZENSHIP

Pentagon plans to eliminate the high school ROTC program are a step in the wrong direction.

The program in the Carthage schools, consistently one of the finest in the Nation, has proved highly beneficial not only to the young men who participate but to the schools, the community, and the Nation's Armed Forces.

Graduates of the Carthage ROTC program repeatedly have indicated the experience stands them in good stead when they formally enter the armed services. It provides them with the basic essentials of military organization, respect for authority, and ability to understand and obey military orders. This in itself is a matter of extreme importance to the maintenance of an adequate protective force for the Nation at all times.

It also provides these young men with a definite sense of involvement in the affairs of their Nation at an age when they otherwise might be devoting their energies and thoughts to the escapades of the black-jacket, motorcycle set.

It is a force within the community for good citizenship and this in itself is reason enough to continue it.

The ROTC program here has proved its worth. The results are evident on all sides.

The Press firmly opposes any attempt to eliminate this valuable program and urges all citizens join in a loud protest.

You can help by writing your expression of opposition to the Pentagon proposals to Congressman DURWARD G. HALL, Senator STUART SYMINGTON, and Senator EDWARD LONG.

Early action is desirable. Otherwise we might lose, never to regain, one of our most significant community and national assets.

CARTHAGE SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS OPPOSE POSSIBLE ROTC ELIMINATION

A Defense Department proposal to drastically revise and cut back the Reserve Officers Training Corps program in colleges and high schools was met by strong opposition today from Carthage Senior High School administrators.

Carthage is one of the smallest high schools in the Nation to support an ROTC program.

"We'd hate very much to lose the ROTC program," Supt. Lester Gillman said today. "It is an important part of our school, both in the curricular schedule and extracurricular activities.

"The training offered is beneficial to boys. Many of our graduates who have gone into college ROTC or into service have told us it has been very helpful."

Edward L. Rogers, Carthage Senior High principal, voiced Gillman's sentiments. "It's a fine program and the association of the school with the ROTC personnel has been of great benefit. I'm strongly in favor of ROTC and hope it will be retained."

Defense officials said the revised program will eliminate all high school ROTC programs, compulsory ROTC programs in all land-grant colleges, and reduce the 4-year courses in most colleges and universities to 2 years.

There are 183 boys enrolled at present in ROTC at Carthage Senior High. One-half credit toward graduation requirements are offered each of the first 2 years of the program and a full credit for the final year.

## Railroads Need Help—Diversification Would Be Welcome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the President called to the attention of the 87th Congress the "chaotic patchwork of in-

consistent and often obsolete legislation" which has become the framework of this Nation's transportation policy. His April 5, 1962, transportation message made the flat statement that this patchwork policy "does not fully reflect either the dramatic changes in technology of the past half century or the parallel changes in the structure of competition."

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House, and the appropriate committee of the other body, conducted extensive hearings in the last Congress on the recommendations made in this important domestic legislative message. They gave particular attention to proposed deregulation of certain minimum freight and passenger rates. Undoubtedly there will be further hearings in the current session of the 88th Congress. I am confident, too, that this new Congress will act once its committees have finished their work and brought transportation legislation to the floor.

Yet there is an anachronism in U.S. transportation today, Mr. Speaker, which rivals or surpasses the most threadbare of the statutory patches to which Mr. Kennedy directly referred. Since hearings in 1960 before the House Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics, Congress has heard relatively little about it. In short, it is this:

The American railroad industry, recognized by all of us as both economically vital and economically ailing, is being forbidden by the fears of a past era the tools it needs to build a healthy future.

When every signpost in transportation points toward freer flow of traffic by whatever transport mode is most economic and offers best service, U.S. railroads remain pinned down by Federal regulatory restrictions that sprang from the 19th century of transportation.

An unmistakable promise of future rejuvenation lies in a railroad's ability to offer a shipper the transportation service which best fits his needs and his budget, whether it be by rail, truck, ship, or aircraft. Yet under existing Federal regulation the railroad is barred from acquiring the surface facilities—by road or water—it would require to offer the service of a true transportation system to its customer.

Current public policy on single ownership of multiple transportation modes stems from the Interstate Commerce Commission Act and the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. In effect, this policy today bars a railroad from acquiring other forms of surface transportation without severe restrictions, while leaving all other surface transport modes free to diversify as they choose.

It is significant to note in passing, Mr. Speaker, that none of the statutes involved contains language specifically prohibiting transportation diversification as such. The rules which now operate to deny railroads equal opportunity among surface modes to own and operate other forms of transportation largely are interpretations of the statutes by the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the courts.

Thus it can be said that even with so fundamental a question of national transportation policy, the answer has been supplied more by the judiciary and by the Congress' independent agencies than by the Congress itself.

In virtually all of existing and prior statutes and in the history of their application, the single dominant theme has been the real or imagined fear of railroad monopoly. This fear was the cumulative result of the explosive 19th century growth of America's railroads, of the trustbusting of the early 1900's, of the industry's relatively giant proportions in the early 20th century, and of the childlike strengths of the motor, water, and air carriers as new legislation sought to nurture their early development in the 1920's and 1930's.

But this is 1963.

In 1926, railroads carried more than four-fifths of all ticketed intercity passengers. The rail share of intercity freight tonnage exceeded 75 percent.

Today, best estimates place railroads' share of ticketed intercity passenger traffic at 26.4 percent for 1961, the last full year statistically available. Rail freight for 1961 is estimated at 43.4 percent of the total. This means, Mr. Speaker, that the railroad share of the passenger and freight markets has shrunk from three-quarters and more to well under one-half.

On a year-by-year basis, World War II distorted the picture of relative strengths of various modes in the U.S. transport market. But the trend of postwar years is quite plain. In 1947, railroads accounted for 58.5 percent of all U.S. intercity passenger service, but in 1961 it could claim only the estimated 26.4 percent share of this market. Similarly, railroads' 1947 portion of the intercity freight business—excluding coastwise and intercoastal traffic—was 65.3 percent, but in 1961 this had shrunk to the estimated 43.4-percent figure.

Throughout this period of dwindling railroad strength in the transportation market, competing modes which had been the infant enterprises of the 1920's and 1930's were showing sometimes phenomenal growth. In terms of relative share of the intercity ticketed passenger market, airlines were exploding from an insignificant 7.8 percent in 1947 to a full 45 percent in 1961. In intercity freight traffic, trucking grew from a 10-percent share of the 1947 market to an estimated 23 percent of the 1961 market. Inland water carriers' share of this traffic nearly trebled, and pipelines' share nearly doubled.

Among all forms of passenger transportation, of course, the private automobile remained the unchallenged favorite. It has carried upwards of 90 percent of all intercity passengers for the past three decades, and was second only to the commercial airliner in rate of postwar growth as an intercity carrier.

Looking over this picture, the so-called Doyle report—a special transportation study reported to the Senate Commerce Committee early in the last Congress and one of the most comprehensive available surveys of the modern transportation scene—concluded:

> It is clear that the era of the railroad as a dominant monopolistic industry in transportation has long since ended, and that most of the growth of passenger traffic has gone to the private automobile and of freight traffic to other surface carriers.

Mr. Speaker, the statistics which paint this picture of a railroad industry sliding steadily back down the competitive hill are vivid ones. Certainly they should lay at rest any lingering fears of a 20th century railroad monopoly in transportation in the sixties—possibly the one most compelling reason for action to ease the restrictions on some sort of railroad diversification.

The common carrier, backbone of America's concept of Government-regulated but privately owned transportation, is losing out to the private carrier. Industry after industry has turned away from the common carrier because it cannot offer the service the shipper believes he must have to meet his own precise needs. So he contracts privately with a for-hire carrier, or he buys wheels and does his own transportation job.

Evidence of the trend is unmistakable and rarely contested. The Doyle report predicted that by 1975, regulated carriers will represent barely more than 60 percent of all transportation. If the report's projection of postwar private carriage growth proves accurate, "a rapid deterioration of regulated carriage could be expected under the competition of unregulated carriage."

The report said:

> The base of our transportation of freight in the last quarter of the century may be expected to be unregulated private and exempt carriers rather than public carriers if present trends continue.

The report also noted:

> The impact on the railroads as the principal public carrier is much more serious than on public carriage as a whole.

Even after making allowances for short-term factors it said:

> The recent 5-year trend of railroad freight appears to offer substantial cause for alarm.

Under any such long-term decline in public carriage as is forecast, "it is entirely unlikely that private ownership of public carriers could survive," the Doyle report concluded.

I should like to point out here, Mr. Speaker, that impending dominance by private carriage is much more than a vague exercise in transportation academics for me and for every one of my colleagues in this Chamber. When public carriage declines, the big shipper shifts to private contract carriage—or decides to haul his own goods—with relative ease.

But the small shipper often cannot afford this. As public carriers are forced to retrench, the service they can offer the small shipper steadily deteriorates—in convenience and quality as well as in frequency. As do-it-yourself carriage siphons off more and more of the most profitable traffic, the public carrier is forced to charge more for hauling the remainder. Thus it is the small shipper who in turn is forced to pay a higher transportation bill.

How is this fundamental problem to be solved? Certainly not just through tug-

ging and hauling within the transportation industry to see how common carriers are to divide a steadily decreasing share of total traffic among themselves. Rather we must help common carriers find means to retain existing traffic, and to win back business they have lost.

Joint services and rates among the various transport modes has been put forward as one answer. Yet these are of little interest to the private shipper who has purchased barges or trucks or airplanes to handle his own transportation requirements. Private shippers will turn to common carriers only when they are assured of getting the kind of coordinated transportation service they want for less—or at least no more—than the cost of providing it themselves.

The only real answer is to permit the establishment of true transportation companies that can perform service by a variety of modes or combination of modes. And for conclusive evidence of this, need we look any further than at the mushrooming growth in recent years of piggyback service that carries truck trailers by rail or water between their doorstep pickups and deliveries?

The twists and turns which our so-called national transportation policy has taken in fashioning today's chaotic patchwork sometimes is wondrous to behold. With few exceptions—where grandfather clauses have permitted already established, rail-owned trucking companies to continue their operations—our rail carriers are handcuffed in turning to the truck as an alternative transportation vehicle. In general, the railroad today can truck its freight only in supplementing its regular rail service. It is sharply limited to certain key points along its routes, and must truck only freight that was originated with or is destined for rail haul.

Yet, in literally hundreds of these very key points, Mr. Speaker, public tax and transportation policies create this remarkable distortion: The independent trucking company, with no roadbed to build or maintain, pays the key point's municipal government nothing for the highway rights-of-way its trucks roll on, and nothing for the police and fire protection they receive. It pays little or no property taxes; the shippers own and pay local taxes on most of its loading and unloading facilities. And the trucking company thrives.

The railroad, however, pays often excessive property taxes on roadbeds, tracks, yards, and terminals—facilities which it financed entirely with its own private funds. In hundreds of smaller U.S. communities, the railroad is the town or city's largest single taxpayer, and has been for years. Its unenviable tax position, it should be noted here, prompted the Doyle report authors to recommend exemption of common carrier rights-of-way from property taxes—a plan which, whatever its merits, certainly reflects a basic tax problem. And in addition to contending with this, the railroad finds the Federal Government effectively limiting its trucking operations to a virtual neighborhood delivery service, and meanwhile the railroad flounders.

Can even a rich and prosperous Uncle Sam afford to impose on its transportation system so wasteful a handicap? We need look no further than our northern neighbor, Mr. Speaker, so see the benefits of diversification. Both the Government-owned Canadian National Railways and the privately owned Canadian Pacific have been permitted to broaden their transportation services, and both own and operate airliners, ships, and trucks. And when rail revenues sagged so badly in 1960 throughout North America as well as in the United States, Canadian railroads were that much better prepared to adapt to the changing revenue picture and to fit their services to it.

I do not advocate for the present or immediate future any mergers, consolidations, common stock ownerships, or mutual affiliations of railroads and airlines. I peer into the dim periods ahead. If it be for the well-being of airlines and railroads to come together and the public welfare be served and public transportation be bettered and cheapened, then so be it. I emphasize that I do not speak of the present. Railroads are in difficulties and many airlines are not without trouble. Numbers of them seek and have sought surcease of their difficulties by mergers. United absorbed Capital Airlines, American seeks to merge with Eastern Airlines, Colonial was swallowed by Northeastern, Pan American would unite with TWA. I doubt whether marriages of railroads and airlines at present would be successful. The frustrations and embarrassments of both do not and cannot be blended together happily. Two plus two cannot make five. In other words, presently such marriage would be disastrous and end in tragic divorce.

However, whether it be diversification rights, an end to tax inequities or relaxed rate regulation, the record shows that American railroads have asked us not for favored treatment but for fair and equal treatment.

They seek equal rights with their competitors to quote rates that will win them business.

They seek equal tax treatment with other property owners and other forms of transportation so they may be in a financial position to quote more competitive rates.

And they ask elimination of artificial diversification barriers not to invade competitive modes purely for the sake of expansion; rather they seek equal opportunity to offer a varied transportation service which always would be required to meet the basic statutory test of public convenience and necessity.

They seek, Mr. Speaker, equal opportunity to render better service at lower cost to the shipper.

## Fairplay in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we considered a basic change in the permanent rules under which the House of Representatives will function in the future. Our decision is an indication of the attitude with which the House will approach the tasks it faces.

Some people, both inside and outside of this body, have made the claim that the Rules Committee has come to hold too powerful a position with the House of Representatives. These people conclude that the Rules Committee has the power to prevent the entire House from making decisions on various important issues. It is the so-called power to "block" legislation.

The solution which these same people advocated was to permanently expand the membership of the Rules Committee from 12 to 15. This solution was adopted and is simply a power play to control the committee. It is not an attempt to correct any present weakness in the committee.

If it is true that the committee has the ability to block legislation it does not like, having more members will not change that fact. Indeed, a new group will simply have the right to stop legislation which it finds undesirable.

The House has always had a formal written guarantee that the Rules Committee cannot permanently act contrary to the wishes of the majority of the House. That guarantee is the discharge petition. It was used successfully on a major bill as recently as 1960 when a discharge petition for the Federal employees pay raise bill was adopted by the majority of the House.

Whenever we discuss the desirability of any legislation, it is important to know who is determining the desirability. Does the majority of the House make that decision or do most of the members of the majority party of the House? When the Speaker was prohibited during the early part of this century from serving on the committee, it was assumed that such action was intended to make the committee a tool of the majority of the House Members rather than only of the leadership of the majority party.

Increasing the committee size from 12 to 15 members increases the Democratic majority from 4 to 5. Yet, proportionate representation would give the Democrats a majority of only 3 members on a 15-man committee.

Fair representation of the minority party should always be maintained in any committee. Such should certainly be the case in a committee as powerful as the Rules Committee as was pictured yesterday.

I would have been favorable to considering reviving the 21-day rule. By prohibiting the Rules Committee from holding any bill for more than 21 days this change would correct the situation in which the Rules Committee could block legislation. At the same time, fair representation would be maintained on the committee.

If our concern is to insure that the majority of the House be given the opportunity to express its will on the important issues which come before this body, we should not simply give the power to determine desirable legislation to another group. That is what the present makeup of the Rules Committee does.

In the future, changes should be guided by three factors:

First. Congress should decide whether the Rules Committee should have the power to stop legislation.

Second. If the decision is affirmative, the minority party should be given representative strength on the committee.

Third. If the decision is negative, some means such as the 21-day rule will be necessary to weaken the power of the committee.

This is the only way fairplay in the House of Representatives will be secured.

## J. P. Stevens & Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the Chester Reporter, Chester, S.C., of January 9, 1963:

J. P. STEVENS & CO. BEGINS 150TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., began the official observance of its 150th anniversary year Friday. Founded in 1813, just 37 years after the signing of the Declaration of Independence, the company history of 150 years of continuous operation is unique in the annals of American industry. From modest beginnings, the business has grown into one of the leading textile companies in America, employing 35,000 people. Fifty-five manufacturing plants produce over 800 million yards of fabrics annually.

In 1813, Nathaniel Stevens began the manufacture of woolen broadcloth in North Andover, Mass. The business acquired additional mill properties in New England and, following his death in 1865, continued to prosper under the guidance of his son and grandsons in the years that followed. In 1899, John P. Stevens, a grandson of the founder, formed a partnership, J. P. Stevens & Co., to sell the product of M. T. Stevens & Sons. During the next few years, J. P. Stevens & Co. expanded its cotton goods business through participation in the building of plants in the South and by acting as selling agent for additional cotton mills.

The partnership was incorporated in 1923 and, upon the death of John P. Stevens in 1929, his sons, John P. Stevens, Jr., and Robert T. Stevens, who had been actively identified with management, assumed greater responsibilities in the conduct of the business. A strong and aggressive management team included such men as William O. Fraser, an original member of the firm, and its treasurer, who occupied a position of leadership in the credit world and whose achievements in the prevention of commercial fraud won him widespread recognition; William J. Gillon, whose dynamic pearsonality and vigorous leadership were a constant inspiration to all who knew him; Thomas W. Estes, a man of extraordinary creative and merchandising ability; Horace N. Stevens, a grandson of the founder; and Joseph H. Sutherland, who was first a salesman in the Boston office before being called to New York in 1935 where he later became largely responsible for the growth of the company's synthetic goods business.

In 1930, the company established a connection with 10 additional mills and from 1936 to 1939, achieved further penetration of the steadily growing market for synthetic fabrics through financial participation in the building of 2 plants and by becoming sales agent for 2 additional concerns. One of these the present Slater Plant at Slater, S.C., was part of a business conducted by the descendants of Samuel Slater who founded America's first cotton mill at Pawtucket, R.I., in 1790.

In 1946, the Stevens selling organization merged with 9 textile companies which operated 29 manufacturing plants. As a result of his reorganization, J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc. emerged as a publicly owned corporation and its shares were admitted to trading on the New York Stock Exchange on August 28, 1947.

John P. Stevens, Jr. reached the company's retirement age in February and retired as chairman of the board of directors and chairman of the executive committee on March 1, 1962. He had served the company approximately 40 years in many important capacities, including 11 years as president and more than 9 years as chairman of the board. He played a major part in the development of the business. Mr. Stevens continues as a director.

Robert T. Stevens was elected president in 1929 and has held the office of president or chairman of the board since that time except for the years he spent in the service of our Government, an artillery lieutenant in World War I. He served as Deputy of Purchases in World War II with the rank of colonel. In 1952, he was named Secretary of the Army by President Dwight D. Eisenhower. He returned to the company as president in 1955. He has also held the office of chairman of the board since the retirement of John P. Stevens, Jr., in March 1962.

In commenting upon the occasion of the company's 150th anniversary, Mr. Robert T. Stevens said, "The progress of J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., symbolizes the spirit of American free enterprise—the spirit we hope future generations will strive constantly to preserve. Whatever success our company has achieved has been due to the combined abilities and spirit of the 35,000 people of Stevens who produce and merchandise its products. Although our industry is threatened by a serious import situation, I believe that President Kennedy's seven-point textile program, if fully implemented, would be most helpful in assisting the American textile and apparel industries to deal with cheap imports."

The Stevens Co. will have many events throughout 1963 to commemorate the anniversary. On the 27th of December, an unprecedented salute from the city of New York took place, when a 30 by 40 foot banner was unfurled across Broadway at the Stevens building, one-half block south of the crossroads of the world, Broadway and 42d Street.

An event of singular importance will take place on January 8 when the company will have a special 150th anniversary dinner in the ballroom of the Hotel Plaza. Industry and Government leaders will attend this event. The dinner is a salute to free enterprise in America.

A special Stevens anniversary movie, "The Exciting World of Stevens Fabric," has just been released as a part of the anniversary program. A local spokesman said that the movie is available to be shown in both 35 millimeter for theater showing, and in 16 millimeter for smaller groups. "Anyone interested in seeing the film need only call the Stevens plant in his community," he said.

Special displays of Stevens fabrics and products have been scheduled in communities where Stevens has plants and offices. A comprehensive schedule of advertising will appear throughout the year in national magazines and newspapers.

Later on, New York City will further hail Stevens when famous Times Square will temporarily be renamed "Stevens Square" in honor of the 150th anniversary of the famous textile company.

## The Future Is Not Ours To See—But Our Attitude Will Determine It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am very much impressed by a very timely statement from the pen of John C. Malone, Jr., president of the First National Bank in Milton, Fla. I feel that his statement is something which carries a message of importance for the Congress and for the Nation.

THE FUTURE IS NOT OURS TO SEE—BUT OUR ATTITUDE WILL DETERMINE IT

This is the time of the year that our national interest seems to center on how good business was in the old year and what is the outlook for the new year. This is not my intention. I am more interested in bringing to your attention the key figure in your prosperity in any year, your employer.

In the last 80 years ending in 1957, our Nation's population has quadrupled, our total output of goods and services has multiplied 21 times, personal output has increased 2 percent each year and living standards have doubled each 35 years. This phenominal growth in general has been due to the traditions, attitudes, and aspirations to growth of the American people. The strength of our country is that this growth is shared by all our people, our family incomes have steadily increased. We are not plagued by multitudes of the underprivileged. Our growth has been shared by all. Our government at all levels is keyed to listen to the voice of the people, not vice versa.

We have more than 4 million businesses in our country, large and small, corporate or otherwise. These businesses are young. Some of our largest corporations are less than 50 years old. The heads of these businesses are men of imagination. It is their competence, managerial ability, farsightedness, and financial risk that makes your employment possible. It is these men that provide the wages with which we have established our standard of living, the highest in the world. Their wages keep us in the position also of being consumers. Our use of consumer goods is the largest of any people of any nation. We own more automobiles, electrical appliances, have better roads, public buildings, schools, colleges, than all the rest of the world together. All is made possible by the wages we earn from our employer. He translates the demand into products through your employment and the necessary equipment.

There is keen competition between businesses. Three hundred thousand to four hundred thousand turn over each year out of the total number of over 4 million. Managerial ability and competence of the employer seems to be the key factor. Your employer is an "uncommon man."

He is also a taxpayer. His business, corporate or otherwise, pays taxes at all levels of government—Federal, State, county, and perhaps municipal. He is generous in contributions to the many funds for public

good. He fosters education at all levels because he uses it in his enterprise.

To do all this your employer must make profits, high profits, to satisfy you, the wage earner, the tax structure, to replace equipment, to build new factories, and through research to improve his product and find new ones. Contrary to popular belief high profits mean all of this plus high wages and more jobs for you and yours, more banking business for me. Low profits mean a declining business, a poor job future for you, inefficiency, lack of ability to create, or the presence of artificial pressures which create conditions under which business cannot grow. Low profits mean declining employment and if persisted in can only end in the loss of the business or industry and all of the employment it provided. The old parable of the goose that laid the golden egg is more true today than ever before. The greater Milton-Pensacola area has been very fortunate. Our economy has been climbing slowly but steadily throughout the years. We have seen an agricultural, timber, naval stores economy gradually change to an agricultural, industrial, forestry and military supported one. We have made this transition in the memory of most of us.

What would constitute catastrophe for the Greater Milton-Pensacola area short of natural disaster or war damage? The answer is simple. The loss of one of our larger payrolls would cause a local depression such as we have never experienced. We would gain national headlines by being declared a disaster area. The industrial and military payroll of ths area is the lifeblood of our way of life. It flows through you to the storekeepers, shops, banks, taxes, recreation, hard goods, and back again into more business which means more and bigger payrolls at better wages. This is our economic life cycle in which each shares his own part, and contributes that for which he is compensated, his very best.

The employer, be he small or large, independent or corporate, is the key to our economic prosperity. Treat him well and grow with him. Kill him in the search for the golden egg and depart with him. In our drive for "improved everything" in late years we have forgotten to improve the lot of he who provides all through the utilization of knowhow, capital, and your services.

In the years gone by the panacea for poor business was "Go west, young man, go west." Today that west has gone also. We must achieve success where our services or attainments can be utilized. Let's keep business in business by cooperation with our employer, giving him the imaginative creative work, faithfulness and loyalty that he pays for. In so doing our own lot will continue to improve and our economic area will prosper. Let the people of the greater Milton-Pensacola area be known for their appreciation of their employers.

I propose that the year of 1963 be known as "employer appreciation year" when we contemplate the workings of the system that provides us so much and identify the key figure therein—the employer. It is in our personal interest to keep him in business and making plenty of profit.

## Hon. Ernesto Ramos Antonini

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JACOB H. GILBERT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grieved by the death of the very able speaker of the Puerto Rico House of Representatives, the late Ernesto Ramos Antonini.

It was my privilege to meet the distinguished speaker when I visited Puerto Rico, and I was deeply impressed by his high degree of intelligence, his brilliant mind, his love for the people of Puerto Rico, and his high ideals and strong faith in democracy.

The record shows that he was an outstanding public servant, closely associated with the people, untiring in his efforts in their behalf and largely responsible for the great success of Operation Bootstrap and the economic development of Puerto Rico; he worked in close cooperation with Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín and Ambassador Teodoro Moscoso to insure the splendid achievements realized in the remarkable development of the island in recent years.

Ernesto Ramos Antonini will be greatly missed and wee deeply mourn his loss as a noble leader in the Western Hemisphere.

## U.S. Retaliatory Punch Being Reduced by 80 Percent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, according to current figures U.S. missile strength now includes 126 Atlas, 54 Titan, and 20 Minuteman intercontinental ballistics missiles, plus approximately 144 Polaris missiles and some 100 Jupiters and Thors. This force of about 444 missiles has approximately a 1,000-megaton nuclear punch.

Also according to current figures we have in our strategic manned bomber force approximately 1,600 B–52's, B–58's, and B–47's. This manned strategic bomber force has approximately a 10,000-megaton nuclear punch on its first run, plus such force as might be delivered on reruns to strategic targets since potential enemy defenses cannot be estimated as perfect.

An estimated 10,000 missiles yet unbuilt, yet unemplaced, not even contemplated, would be needed to replace this manned strategic aircraft retaliatory capacity which now deters Kremlin masterminds from pushing their surprise attack button. This is assuming the Soviet Union's massive effort to erect ICBM defenses ends in a semitotal failure.

Should the U.S. retaliatory force wind up around about 2,000 missiles, which seems to be the present thinking of administration planners, and should manned strategic aircraft fleets be allowed to phase out, which seems to be the present thinking of administration planners witnessed by statements and inferences out of the Skybolt controversy, then our retaliatory capacity shrinks by approximately four-fifths, 80 percent, to around 2,000 megatons with no backup rerun capability whatever.

Phasing out the manned strategic aircraft surrenders weapons systems which are genuinely maneuverable, which can carry defensive armament and which are usable in coordination with ground-to-ground and air-to-ground missiles capable of reducing an enemy's offensive and defensive missile and aircraft interceptor bases. The replacement missile weapons systems are generally unable to identify and pinpoint targets, attack moving targets or destroy very hard targets. Thus unable to function without cooperating aircraft, they would be unable to knock out enemy offensive forces and stop an invasion of Western Europe.

Neither would the missile weapons systems be capable of being held on airborne alert. With only the capabilities of an all missile deterrent system, a U.S. President could only choose between pressing the button or sitting out an attack. But with manned aircraft in the deterrent system in proper proportion, he would have the additional alternative of foregoing irreversible action on ambiguous warnings and delay a fatal decision until the facts are established.

All of the foregoing is the burden of an excellent and most perceptive letter to the editor of the San Francisco Examiner published December 26, 1962.

The letter was written by one of the keenest minds in the United States which is devoted to the philosophy and strategy of U.S. national defense. He is Dr. Stefan T. Possony of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, Stanford University

Dr. Possony has been adviser to the Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence, Department of the Air Force. Born in Vienna, he received his Ph. D. from the University of Vienna and subsequently studied in Rome and Paris. From 1947 until joining the Hoover Institution he was professor of international politics in the Graduate School, Georgetown University. He is an associate of the Foreign Policy Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania, and lectured at the first National Strategy Seminar for Reserve Officers.

The following is the text of Dr. Possony's letter:

MISSILES, BOMBER FLEET

To the EXAMINER:

On December 20, 1962, Peter Andrews wrote: "The 200-missile U.S. missile right arm now includes 126 Atlases, 54 Titans, and 20 Minutemen. This growing missile strength is one more sign that the manned bomber fleet is dead. All that is needed is a dignified funeral."

This missile force presents a firepower of approximately 600 metagons. If you add the firepower of 144 Polaris missiles, and 100-odd Jupiters and Thors, our present missile force has a 1,000 metagon punch. Approximately 1,600 B–52's, B–58's, and B–47's are able to drop in excess of 10,000 megatons. This is their single mission punch. Remember that even if the Soviet defenses were perfect, many of those planes would fly several missions. (These figures do not take into account carrier aricraft, fighter bombers, and tactical missiles.)

Hence if we desire to replace our bombers with missiles, we would need a minimum of some 10,000 missiles—but no one has yet talked about a U.S. force even approaching

this size. But if we reduce our strategic force to 2,000-odd missiles, as seems to be the present plan, our deterrent and retaliatory power would be cut by four-fifths or more. Hence if the manned aircraft fleet is dead, perhaps it is the United States which should prepare for its diginfied funeral.

Khrushchev recently stated that the effort which the Soviet Union has put into defense against ballistic missiles equals that invested in the missile itself. Hence the present invulnerability of our ICBM's won't last. In the offense-defense race the aircraft ultimately will come out on top, because (a) it is manned and, therefore, genuinely maneuverable, (b) it can carry defensive armament, and (c) it would be used jointly with ground-to-ground and air-to-ground missiles which would be aimed at the enemy's missile and aircraft interceptor bases.

The missile is unable, by itself, to identify and pinpoint targets; attack moving targets; and destroy very hard targets. Hence a missile force cannot function without aircraft and cannot be the main element of a strategy designed to knock out the enemy offensive force and stop the invasion of Western Europe.

Moreover, the missile force cannot be held on airborne alert. If warning is received, we have but an all-missile force, the President has only one choice: to press the button or sit out the attack. Bombers on air alert allow him to forego taking irreversible action on ambiguous warning and delay the fatal decision until the facts are established.

STEFAN T. POSSONY,
*Hoover Institution,*
*Stanford University.*

## Editorials of Interest to Members

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, two recent editorials in the Repository, of Canton, Ohio, will be of interest to Members of the House and under unanimous consent I include them with my remarks:

WE LOST THE ARGUMENT TOO

Everything possible will be done to build up the illusion that the United States came out ahead in the Cuban showdown. The truth is, the United States will be whistling in the dark.

Once more there has been a tardy reaction after a harsh provocation. Once more it has been shown why the side that seizes the initiative and holds it in a cold war gets the breaks and the other side does the bumbling.

The Soviet Union seized the initiative in Cuba and held it.

It moved in on what appeared to be a genuine revolution against an oppressive dictatorship that had been shored up with U.S. assistance. It snatched Cuba from under Uncle Sam's nose.

It then added injury to insult by changing Cuba into a Communist state and in turn added insult to injury by fortifying it as a Communist bastion in the New World—a studied and insolent challenge to the Monroe Doctrine.

When the U.S. reaction to this was violent, the Soviet Union scored still another cold war triumph by withdrawing missiles and bombers on its own terms and in its own time and refusing to permit inspection of Cuba to see what might have been left there.

Meanwhile, it seized President Kennedy's ill-advised offer not to invade Cuba if the missiles and bombers were withdrawn and built this into a commitment. It will do no good for the United States to explain that it despairs of inspecting Cuba to find out if Russia acted in good faith and therefore withdraws its promise not to invade Cuba.

If it became necessary to invade the island to eliminate a submarine base that might be deadlier than a missile base or a bomber base, the United States would be beaten over the head with its no-invasion promise by every Latin American diplomat.

It has never been grasped by U.S. critics of United Nations intervention in the Congo that Latin Americans have strong convictions about U.S. intervention in Cuba. Latin Americans believe as firmly in self-determination for Cubans as critics of the United Nations believe in self-determination for the Congolese.

There has been a reversal for the United States in Cuban policy—if the absence of a policy can be referred to as "policy."

With formal termination of discussions between Washington and Moscow in the United Nations, the issue is officially closed.

We lost the ideological issue after six decades of relations with Cuba that gave free enterprise a black eye.

We lost the military issue. Cuba is now a heavily armed offshore island manned by thousands of unfriendly troops, and this fact has not been altered an iota by a show of U.S. military strength in the Caribbean and in the air over Cuba. The Russians are still there.

And on top of everything else we lost the argument. We had to back down on the Monroe Doctrine.

There must be days in the Kremlin when Khrushchev, Mikoyan, and their pals are so busy laughing they can't find time to pick out another strategic place to make Uncle Sam bleed a little.

BUT DON'T BLAME REPUBLICANS

The chairman of the Democratic National Committee, John M. Bailey, is the author of a remarkable communication that has been sent to newspapers.

It deals with the Democratic Party's complications over its reactionary majority on the House Rules Committee—the dilemma dissolved temporarily 2 years ago by the late Sam Rayburn's determined and successful fight to weaken the majority's domination by adding three new members to the committee.

Chairman Bailey, who is understandably concerned because the same dilemma now must be dealt with at the beginning of the 88th Congress without the matchless influence of a Sam Rayburn, has come up with a remarkable point of view.

He blames the whole thing on Republicans.

He uses the same inverted reasoning that has been applied to Democratic inability to muster majorities in the House and Senate on key votes, though the Democrats are an overwhelming majority in both houses—Republicans are to blame for not voting with Kennedy Democrats against non-Kennedy Democrats.

Continuing this inverted reasoning, the Democratic chairman argues that it somehow has become the responsibility of Republicans to rescue Democrats from the consequences of the North-South schism that has made many southern Democrats the opponents of Democratic Presidents starting with Franklin D. Roosevelt.

It is not a Republican responsibility to help the majority party in Congress or a Democratic regime in the White House.

Every committee in the House of Representatives and the Senate is affected by it to some extent. The Rules Committee is especially affected because its chairman, Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia, is a crusty reactionary who thinks it is his personal duty to block every bill he personally dislikes.

Moreover, he thinks it is his legislative duty to use his chairmanship and his committee to block bills objected to by his southern associates.

This is not surprising, nor is it exceptional. Key committees in both the House and Senate are dominated by southern Democrats and chairmen who hold their posts because, as southerners, they built up seniority. Only in the Democratic South with its one-party system can a legislator be reasonably sure of winning reelection long enough to qualify for the chairmanship of key committees.

It's a party problem, particularly acute in the Rules Committee, where abuse of power can cause bills to be held up with only a scant chance for a House vote. The Democrats can't be blamed for getting into a stew over this weakness in their political situation.

But blaming it all on the Republicans because the Democratic Party is split wide open over civil rights—aw come on.

That's ridiculous. Even for Chairman Bailey, who is paid for being 150 percent Democratic, it's silly.

## Compliment to President Kennedy on His State of the Union Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the minority party who believes in responsible and constructive comment on the words and deeds of the administration in power, I wish to compliment our Chief Executive, President John F. Kennedy, for his cogent state of the Union message.

The President's analysis and constructive comments with respect to the Atlantic Alliance, and his cautious approach to the presumed rift in the Communist camp should serve notice to all that America and her allies have not relaxed their vigil. I must admit, however, that I am somewhat skeptical at the vision of the unalined countries painted for us by the President, as a result of the Russian-Cuban missile scheme and the Chinese invasion of India. The so-called neutrals have shown a notable lack of response to moral force, as witness the silence accompanying the resumption of nuclear testing by the Soviets and even this very same aggression against India. There has been an equally remarkable tendency to respect apparent physical power, or their own internal political needs. A more critical analysis of past foreign aid programs would have been welcomed as well.

Until the full details of the President's tax proposals are made available to us, I believe it behooves the Congress to speak

with some reserve with respect to the plan outlined in the state of the Union message. Certainly, a more equitable sharing of the tax burden is called for, and the recognition of the role played by business expansion in the economy by the President is heartening. Present indications for new expenditures for plants and equipment do not pose quite the optimistic picture included in the state of the Union message for last year's investment tax credit plan, however.

The most encouraging news of all is the President's pledge to submit a budget which will, in his words, "hold total expenditures for all other purposes below this year's level," although anticipating increases for defense, space, and fixed interest charges. This is, at least, a favorable start toward a fiscally sound budget policy. I would suggest that the next step is to critically consider the new proposals proferred by the President, since he himself has indicated the need to reduce or postpone many desirable programs.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we can all join together, regardless of party, in welcoming the constructive suggestions by the President, in complimenting him on a forceful presentation of America's worldwide goals and achievements, and in assuring him of the most careful examination of this and subsequent messages in light of the national interest.

## Commendation of Volunteer Firemen From the Villages of Franklin Square, West Hempstead, South Hempstead, Uniondale, Roosevelt, Elmont, Lakeview, Garden City, and Hempstead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN W. WYDLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of this august body a feat of daring, bravery, and courage performed by a group of my constituents: the volunteer firemen from the villages of Franklin Square, West Hempstead, South Hempstead, Uniondale, Roosevelt, Elmont, Lakeview, Garden City, and Hempstead.

On the morning of December 31, 1962, a blaze broke out in a warehouse in the village of Hempstead which eventually destroyed Long Island Railroad station there and caused over $1 million worth of damages. During its course, several homes were threatened.

The temperature was at near zero throughout many hours these brave men spent fighting the blaze. In a short time after they arrived at the scene, each man resembled a ghostly apparition; each was covered with a cake of ice. The cold was bitter; the fire raged. Despite these obstacles, these wonderful men fought on, eventually bringing the fire under control—a fire that had all the earmarks of being the most devastating Long Island had ever experienced.

Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House of Representatives to these men because they are volunteer firemen—they receive no pay for their labors—they are dedicated to the preservation of life and property in the community. Through the years they have performed their duties with courtesy, kindness, and efficiency. They are on call 24 hours a day. And when the siren sounds, they are on the go immediately without regard for personal comfort or safety.

These men deserve the undying admiration of the people of their communities. The same admiration is due their wives and families who keep the fearful vigil, many of whom have formed auxiliary units which, like the male groups, travel to the scene of the fire and provide these hardworking men with coffee and doughnuts and aid during the critical firefighting time.

I commend to your consideration all volunteer firefighting units, but especially, at this time, the brave men of the villages I have cited who performed so well in the recent, critical Hempstead blaze.

These are men I suggest, who do not ask what their country can do for them, but in the tradition of the minutemen of Concord and Lexington, are actually doing right now. They are to be applauded as examples of the finest in Americanism.

## Another Year of Service by FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial from the Columbus Enquirer entitled "Another Year of Service by FBI."

This editorial does an excellent job in pointing out the outstanding record of service that is being rendered the American taxpayers by J. Edgar Hoover and his dedicated agents:

ANOTHER YEAR OF SERVICE BY FBI

Another successful year in its relentless war against crime has been reported by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The annual report of Director J. Edgar Hoover, made last week to Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, shows marked increases were recorded in all major categories of FBI accomplishment in the past year.

More wanted persons were apprehended, more convictions were recorded in cases made and fines and recoveries gained.

The 12,700 convictions obtained in FBI cases exceeded the 12,418 of a year ago by more than 200. It was a like story on the number of fugitives apprehended—11,400 as compared to 10,668 in 1961.

Fines imposed and recoveries made totaled well above $200 million. The figure was $148,421,690 for 1961. Taxpayers will be pleased to learn the figure far exceeds the funds it takes to finance FBI operation.

The statistics cited above are only the highlight of Mr. Hoover's annual report. Careful reading of the full outline of accomplishments causes one to realize how much Americans depend upon FBI agents to protect them and how much assistance the FBI gives to law-enforcement officers at the local level.

Accomplishments of the FBI in 1962 are a tribute to the leadership of Mr. Hoover, which has spanned a period of more than 38 years. Under his direction the FBI has established and maintained a high level of service to the Nation.

## LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

## GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

## CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

## PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

# Appendix

## Conserving America's Agricultural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to the remarks of Mr. Edward M. Dwyer, of the Massachusetts Department of Agriculture, during a panel discussion entitled "Action Today for Tomorrow's Growth." Mr. Dwyer presents in capsule form some of the very real problems we face in the field of conservation, especially as they relate to the American farmer. This is a particular area of American agriculture in which the Federal Government can and should be of greater assistance to our farmers if for no other reason than a consideration for the future needs of our people. Though Government's massive intervention into agriculture has not cured any of its ills, we must be extremely careful in any withdrawal that such a vital area as conservation is not left floundering.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks by Edward M. Dwyer, director of the Division of Livestock Disease Control of the Massachusetts Department of Agriculture:

REMARKS OF EDWARD M. DWYER

Farming today is far different from what it was 2,000 years ago, 100 years ago, yes, 10 years ago. Credit for the constructive change must be given to many brilliant minds, to many different chemists, to many different engineers, to many different industries, to our national leaders starting with George Washington and Thomas Jefferson, and continuing with our present leaders in the Department of Agriculture in Washington and the departments of agriculture in our States. But most of all we must praise our dirt farmer himself who has adopted the new found basic rules of nature in the production of food and fiber. One farmer suffices today to supply the needs of 26 whose labors have been used by our widespread system of industry.

The soil releases its food to the plant more abundantly, the seed resists its natural enemies, the drought is still a hazard, but it is not a bugaboo; the swarms of destructive pests are kept in place, and the fungus and rot are being conquered. As a result, we have more food for man and animal, a greater variety for our national diet and all this at a lowered price as measured by the percentage of the consumer dollar spent for food.

The task before us in the next 10 minutes is to discuss "Action Today for Tomorrow's Growth." If we are satisfied that everything possible is being done and that we are handing on to posterity our natural inherited assets at interest, then this talk is unnecessary. But if you are not satisfied, as I am not, that with our progress we are not replacing each year the essential elements in the soil eaten up by the harvest, then this talk is apropos.

Responsible officials estimate that our topsoil has been depleted from a national average of 9 inches at the time of the founding of this country to a present day average of 6 inches. This is a truly alarming rate of depletion in a period of 250 years, but more alarming still is the fact that our agricultural lands, west of the Mississippi, were tenanted by the Indians a mere 100 years ago.

Before the breaking of the land, our forests and ground cover protected the soil against movement by wind and water. Leaving the soil without cover after the harvest created the situation whereby the howling and roaring winds from the frozen north picked up the topsoil and deposited it in far off spots where it was not wanted. Traces have been found thousands of miles away after being blown from west of the Mississippi. Added to the wide open spaces were the areas denuded of trees by our rapacious settlers to provide lumber for homesteads and ground for crops. The lands lost much of the natural barriers to keep the winds in check. And when we denuded the forests and left the soil without ground cover, the rains gushed into our unprotected fertile areas and carried with the torrents, thousands of tons of topsoil to the brooks and streams, to the rivers and to the sea. No scientist is needed to prove this statement as any common man can witness the color of the waters, all murky with soil and wade in the silt piled high at the mouths of the rivers.

All this is manmade conditioning for destruction.

What about the nutrient values of our soils today as compared with 50 years ago? Every soil needs calcium, nitrogen, phosphorus, and potash among other trace minerals for normal growth of crops. Over cropping without replenishing the soil nutrients and humus has created a situation where one-half-a-million acres of crop land is being removed from agricultural production. (Some of this land is going into housing developments and business pursuits.)

The consuming public is diet conscious and insists on balances for proper human growth and survival. If our crops lack the proper elements because the soil has been drained of them, the public will be forced to survive on capsules and eat only for bulk. This statement may have more merit than a casual reading may warrant. If we have the means at hand to maintain fertility, can we justify handing on to posterity the barren land that we have robbed of its riches when we at best are only tenants of the soil? And what does this malpractice do to the economy of the present day farmer? He will increase his time and expense to get from the soil a poorer product chemically, and a much poorer product marketably. Let us not forget that the soil produces food for our nourishment, clothing for our warmth, and shelter for our protection.

Our suggested program for the present and for the future is a logical one.

1. First and foremost is the job of informing our Representatives and Senators of the basic farm problem affecting the health of our citizens and the citizens of the future. The solution to the problem is for our own economic welfare and, in addition, for our own health. An abundant food supply maintains a healthy body politic and substitution of concentrated forms of health-supplying additives is a far cry from the real proven product.

Supplying the essential facts to our elective body will condition them for the time when the appropriation for the several projects comes before them for a vote.

2. Administration:

The most important factor for the correction of the existing evil, as I have presented it, is the administration of the agricultural laws that are now on the books.

Any correction of the basic conditions is beyond any individual efforts or any one-group effort. The social body must meet the challenge.

There are programs operating under present laws. These programs are good in themselves, but powerful when joined in a concerted and coordinated effort. Each program must have maximum funds to successfully operate.

I will review some of these programs briefly and in outline, with suggested improvements.

A. First: The ACP program:

Some of the practices administered by the agricultural stabilization and conservation committee in the Northeast area through the local and State committees are the following:

1. Soil protection and replenishment through (a) cover cropping—for protection of the topsoil; through (b) permanent reseeding of certain lands which will replace the organic matter of the soil (lost through several causes); through (c) liming to correct the acidity of the soil to foster growth of legumes; through (d) adding minerals for plant growth such as phosphates, potash, nitrogen, and trace minerals.

2. Reforestation: This work involves the thinning and replanting of trees cut for harvest.

3. Watersheds and farm ponds: This project conserves our rainfall for useful purposes by holding it until the time is most useful and most necessary and prevents loss by erosion.

4. Incentives: Much of the above could not be done through the efforts of the individual farmer unless a tangible token reward was dangled before his eyes. The reward is recognition of a job well done. Of course, some of the services performed by ACP could not be done by the individual because of the cost factor, but when the services are performed on an area basis, the individual cost is reasonable and economic.

SUMMARY

The above work by the ACP is a national effort at a present outlay of $250 million. The legislation as originally passed contemplated a budget of $500 million. With the accumulated experience of the personnel for the past 25 years, it is my humble opinion that the budget for ACP should be increased so that the program can be expanded to our economic advantage.

I mention here, and more is to be said about the committee system for the operation of the ACP program. Suffice for now to say that this system is democracy at the grassroot level.

I am quoting the agronomists when I say that the application of lime to the soil is but 15 to 20 percent of the recommended

annual application, and the addition of minerals is but 20 to 25 percent.

B. The Extension Service Program: The personnel attached to this service carry to the farmers the message of the results of research and its practical application. Let us give our need of praise to these dedicated men who have helped the farmer to produce more of a better crop and channeled the product into marts of the world.

C. Soil Conservation Service: This Service offers great financial assistance through their technicians, to carry out major farm programs. These programs protect and extend croplands and develop other lands for recreation, for wildlife, and for forestry. The Service is invaluable and the plans should be carried out by each individual producer involved.

D. Forest Service: This Service is widely known through publicity in all forms. What child does not recognize Smokey, the bear, and the forest warden at the top of the tower, alone in the depths of the woods? This picture stirs the imagination of everyone. The Service is widely acclaimed for its work in protection, education, and in development of our great national resource: forests.

E. Farmers Home Administration: This service provides money when needed, under controlled auspices, to our farmers, through the constituted farm banks. The lending of money to an individual is coordinated with the services described above. Its greatest asset is the personnel who understand the meaning of money and who understand the work of the farmer. The city banks slant their programs to the needs of our industrial communities.

3. Education:

When the public gets the facts on agricultural needs, repeated for emphasis, and without scare headlines, great strides will have been made. The exposure of the facts depends upon artists trained in the art of communication. Our federally aided schools and colleges must rise to the opportunities in this field, but talent must be seized wherever available.

Our farmers must be trained and developed in the art of soil conservation. The Extension Service has performed notably, but the goals must be set higher. Let us take note of the classic studies made in industry by Taylor and Galbraith with their works on industrial management and individual effort.

Our programs on television, slanted to propagandize the farm problem, should carry the spirit of adventure which Telstar and the rockets so superbly exhibit.

And to close with one of my own personal experiences, not a great accomplishment, but an effort which can be multiplied many times to advantage.

I acquired 290 acres of farmland in the 1930's. The soil was depleted by malpractice that the acreage would not pasture 40 head of cattle. Using every available service and help, the fertility and quality of the soil was developed by application of tons of lime, hundreds of pounds of nitrogen and phosphorus, and the cover crop was plowed in for humus. Today these fields support nearly 300 head of cattle, with 800 tons of grass silage and 300 to 400 tons of hay. This is a long way from the days in the 1930's when the acreage would not support a farmer.

My experience with these programs has convinced me that the local committeemen are in the best position to help solve the problems of the local farmer, and these solutions fit into the national picture. To suggest a substitution of the local committeemen for committeemen ruling from a seat in Washington would be a tragic error. Such a substitution could allow a corn belt man or a cotton plantation man to make rulings for agriculture in our Northeast section of the country. Our problems are local and the character of the farmers are peculiar to our section. Local men understand our needs and our oddities and have made, and can continue to make, this democracy of ours work.

Our farmers are individualists and hate rule by dictation. So let us keep our programs operating through the local committees.

I emphasize my firm convictions in the strength of our free enterprise system of government. We are great and strong and resourceful, all because we are allowed freedom of choice with a minimum of regulation. But this does not justify subsidizing the inefficient in the name of a support program.

I take this moment to express my appreciation for your kindness in listening to me and to those responsible for the invitation to be a panel member.

---

## Russian Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Tuesday, January 15, 1963*

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article dealing with Russian agriculture by Dr. Paul Sanders, which was published in the December issue of Rural Virginia.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Russian agriculture is fully 50 years behind that of the United States, and shortage of food is their biggest problem. They are making fantastic progress, though, on farms and in factories; but lack of incentive for extra effort is plaguing them.

These are among the major impressions of agriculture that I brought back from a 3-week, 15,000-mile tour with 34 other Virginians in Central Europe. Most of the time on the tour last summer was behind the Iron Curtain, studying farming methods and country life deep in the heart of the Soviet Union.

Our tour group was handpicked by Parke C. Brinkley, then Virginia's commissioner of agriculture, to represent every phase of the industry of agriculture.

There were dairymen and milk handlers, stockmen, and meatpackers; fruitgrowers, truck farmers, and canners; poultrymen, grain growers, and nurserymen; county agents, vocational agriculture teachers, and farm journalists. Two outstanding farm machinery men made the trip.

Everyone paid his own way. Not a dime of State or Federal money went into the undertaking. It was a people-to-people project made possible under a treaty between our Government and Russia which permits the exchange of cultural and scientific knowledge. Our route was carefully planned in advance and arranged to permit us to see every facet of Russia farming.

Nearly everyone in the tour group had a camera or two. When we compared notes in the evening after a long day on a farm or in a factory the group came up with a pretty good picture of its operation.

To begin with, Russian farms are too big for efficient operation. Their state farms average 58,000 acres; the collective farms, 14,000 acres each. Compare this with the U.S. average of 220 acres per farm and you see one big difference between the democratic and the Soviet systems. Our people own family farms, and work hard and intelligently to make land and labor profitable in order to enjoy a high standard of living. In Russia, the Government owns all the land, and everybody works for the Government. The standard of living of all Russians is alike as "two peas in a pod." There is no incentive to achieve. Result: low production.

On Russian collective farms, the workers draw a very low wage but share in returns from production over and above a quota or norm set by the Communist Party. The surplus is sold to the state and the proceeds divided among the workers. This type of operation is on the decline because the norm is being constantly inched up and there is little surplus to divide.

On state farms, wages are higher, and there is no participation in the proceeds. Everybody trades at the state stores. It is the Russian feudal system without compassion.

Farming methods in Russia are a paradox, a study in contrasts. On the same farm one sees practices used since the days of the Pharaohs and others as modern as tomorrow. I saw tractors pulling four-row cultivators alongside 129 women with short-handled hoes weeding hybrid corn; oxen supplying farm power in the shadow of a dozen huge combines being readied for the grain harvest; women gleaning fields, as did Ruth in Biblical times, and others in a nearby modern milking parlor milking 1,000 cows with electric milking machines. This strange mixture of the old and the new is Russia's agriculture today.

This clash between the old and the new stems in part from the Kremlin's frantic effort to adopt the scientific farming methods that have brought the United States the most abundant food supply at the lowest cost mankind has ever known. The Russians apparently have access to all of the technical knowledge in the experiment station bulletins of our land-grant colleges, U.S. Department of Agriculture, and commercial concerns. But the Soviets have failed to allocate enough machinery, chemicals, and scientific know-how to agriculture.

The best trained manpower in Russia has been moved into official functions, defense work, and propaganda agencies, leaving illiterate and poorly skilled labor on the land. This type of farm worker might be satisfactory for the peasant agriculture that characterized Russia for 1,000 years, but as the country moves into an industrial complex with a large percentage of the population living off the farm a highly technical agriculture is essential. Russia still has 45 percent of the labor force in farming, and the average consumer spends 50 percent of his income for a drab, starchy diet that is woefully weak in meat, milk, and eggs.

Contrast this with the United States, where less than 9 percent of the labor force is engaged in farming and the consumer spends only 20 percent of his income for the best diet on earth. The competitive free enterprise system of our country has channeled essential machinery, chemicals, and professional manpower into food production that all of our people may eat well at low cost. Farm research and universal education have made American agriculture the marvel of the world.

There is nothing Mr. Khrushchev wouldn't give for our farflung system of land-grant colleges with their research, teacher training and extension work, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture with its multiplicity of programs designed to meet every inequity in American agriculture. Such a system behind the Iron Curtain might well be the difference between success and failure of the Soviet system.

Soviet peasants are still permitted to farm small garden plots of ground around their homes—one-half to 2 acres. This production can be sold in the market places for a profit. These small garden plots were the best-

farmed areas we saw in all Russia, showing that private initiative and profit attain production. From these small private, plots which constitute only 3 to 4 percent of the total sown acreage in the Soviet Union, come 47 percent of the meat, 80 percent of the eggs, 60 percent of the potatoes, and 50 percent of the green vegetables.

Drought is another thorn in the side of Soviet agriculture. The deep, rich soils of the Ukraine—the "bread basket" of Russia—look like Iowa and Illinois land. But shortage of rainfall cuts deep into crop yields.

Average rainfall in much of the Ukraine is 20 inches a year—less than half Virginia's annual precipitation. Some irrigation is used for vegetables, berries, and other high acre value crops. But as one travels east, the climate grows dry and the population sparse. It is in this arid country that 5 million of some 90 million acres have been plowed and seeded to grain. Many soil experts feel the Russians may be unwittingly opening up what could become another "dust bowl."

What holds Russia together? They have little to eat—mostly brown bread and potatoes. Yet the people appeared healthy and well fed. The clothing is inadequate—ill fitting, loud and ugly. There is a noticeable dearth of consumer goods, recreational facilities, and luxuries. Wages are low and prices are high. Housing is substandard. Life is cheap. Safety devices of all sorts were conspicuous by their absence. Everyone wears a serious, deadpan expression. There is little laughter.

Communists are all cast in the same mold. While some of the people were pulled down to fit the pattern, others were pulled up. Unquestionably, the average Russian is better off today than ever before. They never knew freedom and, therefore, they don't miss it.

Three things are holding Russia together: work—everybody works in order to eat; fear—of atomic bomb attack, famine, or someone squealing on them; promise—of more food, consumer goods, and free housing, medicines, and no taxes in the future.

I would summarize my 3-week trip by saying Russia is making great progress. To deny this is to kid ourselves. The average American has been badly victimized by propaganda on Soviet agriculture. The Communist threat to the free world is genuine. It's real. It may be later than many Americans believe.

Communism is more than a form of government. It's a new economic and social order—a religion. They have abolished God by public decree and substituted the Soviet system as the supreme power. The state owns all enterprises, housing and land. Everybody works for the Government. It's a political paradise—every able-bodied person has a government job.

The free world can thwart communism only by a healthy economy where the private ownership of property is profitable, greater dedication to the basic precepts of democracy, and a deeper religious and moral consciousness among our people.

## Success Story Spiced by Horseradish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on January 15, my colleagues in the House had the opportunity to sample an outstanding product from my home district in Wisconsin. The House of Representatives dining room was serving zippy Wisconsin horseradish, compliments of Ed Bartusch, general manager of Silver Spring Gardens, Inc., Eau Claire, Wis.

I have had the pleasure of visiting Silver Spring Gardens, which began as a home operation during the depression and which has since grown into the largest horseradish producer in America. The success story of this enterprise is told in a story which appeared recently in the Milwaukee Journal, Milwaukee, Wis. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have this article printed in the RECORD:

HORSERADISH: WISCONSIN'S SNAPPY HARVEST

(By Clarice Rowlands)

EAU CLAIRE, WIS.—Snow flurries were in the air; the temperature was 13 above zero. Even horseradish harvesting was at a temporary standstill as the ground started to freeze. This was the state of late autumn weather in northwestern Wisconsin as a horseradish grower and processor became concerned about digging roots. Last of the State's crops harvested from mid-October into November, there is a concentrated rush of activity before winter sets in.

Familiar to most people in its grated, creamy form as it comes from the bottle, zippy horseradish starts its existence as a root cutting in the ground, according to Ed Bartusch, vice president and general manager of Silver Spring Gardens, Inc., largest producer in America. Located near here, the 360-acre farm is part of a 2,500 acre operation which also grows melons and potatoes.

RESULT OF DEPRESSION

Credit for the development of the nippy condiment goes to Ellis Huntsinger, president of the concern and father-in-law of Bartusch. When the depression deprived him of his sales job in 1929 he recalled his earlier farm life. With this inspiration he started growing melons, berries, and horseradish. He began with half an acre of the latter and produced three-fourths of a ton of horseradish. Today production is 1,500 tons.

Although he admits he's taking it easier now he still has his eye on the business. While others worry about the advent of winter, he contemplates leaving shortly for Florida to spend about 5 months.

RECALLS FIRST PACKING

"The first time I grated horseradish, there was no ventilation," he recalled. "There was nothing. We packed bottles by hand and we worked 16 hours a day, 6 or 7 days a week. I started the present operation in the milkhouse on this site."

His daughter, Mrs. Ed. Bartusch, remembers how she used to apply labels by hand on top of a board over a box. Mrs. Huntsinger, she said, did all the bookkeeping and anything else necessary to get the job done.

The present processing and bottling facilities at the plant are quite a contrast. They are the most modern available with sanitary stainless steel equipment handling the 48,000-bottle capacity per day.

Because Huntsinger is modest about his pioneer work in the horseradish business, Bartusch, who joined the concern in 1945, speaks proudly of it.

"It takes a cold climate to mature horseradish roots properly," he pointed out. "They become nice and white once the tops are frozen. The "R" months are the best for harvesting. We harvest about two-thirds of the crop now but leave some in the ground over winter for our spring harvest which accounts for about one-third."

Lush horseradish plants with their broad leaves look like Swiss chard during the growing season. Once frost hits they start turning brown, he explained. The main root is used for grinding stock while the best shoots or sets which branch from it are cut off and saved for future plants. It requires about 8,000 plants per acre and these are planted in rows.

AREA IS RECLAIMED

Bartusch drove us to a 1,000-acre area 5 miles west of Mondovi which his company started reclaiming from swampland in 1954 and is now an excellent productive area. While harvesters were digging roots in one section, other employees were planting cuttings in another area. The mechanical planter is capable of planting four rows at a time as eight employees sit on seats and feed the cuttings.

"The hills are worked off in the spring," he said. "We worry about a fast thaw. It should be gradual to insure our plants."

The St. Louis area, particularly in southern Illinois, is the center of horseradish growing in the United States, according to Bartusch. Approximately 3,000 acres are grown throughout the country and from this comes the horseradish supply for the Nation. Because of a shortage in the St. Louis region in 1952 and 1953, some was imported from Sweden and Japan at that time. No foreign horseradish, however, is now coming into this country, he added.

Bartusch is an authority, too, on who likes horseradish best. He's in a position to know because his concern distributes from coast to coast in 30 States and also in Canada.

"The North is the best market, although we do sell in Los Angeles and Miami. We think the liking for horseradish can be traced directly to European heritage. Polish people seem to be the best horseradish eaters, with those of Jewish and German heritage next. The French think it isn't subtle enough, and Italians never seem to use it. Wherever the climate is warm they don't know what it is. Argentinians do use it," he explained.

He also mentioned that Huntsinger worked closely for many years with the Univesity of Wisconsin college of agriculture in development of roots to produce a better yield, color, and strength. Wisconsin was the first to produce a hybrid horseradish.

The greatest advancement for the consumer came in 1941 when Huntsinger mixed some cream with horseradish and discovered that it prevented horseradish from turning brown and deteriorating. Butterfat coats horseradish and prevents oxidation. As a result this cream style stays fresh several times longer than the old vinegar pack.

In addition to the cream style, the firm turns out a shrimp and seafood sauce, hot dog relish, and beet horseradish, all incorporating horseradish. A rabbi from the Twin Cities regularly visits the plant prior to Passover to supervise the packing of horseradish for Jewish consumption. Labels are applied while he is there.

Bartusch has a strong word of advice for consumers. "Horseradish has to be kept cold. The colder, the better," he cautioned.

Like other packers, he is behind the label which appears now on shipments. It says. "Horseradish is a fresh food and to taste best must be refrigerated at all times."

"It is discouraging for us to find stale brown horseradish in restaurants, institutions, and even on grocery store shelves. Obviously, someone did not take care of it—the shipper, the warehouse, stock clerk, the restaurant, or the institution manager," he said in behalf of all packers.

In tracing the steps of horseradish roots from the field to the grated product available to the consumer, Bartusch explained that the roots dug by a mechanical digger are hauled

directly to a sorting shed. Here some 200 women working on conveyor belts separate the main root for grinding from other attached roots which are cut and bunched as cuttings for future plantings.

The grinding roots are then transported to coolers and the processing plant. A temperature of 32° is maintained in the huge cooler building where as many as 100 tons of roots can be stored when it is filled to capacity. From here the roots go to the processing plant where they enter revolving stainless steel churns. They undergo the washing process in a constant tumbling action.

Roots are then hauled in carts to the peeling room where women trim most of the blemishes by hand as roots move down a conveyor belt. A gentle spray of water washes them again and they are taken in carts from which they are dumped into two huge grinders. After the grinding, vinegar, sugar and cream are added. The completed mixture then moves on in stainless steel pipes to the bottling room where automatic machinery fills 5 ounce, 10 ounce, 1 pint, quart, and gallon containers. Labeling and packing into cartons complete the process.

The uses of this finished product are much more numerous than most homemakers think, the Huntsinger and Bartusch families believe. Huntsinger's favorite use is a sauce in which he combines one-third portion tartar sauce, one-third portion sweet or sour cream, one-third portion horseradish, a little lemon juice and sugar to taste. He mixes the ingredients and likes to serve it on baked potatoes, with meat or fish. A homemaker, he said, might prefer to use sour cream because it makes the sauce thicker.

## John P. Duncan, Jr.: Man of the Year in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Tuesday, January 15, 1963*

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, John P. Duncan, Jr., a fellow Georgian and friend of farmers throughout the Nation, has been selected by the Progressive Farmer magazine as a Man of the Year for 1963 for his dedicated service to agriculture.

I congratulate Mr. Duncan on this honor, and know that my pride is shared by all those who know the outstanding contributions he has made toward improving agriculture and the life and welfare of the farmer.

Mr. Duncan served with distinction as president of the Georgia Farm Bureau before coming to Washington to become Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. His splendid work has drawn praise from all of his associates, including Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the citation given Mr. Duncan be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN P. DUNCAN, JR., GEORGIA, A SUCCESSFUL DIRT FARMER SERVING THE NATION WITH GREAT DISTINCTION

As a boy and as a young man, John Duncan trained for a career in farming and farm leadership. He grew up as an active worker on his father's farm—that of Master Farmer John P. Duncan, Sr., Brooks County, Ga. He gained more than usual training as a student at the University of Georgia College of Agriculture and at Emory University.

These years were followed by experience in the old Triple A State office in Athens, as a southern regional AAA representative in Washington, and then as a successful dirt farmer back in Brooks County. All these prepared him for the superior work he did as Georgia Farm Bureau president, and is now doing as Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman says, "John Duncan is well known from one end of Georgia to the other as a dedicated, tireless worker for the farmer. His work in Washington may not be as well known to his friends in Georgia, but it is equally outstanding. He carries a heavy burden in the Department of Agriculture and commands both the affection and respect of all his associates. I am privileged to join the Progressive Farmer in saluting John Duncan as Georgia's Man of the Year."

Under Secretary Charles S. Murphy added, "John Duncan's rare combination of ability, courage, and integrity, coupled with his thorough and practical knowledge of agriculture, qualify him to a unique degree for the position he now holds. The farmers of the Nation owe him an immeasurable debt of gratitude."

Few, except those who know intimately his Washington activities from week to week, can appreciate the tremendous job he has done for cotton, poultry, peanut, tobacco, and all other farm families of the South. In present cash dollars, it would run into multiplied millions; in contributions to a permanently stronger and brighter agriculture, his worth cannot be easily measured.

## The Taxpayers' Friend: Comptroller General Joseph Campbell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Tuesday, January 15, 1963*

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Chicago Daily News, very ably written by James McCartney, praising the extraordinary efficiency and public spirit of the Comptroller General of the United States, Joseph Campbell, may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAXPAYERS' DEDICATED "WATCHDOG" NIPS AWAY AT WASTE IN WASHINGTON

(By James McCartney)

WASHINGTON.—In the vast administrative jungle that is Washington, Joseph Campbell, 62, may be the taxpayer's best friend.

He is a man sworn, purely and simply, to fight waste in Government spending.

He is a modern "David" in a David versus Goliath struggle to prevent inefficiency, extravagance, and downright crookedness in the spending of the people's money.

Campbell is the Comptroller General of the United States, head of the Government's General Accounting Office.

As such, he works for Congress with the express role of keeping an accountant's eye on the mushrooming Federal bureaucracy.

Consider the odds:

The executive branch of the Government has more than 2,500,000 employees. Campbell has 4,700 in the GAO.

The Federal budget next year will approach $100 billion. Campbell's operating budget at the GAO is about $43 million.

It is an unequal struggle at best, but, amazingly enough, Campbell—unlike almost every other agency boss in Washington—is not in the business of trying to boost his own budget or enlarge his empire.

In fact, in fiscal 1962 the GAO, because of Campbell's tight administration, didn't spend all of its appropriation.

It didn't draw $2,100,000 of its legally appropriated funds because Campbell figured he could get along without the money.

And, rather than growing in size in recent years, the GAO payroll has been sharply cut.

When Campbell took over 8 years ago the agency had 5,800 employees—1,100 more than it has now.

AN UNUSUAL BREED OF PUBLIC SERVANT

These actions, needless to say, violate every rule of Washington empire building and, in themselves, single out Joseph Campbell as an unusual breed of public servant.

Perhaps even more remarkable is the fact that Campbell believes his small force is doing a better job than the larger force he inherited.

When it comes to running an agency, Campbell is a believer in quality rather than quantity.

"A smaller number of more efficient, more professional men can do a better job than a larger number of voucher clerks without professional training," he says.

It's not that he doesn't think he could use more people to perform his assigned job. If he could get good people, he'd want them.

But he is not currently asking for more help because professionally trained accountants of the quality he would like to have are in short supply, and he doesn't want to load up with second-class men.

The pipe-smoking Campbell, a deep-voiced, soft-spoken man with bright, penetrating blue eyes, was brought into the Government by President Eisenhower.

Campbell was treasurer of Columbia University when Mr. Eisenhower was Columbia's president. When Mr. Eisenhower became President of the United States he appointed Campbell to the Atomic Energy Commission and then, later, moved him to GAO.

Campbell still carries the aura of the campus with him.

He wears informal blue shirts, a vest, dark brown horn-rimmed glasses and thick, rubber-soled shoes. He might be mistaken for a professor at almost any university.

"He can call hundreds of GAO employees in offices throughout the world by name," says an aid.

MAKES SPOT CHECKS ON U.S. SPENDING

The GAO's job is to spot check Government spending through independent audits.

On one occasion an audit turned up the fact that some Army officers at Fort Lee, Va., had spent more than $500,000 for an airfield—when they were officially limited to $25,000 for the project.

When the cat was out of the bag, Congress clamped down quickly.

Another time the GAO discovered an administrative maze in the Weather Bureau.

It seems that supplies bought by the bureau were delivered to a storeroom where they were counted and inspected for breakage, then reshipped to another location 2 miles away where they were counted again and tested.

The crowning touch, however, was the discovery that the supplies were then shipped back to the original storeroom—where they were counted again.

The Weather Bureau has revamped its procedures since.

These are but isolated samples, however, of hundreds of reports issued by the GAO. At any one time the GAO is involved in about 200 to 250 investigations.

By its own estimate, measurable potential savings to the taxpayers as a result of GAO recommendations came to about $95 million last year. That is well more than twice the GAO's own budget.

Campbell believes the biggest problems in trying to prevent waste lie not so much in outright thievery or dishonesty as in honest mistakes or bad judgment.

He says the biggest areas of waste are in procurement of government supplies, particularly in defense supplies, and he is sharply critical of lack of competition for many defense contracts.

There are many areas of "inadequate controls" and "inadequate management" in governmental administration, he says.

In brief, Campbell would like to see the government operated like a taut, well-run ship, with the best possible personnel. He knows it can be done. He has done it in his own agency.

## Wisconsin Author Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the town of Pepin in my home district of Wisconsin is known across the Nation as the birthplace and childhood home of the noted author, Laura Ingalls Wilder. Countless readers have become familiar with pioneer life in the area surrounding beautiful Lake Pepin by reading Mrs. Wilder's book, "Little House in the Big Woods." It is a well-written and fascinating account of her childhood in a frontier community.

Although Mrs. Wilder's books were written primarily for children, the stories have a universal appeal. The philosophy which they express is basic:

It is still best to be honest and truthful; to make the most of what we have; to be happy with simple pleasures; and to be cheerful and have courage when things go wrong.

Last fall, a historical marker honoring Mrs. Wilder was unveiled in Pepin's village park, which has been renamed Laura Ingalls Wilder Park. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial from the Courier-Wedge, Durand, Wis., concerning this event:

NEW PEPIN MEMORIAL

Late last fall, residents of Pepin staged an unveiling ceremony at a new historical marker in their village park. The marker honors Laura Ingalls Wilder, whose book, "Little House in the Big Woods," created national interest in the Pepin community. Many people who learn about Pepin through the book have visited this area; countless others send inquiries by letter.

Mrs. Wilder was born 7 miles north of Pepin in a little log house surrounded by a crooked rail fence. Today, the house and fence are gone. The big woods are gone, too. State Highway 183 passes through the former Ingalls farm, apparently following a wagon track described in the book.

Records in the courthouse at Durand show that Charles Ingalls acquired his farm in 1863. His famous daughter, Laura, was born February 7, 1867. The philosophy expressed in her books is basic: "It is still best to be honest and truthful; to make the most of what we have; to be happy with simple pleasures; and to be cheerful and have courage when things go wrong."

During the final years of her life, Mrs. Wilder and husband, Alamanzo, resided on a farm near Mansfield, Mo. After Mr. Wilder died in 1949, she lived alone until she succumbed February 10, 1957.

The wolves, bears, and panthers Mrs. Wilder described in her writings are gone from this area. One thing which still remains is the beautiful lake. It is just as beautiful as the first time Laura saw it on a trip to town. People catch fish in the lake just like her father did in 1870. Through the years, Lake Pepin has been a source of fish both for the sportsman and the commercial fisherman. Many fish are sold in eastern markets.

With respect to the noted author, Pepin Park has been renamed Laura Ingalls Wilder Park. People who pass through Pipin cannot miss the historical marker along Highway 35. Visitors are not disappointed to find the Ingalls house and the woods gone. As the author noted: "Now is now. It can never be a long time ago."

## CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

## PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

## GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

## RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

## LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

## CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

# Appendix

## The Kremlin Can't Kill Christmas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. J. GLENN BEALL**
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, January 16, 1963*

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the attention of the Senate a highly interesting article from the December 23, 1962, issue of Family Weekly by Ernest Conine, entitled "The Kremlin Can't Kill Christmas." Mr. Conine, one of McGraw-Hill's leading writers, spent 2 years in Moscow, Russia, as chief of McGraw-Hill's publication bureau. He is at present chief of their bureau in Boston, Mass., and editor of Business Week.

In these days it is encouraging and refreshing to me, as I am sure it is to the other Members of the Senate, to know that the spirit of Christmas still lives in the hearts of the Russian people.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE KREMLIN CAN'T KILL CHRISTMAS

(By Ernest Conine)

For more than 45 years, the Kremlin's propaganda machine has hammered away at the theme that Christmas is a fraud.

Yet one day next week hundreds of Soviet children will troop into the Great Kremlin Palace, the very citadel of Red atheism. There they will stare wide-eyed at a towering fir tree festooned with lights and bright baubles, and accept gifts from Grandfather Frost—a benign old gentleman who looks suspiciously like Santa Claus.

To be sure, the word "Christmas" will never be uttered, certainly not by the Kremlin sponsors. The gathering is calculated to instill in the children a devotion not to God but to the state.

Undoubtedly, the regime succeeds at least partially in this aim. But as a news correspondent who lived 2 years in Moscow, I can testify that the occasion also stands as a monument to the Kremlin's failure to erase Christmas from the hearts of the Soviet people.

Shortly after my arrival in Moscow, I stood shivering one day on Gorky Street, one of the capital's major thoroughfares. While waiting for a taxi, I pondered the sadness of the holiday season in Russia. It was Christmas morning, and I thought of the Nativity scenes in the store windows back home in America, the streets overhung with holly, the soft peal of church bells.

In Moscow, it appeared to be just another workday. Just one touch of color showed in the great, drab street—a huge red banner urging: "Onward to the Victory of Communism."

Anyone who lives in the U.S.S.R. learns, however, that beneath the dreary surface the Spirit of Bethlehem survives after all the years of propaganda, pressure, and persecution.

Small gifts, even crude Christmas cards, are exchanged among friends. And when I visited the home of one Russian during the holidays, I was surprised to see a Christmas tree; I knew they were unobtainable in the markets, "I cut it myself in the forests near Moscow," he explained. "Many of our people do so."

But more worrisome to the Kremlin is the fact that millions of professed atheists who never go to church any other time—even Communist Party members—attend the special Christmas services which are held on the evening of December 24 in Roman Catholic and Lutheran churches and on January 7 in the Russian Orthodox churches.

Take the case of Vasily, a Soviet journalist who once told me mockingly that: "Our cosmonauts found no God in space." One Christmas Eve I visited Moscow's St. Louis Cathedral, where attendance usually is light for normal services. But on this occasion, I could barely crowd in. As I surveyed the faces, I was struck by the number of young people there—including Vasily, who stood silent with his head bowed.

Although galled by the persistence of the Christian faith, Khrushchev and company cannot afford to return to the harsh persecutions of the Stalin era; the resulting discontent might dangerously impair industrial production.

The regime's current tactic is a flank attack. A clever campaign is underway to take Christ out of Christmas—to preserve the festive trappings while removing the religious content and turning the holiday to Communist purposes.

Christmas is not forbidden; it is simply ignored. But on New Year's Day, celebrations are held in workers' clubs and Young Pioneer Palaces all over Russia. The traditional Christmas tree is there, with all the trimmings. But it is called a New Year's tree, and the accent is on the glorious victories to be won by communism.

The children's party at the Kremlin is the most glittering of all, with admittance reserved for those who have especially distinguished themselves in Young Pioneer work for the Soviet state. Grandfather Frost, a rotund, white-bearded fellow with a sparkling suit, plays the traditional role of Saint Nicholas.

The authorities go all out to make the celebration a truly happy and memorable one. They hope the youngsters will grow up identifying this occasion with the party, not the church.

At home, most Russian families now have a tiny tree of their own. Again, it is called a New Year's tree, at least in the presence of foreigners. But it is significant that the tree usually stays in place until January 8, the day after the Russian Orthodox Christmas—even in the homes of my godless Soviet acquaintances.

## Erosion of American Fishing Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. THOMAS M. PELLY**
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, joint House-Senate hearings are scheduled to be held in Seattle, February 13–14, in connection with North Pacific halibut conservation. The purpose of such hearings is to review results of the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission which meets in Tokyo on February 5 and to obtain information as to the effect on American fishermen of the recent opening of the East Bering Sea halibut fishery to Japanese fishermen by this Commission.

Meanwhile, a recent issue of the Fishermen's News contains a guest editorial by George Johansen, secretary of the Alaska Fishermen's Union. This editorial which expresses great concern over the erosion of American fishing rights, follows:

UNITED STATES CHALLENGED IN HALIBUT CONTROVERSY

(By George Johansen)

Considering the efforts made by the United States and the long uphill struggle we had to rebuild the halibut fishery, it is our opinion that we have a special and preferential right because, without our efforts, the halibut would not be found in commercial quantities on the open ocean today.

Moreover, through research conducted by the Halibut Commission, a pattern of migration from Bering Sea to the Gulf of Alaska as been established. On the basis of that research, we can consider that eastern Bering Sea is, in fact, a nursery ground for part of the halibut caught south of the Aleutian Islands. The reports of the Halibut Commission show that when heavy catches were made north of the Aleutians, a decline in catches was experienced south of the Aleutians The relationship between Bering Sea and other districts of Alaska has definitely been established.

By the terms of the tripartite treaty, any of the participating nations can open up the treaty for negotiations as of June 1963. In accordance with expressions made in Japanese newspapers and fishery periodicals, the Japanese will go all out for abolishment of the abstention principle, and this is a fact which we must face in forthcoming negotiations. The only hope of adequate protection for the American fisheries in the new treaty, lies in full and complete support from our Government. Appeasement and soft talk are not going to accomplish desired results.

In our previous discussions with the Departments of State and Interior, we have received their assurances they will support the abstention principle. We hope those assurances mean that the United States will provide the necessary pressure to implement the promise of support which they have made to the fishing industry.

WORD "ABSTENTION" NEEDED

There already has been some talk of finding language which would substitute some other word for "abstention"—a word which would be less objectionable to the Japanese. In our opinion, this would be disastrous and would not give us the protection we seek; in fact, it could be a circumvention of the abstention principle.

I would respectfully call to your attention that the present treaty has not granted the Japanese any historical fishing rights on North American stocks of salmon on the open ocean. It has specifically stated that the Japanese should abstain from the taking

of North American stocks of salmon. In spite of this and due to what we term "an erosion of the principle of the treaty," the Japanese have taken millions upon millions of North American salmon west of the provisional line. They have been given the red carpet treatment, and while we must and should maintain good relations with the Japanese, we should not appease them to a point where our salmon resource will be destroyed for all time to come.

We note that the U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries has stated that the recommendation of the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission on eastern Bering Sea halibut will be referred to and given most careful study by the Departments of State and Interior. In the first place, the action taken by the Commission was strongly recommended by the advisors of the State and Interior Departments, so it would be very unlikely that those advisors would now comment unfavorably in any way on the Commission's decision. If such review of the decision is conducted by the same representatives who attended the ninth annual meeting of the Commission, then we should discount such review as having little merit under the circumstances.

The salmon, halibut, king crab and other fisheries on the Pacific coast are of utmost importance to the Pacific Northwest, including Alaska. The fishermen on this coast are not unreasonable—they believe in following orderly and lawful procedures, but, in this instance, they feel their rights have been compromised. We had a fuller utilization of halibut in Bering Sea in 1962 than in any previous years, but still, in 1962, we are told to give up rights which we had earned over a period of 40 years.

ECONOMIC IMPACT

We think there are three considerations embodied in our fishery problems, namely: political, economic, and scientific. In the case of eastern Bering Sea halibut, it is our view that the only aspect which was given any consideration was on the scientific side. Recognition should be given to the economic impact upon the fishermen who have to catch those fish to make a living. Down through the years, we have supported all appropriations for scientific fishery research because we believe that in order to successfully manage our fisheries, we must have scientific knowledge. On the other hand, we would not want theorists and biologists to completely dominate the fisheries, and it appears to us that the trend is in that direction.

I believe a treaty is necessary for our future protection. All of us have a responsibility to recognize that fact. I do not believe we can achieve worthwhile results by retreating and appeasement. I would recommend the immediate charter of one or two vessels to conduct necessary research work in the Bering Sea area, to provide additional information needed.

The reaction and opposition to the decision shown by the many hundreds of people who attended the Seattle meeting on December 7, was a clear indication of the tremendous interest and concern the fishing industry has in regard to Government policies pertaining to our fisheries.

The Committee To Save Halibut, composed of various segments of the fishing industry, has forwarded a resolution which we believe should be seriously considered and should constitute policies to be followed in the future.

We must stop the erosion of American rights. As a nation, we have sincerely strived for sound conservation of our fisheries—we have sacrificed to make that program possible and we believe we have a right to enjoy the fruits of our labors.

## Mists of the Deep

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, January 16, 1963*

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Davis Y. Paschall, president, College of William and Mary, entitled "Mists of the Deep" which was made at the launching of the *Henry Clay* at Newport News on November 30, 1962.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISTS OF THE DEEP
(By David Y. Paschall)

It is pertinent to ask why a naval craft, outfitted with the most powerful striking force of the atomic age, should bear the name of one of American history's most effective men of peace. The answer is not difficult, of course, when we recall the historic mission of America itself, which has always been to preserve a just peace among men and nations. The answer is amplified when we consider the main features in the life of Henry Clay himself, and consider again some of his great pronouncements on the destiny of the Nation he loved and served so well.

Henry Clay was born in Hanover County, Va., on April 12, 1777. He grew up in the shadow of the great Virginians of the Revolutionary era—men like Jefferson, Pendleton, and Wythe. It was under Chancellor Wythe—as it had been with Jefferson and John Marshall—that Clay studied law. During his period of study he also served as Mr. Wythe's secretary, and under his inspiring personality Henry Clay grasped the fundamentals not only of the law but of the classics of Western literature and political philosophy that were to characterize his great papers throughout his public life.

At the age of 26, as a resident of the new frontier State of Kentucky, Mr. Clay was elected to the State legislature—and 2 years later to an unexpired term of a U.S. Senator, thus beginning that public career which covered the first half of the 19th century, until his death in 1852. For more than a dozen years in the House of Representatives, and for almost 20 years in the Senate, Henry Clay steered the young United States through the crisis of the Missouri Compromise of 1820 and in his dying years helped shape the Compromise of 1850, by which in two different generations he sought to save the country from the perils of civil war.

As a member of the U.S. Peace Commission in 1814 he witnessed the satisfactory conclusion of the War of 1812, while as Secretary of State under John Quincy Adams he helped effectively to dispose of some of the lingering contentions over trade and national rights which had been fomented by the Napoleonic period. In the compromise of 1832, involving the furious domestic quarrel over tariffs and nullification, he again demonstrated the ruling philosophy of his life—let all parties be prepared to make reasonable sacrifices in the interest of the national peace and harmony. Twenty years later, at the end of his long life of service, the eulogies of onetime political opponents aptly quoted the poet's lines:

"Born when freedom her stars and stripes unfurl'd,
When revolution shook the startled world—
Heroes and sages taught his brilliant mind
To know and love the rights of all mankind."

This is the man we honor on this occasion—Virginian, Kentuckian, American—the man of whom the attribution, "I'd rather be right than be President," has become part of our political heritage—the man whose reputation as "the Great Compromiser" has been universally recognized not as a yielding to any pressure to abandon principles but a constant desire to sacrifice the personal interest where the national interest required it. As a practicing lawyer he always chose to represent the defense against the State. As a diplomat he supported the South American wars of independence and the Greek revolt against the Turks. As an expansionist he stated a characteristic policy with regard to Texas—that its annexation should be only under conditions "without dishonor, without war, with the common consent of the Union, and upon just and fair terms." If it is true that this creed cost him his last chance for the Presidency, it gave this country something much more valuable in his legacy.

On this occasion it might be interesting to quote an early comment from Henry Clay—made in Congress in 1812, during a debate on the expansion of the U.S. Navy. While many contemporary emotions and factors entered into the debate, Mr. Clay accurately foresaw the role that the young country must assume if it were truly to have a voice in the councils of the great nations. He spoke against a motion to reduce the naval forces, and in the process made this prophetic observation:

"But the source of alarm is in ourselves. Gentlemen fear, that if we provide a marine, it will produce collisions with foreign nations; plunge us into war, and ultimately overturn the Constitution of the country. Sir, if you wish to avoid foreign collision, you had better abandon the ocean; surrender all your commerce; give up all your prosperity. It is the thing protected, not the instrument of protection, that involves you in war. Commerce engenders collision, collision war, and war, the argument supposes, leads to despotism. Would the counsels of that statesman be deemed wise, who would recommend that the nation should be unarmed; that the art of war, the martial spirit, and martial exercises, should be prohibited; who should declare, in the language of Othello, that the nation must bid farewell to the neighing steed, and the shrill trump, the spirit-stirring drum, the ear-piercing fife, and all the pride, pomp, and circumstance of glorious war; and that the great body of the people should be taught, that national happiness was to be found in perpetual peace alone? No, sir. And yet, every argument in favor of a power of protection on land, applies, in some degree, to a power of protection on the sea. Undoubtedly a commerce void of naval protection is more exposed to rapacity than a guarded commerce; and if we wish to invite the continuance of the old, or the enactment of new edicts, let us refrain from all exertion upon that element where we must operate, and where, in the end, they must be resisted."

In 1818, Henry Clay again voiced an American creed in his support of the independence movements in Latin America. Again, what he said in that creed has a striking pertinence to our present situation:

"Our Revolution was mainly directed against the mere theory of tyranny. We had suffered comparatively but little; we had, in

some respects, been kindly treated; but our intrepid and intelligent fathers saw, in the usurpation of the power to levy an inconsiderable tax, the long train of oppressive acts that were to follow. They rose; they breasted the storm; they achieved our freedom. Spanish America for centuries has been doomed to the practical effects of an odious tyranny. If we were justified, she is more than justified.

"I am no propagandist. I would not seek to force upon other nations our principles and our liberty, if they do not want them. I would not disturb the repose even of a detestable despotism. But, if an abused and oppressed people will their freedom; if they seek to establish it; if, in truth, they have established it; we have a right, as a sovereign power, to notice the fact, and to act as circumstances and our interest require. I will say, in the language of the venerated father of my country, 'born in a land of liberty, my anxious recollections, my sympathetic feelings, and my best wishes, are irresistibly excited, whensoever, in any country, I see an oppressed nation unfurl the banners of freedom.'"

Again may I quote to you from Henry Clay, in a passage full of import for our own time. Here he speaks in support of a resolution to authorize steps leading to recognition of the Greek revolutionaries in their fight against the Turks, and in his speech he deals with the charge that bold action on a matter of principle may bring the United States face to face with grave international dangers:

"This Government, you, Mr. Chairman, and the body over which you preside, are the living and cutting reproach to allied despotism. If we are to offend them, it is not by passing this resolution. We are daily and hourly giving them cause of war. It is here, and in our free institutions, that they will assail us. They will attack us because you sit beneath that canopy, and we are freely debating and deliberating upon the great interests of freemen, and dispensing the blessings of free government. They will strike, because we pass one of those bills on your table. The passage of the least of them, by our free authority, is more galling to despotic powers, than would be the adoption of this so much dreaded resolution. Pass it, and what do you do? You exercise an indisputable attribute of sovereignty, for which you are responsible to none of them."

This is the man whose name most fittingly is now to be identified with a powerful instrument of peace and the enforcement of right dealing among nations. Henry Clay was a man of peace—but of peace which was reconciled with principle. He shared with Plato the conviction that with nations as with individuals, it is not death, but the failure to attain the just life, which is most to be feared. He lived in a time when the idea of freedom was threatened by different forces, but with as much sinister power, as it is today. He was born during one conflict, and was just beginning his public career when a second was fought on his native soil.

And now we prepare to dedicate another mission in the name of Henry Clay, in our own time. How striking are some of the parallels between his day and ours, and between the issues on which he spoke and those which now confront us.

There are—today as in 1812—those who question whether, with forces of destruction in the hands of those who hate everything democracy stands for, we should not constantly look to our own capacity to strike back.

There are—today as in 1818—forces at work for freedom and forces at work to destroy freedom among our great sister states of Latin America. Can anyone question what our course should be, today, as when the Monroe Doctrine was first in the process of evolution?

There are—today as in 1824—threats to independent nations around the borders of the great Eurasian land mass which represents the unhappy fortress of totalitarianism. Henry Clay saw the support of the Greek patriots as a duty we owed to our own concept of freedom; we are committed to the same viewpoint, essentially, in our decision to resist infiltration and aggression seeking to destroy the free governments of southeast Asia.

The chief difference between our world and that of Henry Clay is simply one of magnitude. The threat to freedom is now worldwide. The capacity for destruction is now a thousandfold greater in the atomic age. Can there be any question but that our response to these challenges must be in proportion?

It is a rather striking coincidence that when Henry Clay spoke in support of an expanded Navy in 1812, he was urging the construction of a number of frigates not quite as large as the number of nuclear submarines now being augmented by his namesake. The modern U.S.S. *Henry Clay* will be the 15th nuclear submarine launched in the national program to guard the frontiers of freedom throughout the world. It gives a proper pride to Virginians to note that so many of the submarines in the Navy's ballistic missile or Polaris system have taken their names from the sons of this Commonwealth who helped launch this great Nation—the *George Washington*, which deployed on her first patrol 2 years ago this month; the *Patrick Henry* and the *Robert E. Lee*, the *John Marshall*, the *Thomas Jefferson* and the *James Monroe*, with the keel already laid for the *James Madison*. A salute of pride is, also, the earned accolade of this great shipyard—the builder of so powerful a deterrent to aggression and so striking a protector of the peace.

It is the happy and solemn responsibility of this generation to preserve what our great forefathers handed down to us. In this century, it has sometimes been an unfortunate practice to treat our heritage as something we have outgrown. The truth is, not only that it is inescapable because it is part of us, but that heritage is our only justification for continued existence as a free people. "Let us now praise famous men"—the early Americans who are living characters in our own living history. Let me assess them in the words of a leading modern American historian:

"Whom did the American revere, whom did he condemn? Who were the models held up to the emulation of the young? Every child carried with him a number of images of the father of his country: The boy George with his hatchet—'Father, I cannot tell a lie'; the young Washington on Braddock's field; Washington crossing the Delaware; kneeling in prayer at Valley Forge; adjusting his spectacles as he addresses his comrades in arms—'I have grown not only gray but almost blind in the service of my country'; retiring in the end to Mount Vernon. He was clearly first in war and first in peace, yet too remote and formidable to be first in the hearts of his countrymen. That place in the affections of Americans was long held rather by Benjamin Franklin, who was recalled more familiarly munching his loaf of bread, trundling his wheelbarrow through the streets of Philadelphia, flying his kite, compiling the homey ophorisms that adorned a hundred readers, and flaunting his fur cap at the court of Versailles. When Poor Richard seemed too tame, there was the fiery Patrick Henry, and every schoolboy knew that Caesar had his Brutus, and echoed, with appropriate gestures, the invitation to 'Give me liberty or give me death.' Besides these, there was a splendid gallery of lesser heroes: John Smith saved by the beautiful Pocahontas; Roger Williams trekking through the snow to Narragansett Bay; Daniel Boone hewing out the wilderness trail; Paul Revere on his midnight ride; Jefferson penning the Declaration; Marion the Swamp Fox; Nathan Hale with but one life to lose for his country; Ethan Allen to whom profanity was permitted; * * * Perry who met the enemy at Put-in-Bay; Decatur who burned the *Philadelphia* in Tripoli Harbor; Jackson who went straight from New Orleans to the White House. All of them, in the end, made way for Lincoln, the very apotheosis of the American, too homely for idolatry, too inscrutable for mere history, a legend before the lilacs bloomed again. These were his heroes: A people could have worse."

In the perspective of time, we can honor men who in their day were often violently opposed to each other—Clay and Andrew Jackson, Jefferson and Marshall, Lee and Lincoln. We honor them because they all exercised the two basic responsibilities of freemen—first, to arrive at a conviction of national welfare based upon honest judgment and integrity; second, to accept the consequences of standing by that conviction.

It is to protect such a heritage that we send forth our armed naval forces to patrol. Because the international waters of the world cover about 70 percent of the world's surface, this is the tactical area in which the patrol should operate. Contemporary need and our own historic policy has settled the question of whether we should choose this course of action—in the words of Henry Clay, "If you wish to avoid foreign collision, you had better abandon the ocean." Rather, we have chosen to use that ocean for protective purposes, and to equip our underwater forces with the facilities of the atomic age—almost unlimited cruising range and endurance limited only by the human capacities of the crew; mobility, secret deployment, constant readiness for action, or carefully considered delayed action.

The American of 1962 does not shrink from the task of following where his fathers walked. He sees again in his mind's eye the "mists of the deep" which slowly and fatefully unfolded over Fort McHenry to show that "our flag was still there," unyielding against the most powerful forces hurled against it. He remembers the Confederates who died on Little Round Top at Gettysburg, and the Union soldiers who died in the Crater at Petersburg. He remembers John Paul Jones who had just begun to fight when he seemed about to be overwhelmed, and the GI's caught in the Battle of the Bulge and their one-word answer to a demand to surrender.

This is the heritage whose preservation we trust to the American of 1962, and which the new U.S.S. *Henry Clay* carries in the armor of the Polaris missile. It is now to be launched, with the dedication of another sailor whose life mission was described by the poet:

"Though much is taken, much abides; and though
We are not now that strength which in old days
Moved earth and heavn; that which we are, we are;
One equal temper of heroic hearts,
Made weak by time and fate, but strong in will
To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield."

## Texas Loses Distinguished Citizen in Death of Former Representative Joe H. Eagle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, January 16, 1963*

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Texas has lost a champion of the people, a distinguished citizen in the death of the Honorable Joe H. Eagle, who served his State in Congress from 1913 to 1921 and from 1933 to 1936.

He was a man of exceptional brilliance, who was superintendent of schools in Vernon, Tex., before he was 20 years old and had served as city attorney in Wichita Falls, Tex., before he was 25—having passed the State bar examination while holding the school administrative job.

Mr. Eagle was a close friend of President Woodrow Wilson. He was a leader in legislative action setting up the Federal Reserve bank law and in farm loan legislation that enabled so many landless farmworkers to acquire their own property.

I ask unanimous consent that an article and an editorial from the Houston Press of Friday, January 11, captioned "Joe H. Eagle" and "Joe Eagle, Scholar and Congressman," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOE EAGLE, SCHOLAR AND CONGRESSMAN

Joe H. Eagle, scholar, ex-Congressman, statesman, attorney, philosopher and poet, died Thursday at the age of 92 at his home at 3424 Wickersham.

A Houston resident for 67 years, the man who cracked jokes in Greek with President Woodrow Wilson succumbed after a 3-day illness.

Mr. Eagle had been confined to a wheelchair following leg injuries when he fell under a bus in 1958.

Born in Tompkinsville, Ky., January 23, 1870, he finished all courses in the little town's school and obtained his first-grade teacher's certificate when he was only 14.

HIGH MAN IN CLASS

Three years later, in 1887, he completed a 5-year course at Burritt College in Spencer, Tenn. He was high man and valedictorian of his class.

Mr. Eagle once told a Press reporter:

"I was 9 years old when my mother told me to be honest and truthful, to work at every task, never to touch liquor.

MOVED TO TEXAS

"She wanted me to become a scholar, a lawyer, an orator, a Congressman—like Henry Clay. That became the program of my life."

He never tasted alcoholic beverage.

In 1887, Kentucky's loss became Texas' gain when Mr. Eagle moved to Vernon, where he was superintendent of schools when he was only 19.

On Sundays and holidays he studied the University of Virginia law course by correspondence. After passing the Texas bar examination he became a lawyer.

He moved to Wichita Falls and was elected city attorney at 24.

CAME HERE IN 1895

Houston was a city of 40,000 in 1895 when he moved his law offices here. Recently, his offices were in the First City National Bank Building.

In 1900, by then a prosperous attorney, Mr. Eagle married pretty Mary Hamman of Houston. Mrs. Eagle died in 1939.

Twice in his lifetime, Mr. Eagle gave unstintingly of himself to his Nation.

SERVED IN CONGRESS

He served 8 years in Congress from 1913 to 1921. Then again, starting in 1933, he was elected for two more terms. Both times he retired voluntarily.

It was during his earlier term, as a Member of the House of Representatives, that Mr. Eagle and President Woodrow Wilson became close friends.

Both men spoke Greek and often exchanged jokes in that language.

FOUGHT THE KLAN

Mr. Eagle was a champion of free silver, a bitter opponent of the Ku Klux Klan, and argued against women's suffrage, explaining he believed the latter to be a States right matter.

For the same reason he fought prohibition.

He helped write the Federal Reserve bank law and was the author of the farm loan bill, which enabled hundreds of thousands of tenant farmers to acquire their own homesteads.

JOE H. EAGLE

The death of Joe H. Eagle at 92 years—and so long retired from public life—will send many an oldtime Houstonian's memory shuttling back 25, 50, perhaps even more years.

Elected to Congress here from 1913 to 1921 and again from 1933–36, Mr. Eagle was by far one of earlier-day Houston's most popular political figures.

Self-taught scholar, philosopher, poet, and gifted storyteller, he was even more popular with those who knew him personally.

Mr. Eagle was born in a small Kentucky town, finished all the schooling offered when 14, and at that tender age won a teacher's certificate.

He completed a 5-year college course in Tennessee in 3 years. At only 19, he came to Texas to be superintendent of schools in Vernon.

While in that position, he studied law and passed the Texas bar examination, served as city attorney in Wichita Falls then came to Houston to practice law—all by the time he was 25.

That is a formal picture of the young Joe H. Eagle but even the recital of these accomplishments do him scant justice.

Joe Eagle would fight a circle saw if he thought he was right and the saw was wrong. He proved it many, many times—as a public official and as a private attorney.

When it was almost official suicide to do so, he opposed women's suffrage on a national basis. The right to say who voted belonged only the the States, he believed. No pressures swayed him. When Ku Klux Klan fever swept Texas around 1920, he was among the first to denounce it as mob rule. When the Nation wracked itself with the pains of-pro- and anti-prohibition, Joe Eagle, a personal teetotaler, fought prohibition, again as an invasion of States rights.

With all his firm views and his largely self-acquired erudition (he was famed for cracking jokes in ancient Greek with scholarly President Woodrow Wilson), Joe Eagle was a fairminded, friendly, and modest man unusually tolerant of and courteous to others.

Joe H. Eagle was a fine gentleman who lived a long, useful life, highly respected and admired even by those who differed with him.

## American Success Story Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, January 16, 1963*

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on December 11, 1962, the American Success Story Awards were presented by the Free Enterprise Awards Association, Inc. Receiving the awards were two women and eight men whose accomplishments symbolize the success possible to all under America's free enterprise system. Each of the award recipients rose from humble jobs to head or own large industries.

I am particularly proud that my own State was represented at the proceedings in the person of Mr. Talbot T. Speer, Free Enterprise Awards Association awards chairman. Mr. Speer is himself an example of the American success story.

Mr. President, we often lose sight of the fact that our country continues to offer opportunities for success to all who are willing to strive for it. To emphasize this, I ask unanimous consent that an article included in the December 11 issue of the Annapolis Evening Capital, together with brief statements made by the award recipients, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AWARDS CHAIRMAN SPEER SYMBOLIZES TRAITS OF AWARDEES

Of the many words of praise written about FEAA Awards Chairman Talbot T. Speer, none more succiently summarized his character, fighting spirit and service to his community than those of Charles P. Crane, former president and chairman of the Baltimore Gas & Electric Co., who now is the firm's executive committee chairman.

Said Crane, in introducing Speer as he was to be honored by the Newcomen Society in North America:

"He has carried energy and determination with him through his business career. His drive and will to succeed have never diminished. A man of action, he often has stepped into difficult and patriotic chores because of his belief in the cause they represented. And I'm happy to say, he has been instrumental in leading them to successful goals."

Speer has, indeed, been a fighter all of his life.

Following great athletic achievements at the University of Maryland and the University of Virginia in football and track, he became an officer of the famous U.S. Army 1st Division which so highly distinguished itself in France.

His leadership and courage with field artillery won for him one of the few Silver Stars that were awarded for heroism.

Captain Speer also returned to the United States at the close of the war wearing, in addition to the U.S. Silver Star Medal, the French Fourragere, Croix de Guerre Medal, and the right to wear the Purple Heart ribbon.

At stages throughout his more recent life, the Government has continued to cite Speer for his service on commissions. A number of certificates have been presented to him for Federal service rendered in connection

with our country's war and economic efforts.

Since 1922, Speer has been president, general manager, and chairman of the board of the Baltimore Salesbook Co., and more recently also of Baltimore Business Forms Co. These huge printing firms have offices in all sections of the United States. Like the newspapers, these companies have expanded many times under Speer's leadership.

He also is president-publisher of the Capital-Gazette Press, Inc., of Annapolis, Md., which publishes the Maryland Gazette—America's oldest newspaper—the daily Evening Capital, the weekly Brooklyn (Md.) News, and the County News.

And in 1951, he created the philanthropic Talbot T. Speer Foundation.

Speer was born in Pittsburgh, Pa., and was educated at the Brennens and Bradshaw Schools, Pittsburgh, the Episcopal High School, Alexandria, Va., the University of Virginia and the University of Maryland.

TOOK OVER REINS IN 1921

He was a salesman for the Daniel Miller Co., of Baltimore, from 1919 to 1921, became the assistant to the president of the Baltimore Salesbook Co. in 1921 and that same year became president and chairman of the board of the company.

He is the founder and president of National Education Fund, Inc., of Baltimore.

Speer lives at Friendship Hill, in Baltimore County, and also owns a large estate directly on the ocean at Delray Beach, Fla. He and Mrs. Speer have three sons, Talbot T. Speer, Jr., J. L. Dawson Speer 3d, and Ramsey Speer, and a daughter, Jane Alexander Speer.

Speer has been a director of the Union Trust Co. of Maryland since 1947 and was a director of the Baltimore Association of Commerce, 1935–40, Baltimore Convention Bureau, 1946–48, the County Taxpayers League of Baltimore County since 1945, and a director of the U.S. Naval Academy Foundation, 1950–54.

He has been a member of the Higher Education Commission of Maryland since 1945, and was on the prison board, 1948–50, the War Production Board, 1940–45, the Industrial Mobilization Commission since 1950 and the U.S. Army Advisory Commission since 1947.

LONG ACTIVE IN NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS

A member of the National Association of Manufacturers, he was a senior director representing Maryland from 1947 to 1950. He is a member of the Accounting Supply Manufacturers Association, a director of the Associated Industries of Maryland, being president in 1951; president of the Salesbook Manufacturers Association, and was president of the alumni association, the University of Maryland for two years starting in 1950.

Speer also is a member of the Newcomen Society, the Navy League, the Society of the First Division, AEF; American Legion, Purple Heart, and Delta Psi. He is an Episcopalian, being member of the lay council, procathedral of Maryland, 1925–54.

He was director, Baltimore Association of Commerce, 1935–39; director, Keystone Automobile Club, 1943–51; director, the Campaign for the 48 States, 1953–59; director, the Defenders of the Constitution of the United States, 1953–59; director, the alumni fund, University of Virginia, for the class of 1915, from 1930 to 1959; director, the alumni fund for the University of Maryland, 1957–59.

Also, director, the Eastern Business Forms Co., 1957; first president, director, and organizer, the Associated Industries of Maryland, 1949–51; president and founder, National Educational Foundation, Inc., Baltimore, Md., 1951–59.

He was general chairman, the Gen. Douglas MacArthur celebration in the State of Maryland, 1952. Member of the Society of the First Division, AEF, the American Legion, the Purple Heart, the Delta Psi Fraternity.

Also, member the lay council of the Episcopal procathedral of Maryland from 1925 to 1954. Member of the vestry of the Episcopal Cathedral Church of the Incarnation, Baltimore, Md., 1924–56, chairman of the Consolidation of the Church of the Incarnation and Emanuel Protestant Episcopal Churches, 1953. Member, vestry of St. Paul's Episcopal Church, Delray Beach, Fla., 1952–53.

ACTIVE IN MANY ORGANIZATIONS

He belongs to the following clubs: Rotary, Bachelors Cotillion, Elkridge Kennels, Greenspring Valley Hunt, president, Carrollton Hounds; president, Wythmore Hounds; Baltimore Country Club, Annapolis Yacht Club, Annapolitan Club.

Also, St. Anthony Club, Lake Placid Club, Everglades Club, National Press Club, the Gulf Stream Golf Club, Newcomen Society; president, alumni association, University of Virginia, of Maryland, 1925–27.

Also, member, Higher Education Committee of the State of Maryland, 1945–53; chairman of the Community Fund, publishers committee, 1936–39; member of the prison board of the State of Maryland, 1948–49.

Also, chairman, the business and industry sections of the American Red Cross, 1936–39. Member, NRA, representing the business forms industry, 1933–35. Member, the War Production Board, representing the Business forms industry, 1940–45.

He was cited by U.S. Government, and awarded a certificate of merit for services to the national war effort. Member, the Industrial Mobilization Committee, 1949–58.

He was chairman, the committee to run the National Amateur Golf Championship, 1932.

He was nominated Man of the Year for 1950 in the South by the southern newspapers as announced in Publishers Auxiliary and the editors of Dixie Business magazine. Served on War Manpower Commission as judge of labor management problems, 1944–45.

Chairman, the committee celebrating (in protest of the enormous taxes of 1957) the burning of the Peggy Stewart (burned in protest of the taxes of 1775).

Trustee the Episcopal High School, Alexandria, Va., 1930–33. Chairman of the building campaign committee for the Episcopal Cathedral of the Incarnation in Baltimore, 1930–32. General chairman, Cathedral Church of the Incarnation building campaign committee, 1954.

Donated a room in the parish house at St. Anne's Episcopal Church, Annapolis, Md., 1956. Second largest contributor to rebuilding program of the Episcopal High School, 1945–46.

Second largest contributor in the 1953 rebuilding drive for the Episcopal High School, and served on campaign committee. Donated new chapel to Sunday school, St. Paul's Episcopal Church, Delray Beach, Fla., 1953.

Donated two adjoining building lots to St. Paul's Episcopal Church in 1955, an air conditioner and heating unit for the rectory in 1958. Donated wing to the young people's building, Episcopal Church of the Incarnation, Baltimore, Md., 1954.

Donated room to the Women's Building of St. John's College, Annapolis, Md., 1953. Donates yearly to the pay of the underpaid clergy of the Episcopal Church Diocese of Maryland. Chairman of board of advisers for Maryland, Western Tax Council, Inc., 1954–55. Selected frequently, including 1960–61, to present the American success story awards for the Free Enterprise Awards Association. Advisory board, U.S. Air Patrol, 1954–55.

STATEMENTS MADE BY FEAA 1962 AMERICAN SUCCESS STORY AWARDS RECIPIENTS PRAISING AMERICA'S FREE ENTERPRISE DEMOCRACY AND ADVICE TO THOSE SEEKING SUCCESS

Walter J. Tuohy, president, Chesapeake & Ohio Railway: "A company's success, as does a nation's, depends on the loyalty and dedication of its people. Teamwork, sharing of problems and freedom of opinion, assures the success of any endeavor. Just as despotism in government or business crushes the human spirit, so does democracy bring out the dignity of the individual—the best in citizen or worker."

John D. MacArthur, president, Bankers Life & Casualty Co.: "In our democracy any person can reach for the rainbow. Don't stop if you come up with a fistful of air. If you stop trying you start dying."

J. Donovan Forney, owner, Forney Industries, Inc.: "In our free enterprise democracy workers have the best working conditions, benefits and own shares in industries. Yet don't be too 'chicken' to go into business for yourself or you might end up with nothing to crow about. Faith in God, your Nation and your ability will bring peace and success."

Mrs. Mae Bonnell Sauls, president, The William Bonnell Co.: "Free enterprise is the only economic system that gives each of us the right to be what we want to be, including the right a woman has to make business or homemaking her career."

Mrs. Zella Ritz-Woller, president, King Bee Manufacturing Co.: "America gives equal opportunity to men and women. Success in a man's world is not always through pleasing his palate. Give him a good product and you will succeed. If men can make ladies' dresses why can't a woman make safety lighting and products for truck-drivers?"

Dudley D. Sherman, president, National Chemical & Manufacturing Co.: "I am just one of the thousands of Russian and other immigrants who achieved success and freedom in America. Our success is a tribute to America's free enterprise democracy and proof that it works for all."

Harold F. Coffey, president, Kent-Coffey Manufacturing Co.: "In our democracy you are free to build your own business. You can make it last forever—like the work of the Old Masters, if you put beauty, durability, and craftsmanship into any product you make."

Dr. Charles D. Bradley, president, Bradley Semiconductor Corp.: "America's free enterprise gives incentive to original research. Anyone is free to develop new and better products and enrich himself and his fellow men. Our competitive system insures success for better 'traps.'"

James Ralph Riley, president, Suburban Motor Freight, Inc.: "Success in America's democracy is assured if you give unselfish service to your customers and your community. Help improve the areas you serve and you will prosper in material and spiritual values."

Lilburn S. Barksdale, president, Barksdale Valves: "In our democracy one can achieve personal and business fulfillment if he couples determination to succeed with personal integrity in his dealings with employees and customers and has a sincere desire to be of service to his fellow men."

---

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

# Appendix

## Tax Cutting Without Expenditure Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS**
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in a comment on the December 1962 report on tax reduction issued by the Committee for Economic Development, Mr. Gaylord A. Freeman, Jr., vice president of the First National Bank of Chicago and a member of the Committee for Economic Development's Fiscal, Monetary and Debt Management Subcommittee, has made a highly useful contribution to our thinking about the subject of tax reduction and reform.

Mr. Freeman takes the position that tax reduction must be accompanied by an offsetting increase in revenues or a reduction in expenditures. He points to the seriously adverse effects which increased budget deficits might have on our gold and balance-of-payments position. Essentially, he takes the position that expenditure and rate reform must accompany rate reduction because of the imperative necessity for maintaining world confidence in the dollar.

Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Freeman's remarks in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF COMMENT, RESERVATION OR DISSENT BY GAYLORD A. FREEMAN, JR., IN COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, REDUCING TAX RATES FOR PRODUCTION AND GROWTH

I cannot join in the recommendations for a massive tax cut unless accompanied by an offsetting increase in revenues or reduction in expenditures. While the objectives which the committee's proposal is designed to obtain, namely, economic growth and reduced unemployment, are highly desirable, the necessity to maintain world confidence in the dollar is imperative, more important, in my view, than even an increase in the rate of economic growth.

If one assumes that the Federal budget at fiscal 1964 will result in a deficit in the administrative budget of about the present magnitude, $8 billion, in the absence of a tax cut, the loss of the first step cut of about $6 billion would (without allowance for the additional revenue that would be collected on the resulting increase of national income) result in a total administrative budget deficit of $14 billion. If we make the highly optimistic assumption that in the first year, as much as one-half of the cut would be recovered (through the tax on increased national income), that would mean perhaps an $11 billion administrative budget deficit in 1964. Such deficits may well persist in subsequent years.

Foreign governments and central banks now have $24.2 billion of short-term claims against us, for which we promise to pay gold if the creditors ask for it. But we have only $15.9 billion of gold. If we adjust for the fluctuations caused by Canada's recent payments difficulties and for the nonrecurring repayments of foreign aid loans, our balance-of-payments deficit this year will be about $2.5 billion—no gain over last year despite considerable effort. There is little reason to expect significant improvement immediately ahead. Under such circumstances, a wise debtor would pursue a course calculated to enhance the creditor's confidence. He would make every effort to operate at a surplus and reduce his indebtedness. But we propose to do just the contrary, to operate at a deeper deficit and to increase our indebtedness.

If our foreign creditors think they see the recurrence of inflationary pressures here, they may prefer to repatriate their funds. We are tempted to ignore this risk on the basis that even a massive deficit will not cause price increases when there is high unemployment and excess capacity. But as recently as 1954 to 1958 with unemployment averaging over 5 percent for the period, and with extensive idle plant capacity, the wholesale price index rose 8.1 percent and the consumer price index 7.6 percent—and this in a period when the annual deficit for the 5 years averaged only a little over $1 billion.

Continued budget deficits of the order of $10 billion or more (particularly if accompanied by an easy-money policy) may well cause our foreign creditors to prefer gold to dollars. Once they make that choice, their knowledge that we do not have enough gold for all may aggravate their withdrawal. We may find our country faced with the unhappy choice of refusal to pay in gold or devaluation. This we should not risk.

It is because of the imperative necessity for maintaining world confidence in the dollar, more important in my view than even an increase in the rate of economic growth, that I cannot join in the recommendations for a massive tax cut without some offset—either a comparable reduction in expenditures, which is desirable, but perhaps politically unrealistic, or an equivalent increase in other taxes which is difficult but in my judgment attainable.

## U.S. Naval Academy Class of 1966: Profile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD**
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy, I know the concern of its members for the well-being of that important educational institution. As a Member of the Congress, I also realize the efforts made to select candidates of quality, which is a basic first step in the making of a high-grade officer corps.

It was, therefore, with the keenest interest that I read in the November 1962 issue of Shipmate, the magazine of the U.S. Naval Academy Alumni Association, a most illuminating analysis of the backgrounds and qualifications of the midshipmen entering the Naval Academy in 1962 (class of 1966).

As the information therein contained will be helpful to all Members of the Congress and others charged with responsibility in the making of future appointments to all the service academies, I quote the indicated article as part of my remarks:

PROFILE—U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY CLASS OF 1966

This profile of the entering Naval Academy class of 1966 has been prepared as a guide to prospective candidates, school authorities, and interested persons. The characteristics noted will aid guidance counselors in determining the representative backgrounds and qualifications of young men entering the Academy, and it is hoped that this information will prove of assistance in advising prospective candidates.

Each candidate for the Naval Academy must meet general eligibility requirements as to citizenship, age, character, and marital status. He must obtain a nomination either from a Member of Congress or from one of the competitive sources. In addition to presenting an acceptable secondary school record, he must score acceptably on specified college board tests or, if he holds a congressional non-competitive nomination, he may present a satisfactory 1-year college record. He must also qualify physically. It is in most of these respects that the Naval Academy's admissions procedures and requirements differ from those of civilian institutions. Detailed information on the above matters is contained in the "Regulations Governing the Admission of Candidates," which may be obtained from the Admissions Office, U.S. Naval Academy.

In the selection of candidates who are competing for appointments, the Naval Academy takes into account the quality of the secondary school record, additional study, the college board scores, extracurricular activities, athletics, honors and awards, employment outside school hours, recommendations of teachers, guidance counselors, principals, coaches, and others who know firsthand the candidate's accomplishments, his potential and his motivation for a career in the naval service.

The prospective candidate should be informed that, while admission to the Naval Academy is highly selective and competition during the 4 years is keen, the associations and experience of these 4 years are rich indeed. The highest ideals of duty, honor, and loyalty are characteristic of the brigade; the 160-semester-hour curriculum is supplemented by a broad elective course program; a comprehensive extracurricular program is maintained; and physical fitness is developed to a high degree. The graduate receives his bachelor of science degree and his commission as an ensign in the U.S. Navy and joins his fellow officers in a rewarding life of service to his country.

COLLEGE BOARD SCORES

The Naval Academy requires that all candidates attempting to quality for admission by the examination method (94 percent of the class of 1966) take the scolastic aptitude test and the achievement tests in English and either intermediate or advanced mathematics. The following table covering the class of 1966 shows the percent within score

ranges of those qualifying for entrance by examination:

| | Sat. V | Sat. M | English composition | Mathematics |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Score range (percent): | | | | |
| 750 to 800 | | 4 | 2 | 10 |
| 700 to 749 | 3 | 17 | 5 | 20 |
| 650 to 699 | 13 | 35 | 14 | 25 |
| 600 to 649 | 24 | 28 | 24 | 26 |
| 550 to 599 | 30 | 15 | 24 | 14 |
| 500 to 549 | 25 | 1 | 23 | 5 |
| 450 to 499 | 5 | | 8 | |
| Mean scores | 586 | 655 | 594 | 661 |

VOLUME OF APPLICANTS

| | |
|---|---|
| Nominated | 6,219 |
| Examined | 4,606 |
| Qualified scholastically | 2,133 |
| Admitted | 1,307 |

DISTRIBUTION OF CLASS BY SCHOOLS

| | Percent |
|---|---|
| Admitted from public schools | 78.2 |
| Admitted from independent schools | 21.8 |

Twenty-seven and nine-tenths percent of the class of 1966 had some college preparation (one-half year or more) prior to admission.

RANK IN HIGH SCHOOL CLASS

| | Percent |
|---|---|
| 1st quarter | 68.3 |
| 2d quarter | 21.0 |
| 3d quarter | 7.6 |
| 4th quarter | 3.1 |

SCHOOL ACTIVITIES AND HONORS

| Honors: | Percent |
|---|---|
| Valedictorians | 3.5 |
| Salutatorians | 2.7 |
| National honor society | 34.1 |
| Other honor society | 18.8 |
| Academic awards and medals | 19.2 |
| Scholarship winners | 32.7 |
| Science fair award | 9.1 |
| Activities: | |
| Class president or student body president | 11.8 |
| Other class officer or student body officer | 35.3 |
| School publication staff | 28.3 |
| Varsity athletics | 71.7 |
| Intramural athletics | 45.0 |
| Subject clubs (Latin, French, mathematics, etc.) | 44.5 |
| Dramatics | 24.0 |
| Debating | 11.0 |
| Musical groups | 29.9 |
| Service clubs | 31.1 |
| Eagle Scout | 8.8 |

GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION

Midshipmen were admitted from every State in the Union and the District of Columbia. Additionally, the class of 1966 included one midshipman from the Philippine Islands, one from Chile, one from Peru, and one from Venezuela to fill quotas authorized the Republic of the Philippines, and the American Republics (other than the United States).

SONS OF ALUMNI

The class of 1966 included 55 sons of Naval Academy graduates (4.2 percent of the class).

## Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian residents of the First Congressional District of Indiana have unanimously adopted the following resolution pertaining to the Communist enslavement of their native land. Resolutions calling for a congressional investigation of the enslavement of captive nations have been pending in Congress during the last two sessions.

Along with other Members sponsoring these resolutions, I do hope that we can get favorable action on the same in this session of Congress. If this legislation comes to the floor of the House, it no doubt will be passed by a large vote. A special congressional committee can again call the attention of the world to the Soviet enslavement of these freedom-loving nations.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere; and

Whereas so many countries under colonial domination have been or are being given the opportunity to establish their own independent states, on the other hand, the Baltic nations having a great historical past and having enjoyed the blessings of freedom for centuries are now subjugated to the most brutal colonial oppression; and

Whereas the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by legal or democratic processes; and

Whereas the Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Lativa, and Estonia by force of arms; and

Whereas Lithuanains, Latvians, and Estonians desire, fight, and die for their national independence; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America maintains diplomatic relations with the free Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and consistently has refused to recognize their seizure and forced "incorporation" into the Soviet Union; and

Whereas no real peace and security can be achieved in the world while Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia remain enslaved by the Soviet Union: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America request the President of the United States to bring up the Baltic States question before the United Nations and ask that the United Nations request the Sovets (1) to withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from Lithuania, Lativa, and Estonia; (2) to return all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prisons, and slave labor camps in the Soviet Union; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the United Nations conduct free elections in Lithuania, Lativa, and Estonia under its supervision and punish Soviet Communists who are guilty of crimes against the peoples of the Baltic States.

## Benjamin Franklin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 257th anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin, whose statesmanship contributed so much to our heritage of liberty and independence.

Although Franklin was born in Boston, he spent the major part of his adult life in Philadelphia, and we of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania are proud to claim him as our first citizen.

Of humble origin, he rose to a position of affluence and renown, honored throughout the civilized world. I need not discuss at length his illustrious career as an author, publisher, scientist, inventor, diplomat, and statesman. Countless pages have been written in his praise. I should like, however, to point out that there is guidance in the precepts of Franklin that will help us to meet the difficulties that confront our Nation and the free world today.

Franklin's philosophy was based upon his unfailing devotion to the cardinal virtues of integrity, industry, and thrift. Such a philosophy, which might otherwise have been stern and demanding, was relieved by tolerance, serenity, zest, and humor. The homely wisdom of Poor Richard is timeless. To many of our present problems Franklin, if again in our midst, would apply his well-poised judgment, his unfailing humor, and his love of constructive achievement. He might urge that many of these problems could be solved by more working and less talking.

It is often unfair to evaluate an individual's political philosophy in the light of the knowledge of a much later date. But Franklin's ideas of democracy have more than held their own with the passage of time. Throughout the world his principles of an extended franchise and proportional representation have been steadily gaining ground. Even his proposal of a unicameral legislature has been coming into increased favor with the passing years.

However, it is in the field of international relations that Franklin's vision has had its most dramatic vindication. The need for closer international cooperation, which he was among the first to see clearly, is now apparent to all. In his conception of the duties and responsibilities of nation to nation, his political theories attain their loftiest and most progressive form. In his faith in the application of united effort to the common problems of human society, he was consistently in advance of contemporary thought. No system which has been consciously evolved to further this ideal will become obsolete as long s human society itself endures.

Few philosophers have exerted a more wholesome influence upon the development of political thought than did Franklin, or have equaled him in transforming abstract theories into living realities of government. The record of his long life of public service endures in the imperishable annals of our Nation.

In these days of world crisis, every American can find inspiration in the words and deeds of Benjamin Franklin. It is appropriate on this anniversary of his birth that we pay tribute to a great champion of human freedom and a great American.

## New Light on the Michigan Study of the Elderly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, most of the major American newspapers carried, shortly before the last election, articles on the report of the University of Michigan Survey Research Center on its study of the condition of America's elderly. A great deal of information is to be gained from a careful reading of this report, just as a great deal of information could be gained from a careful reading of the House Ways and Means Committee's hearings on the King-Anderson proposal, H.R. 4222, of the last Congress. Unfortunately, these articles did not reflect a careful reading and a careful reporting job.

I was contacted by one of my constituents who, on the basis of the newspaper coverage given this report, took issue with earlier statements I had made about the financial position of our senior citizens. I am placing a copy of my reply to my constituent in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for two purposes: First, to set the record straight factually, giving a more accurate presentation of the position of our elderly, and second, to show how distortion can be used to prevent the real facts of an issue from getting through to the people:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D.C., November 19, 1962.*

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your letter of November 1, 1962, calling to my attention an Associated Press story appearing in the October 31 St. Louis Globe-Democrat, page 9C, on the report from the University of Michigan Survey Research Center, "Oldsters Worse Off Financially." I not only read this Associated Press story which the Globe-Democrat printed; I have read the Michigan University report itself. Far from disputing the point I made, that 80 percent of those 65 years of age and over are well able to take care of themselves and do not need financial assistance for their medical costs, the report actually substantiates the point.

The Associated Press story deceives the casual and already somewhat prejudiced reader.

Let me quote the lead sentence. "Older people are worse off financially than other groups on several counts, reports the University of Michigan Survey Research Center." The phrase which keeps the sentence from being a whole cloth lie is "on several counts," but this phrase is buried in the sentence structure and so glossed over by the quick reader. The headline writer fell for the trap and the headline reads, with no qualifying phrase, "Oldsters Worse Off Financially." Later in the article it is pointed up that the report said on other counts the oldsters are better off financially. The real question we are seeking the answer to is, What is the total financial condition of the oldsters balancing off the various counts? The total picture of oldsters today is that—

1. They are better off financially than they have ever been before, as are other groups.
2. They are better off in the total financial balance than any other age group in our society.

The only areas in which they are worse off are the two listed:

1. Yearly income, which is to be expected because they generally receive pensions rather than salaries, and pensions are less than salaries.
2. Their health costs average more than the health costs of any other group.

Balancing off are these counts, among others:

1. They have more assets, both liquid and in total, than any other age group. (Almost 80 percent own their own homes, and this free of mortgage—their average equity is over $9,000.) This is to be expected because they have been accumulating property and savings during their working years which the younger age groups are only in the process of doing.
2. Their budgets for food, clothes, rent, dependents, travel, recreation, and insurance (except health insurance) are considerably less than that of any other age group and the total budget, including the one higher cost for health insurance, is considerably less than for that of any other age group.

All the statistical studies adduced by the Ways and Means Committee in its public hearings on the subject of health care for the aged point out the same thing. One item that tends to prove this point is the statistical studies which consistently reveal that the oldsters are the best paying of any age group when it comes to medical or any other kind of cost.

Our problem is with the less than 20-percent oldsters who are having problems, not just for health costs, but many of them for other living costs. There is little sense, in my judgment, for establishing compulsory governmental system which covers the 80 percent simply to get at the problems of the 20 percent unless there is no other practical way of doing it. Fortunately, there are practical ways of meeting the problem of the 20 percent without interfering at all with the 80 percent—the Kerr-Mills Act and the golden-age 65 plans, health insurance for people over 65 without medical examination and noncancelable, which Connecticut started just a year ago, and New York, Massachusetts, and other States are imitating. The prospects in the future are even better for our oldsters because of the health insurance programs contained in most of our labor-management contracts which now carry over into retirement and the availability of prepaid noncancelable insurance on an individual basis or group basis paid up at 65. The 20-percent oldsters with health cost problems will dwindle in the future until they are less than 10 percent of our older people.

I appreciate your writing to me on this important subject. I would be glad to receive your further comments.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

## Tragedy at Robena No. 3 Mine in Greene County, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, on December 6, 1962, the people of southwestern Pennsylvania heard the tragic news that an explosion had occurred at the Frosty Run shaft of Robena No. 3 Mine in Greene County trapping 37 miners. Rescue teams began to work immediately to try to reach the miners and worked untiringly day and night. The families and friends of the trapped miners kept vigil day and night just waiting and hoping. But as the search went on the feeling of despair increased and after 5 days of agony, those who waited heard the news that the rescue teams had reached the trapped miners only to find them all dead.

Mr. Speaker, I was at the scene of the accident and it was indeed heartbreaking to watch the families of the trapped miners who waited with mixed feelings of hope and despair. I know that they had the sympathy not only of the people of southwestern Pennsylvania, but of the entire Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation for the past three or four Congresses to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide for the prevention of accidents in coal mines. I am confident that Federal inspection of all coal mines, regardless of size, will save lives. I hope that the Committee on Education and Labor will take early action on my bill, H.R. 1666, or on similar legislation so that we can try to put an end to the tragic loss of lives in coal mines.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from the United Mine Workers of America, together with resolution adopted by the international executive board during its recent meeting held here in Washington:

UNITED MINE WORKERS
OF AMERICA,
*Washington, D.C., January 11, 1963.*

*To the Members of the 88th Congress*

DEAR SIR: The terrible tragedy occurring on December 6, 1962, at the Frosty Run shaft, Robena No. 3 Mine, of the United States Steel Corp., Carmichaels, Pa., in which 37 coal miners lost their lives was before the international executive board of the United Mine Workers of America during its meeting in Washington, D.C., December 12–15, 1962.

During this meeting, the board adopted the enclosed resolution, which is self-explanatory.

We again urge earnest consideration by the Members of the 88th Congress to enact enforcement legislation to bring all employees in the coal industry under the provisions of the Federal Mine Safety Act.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. LEWIS,
*President Emeritus.*
THOMAS KENNEDY,
*President.*
W. A. BOYLE,
*Acting President.*
JOHN OWENS,
*Secretary-Treasurer.*

RESOLUTION OF THE UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA

"Whereas this board is horrified and appalled at the explosion which occurred December 6 at the Frosty Run shaft, Robena No. 3 Mine, United States Steel Corp., Carmichaels, Pa., in which 37 coal miners were killed violently; and

"Whereas 31 of those who died were members of United Mine Workers of America,

Local Union 6321, District 4, Masontown, Pa.; and

"Whereas this pre-Christmas tragedy also symbolizes a growing trend in the industry toward placing production of coal ahead of human lives; and

"Whereas many American coal miners who work in small underground mines do not now receive full protection under Federal law because of an arbitrary exemption granted their employers by the Congress: Therefore be it

*"Resolved,* That this international executive board and all officers of this organization including local union officers and mine safety committeemen press with renewed vigor for strict compliance by coal operators with all Federal and State mine safety laws and with the Federal Mine Safety Code which is written into the National Bituminous Coal Wage Agreement; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That the U.S. Bureau of Mines and mining departments in the various States be informed that this organization will insist on their strict and to-the-letter enforcement of existing mine safety regulations; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That the international union, labor's nonpartisan league and district officers urge with renewed vigor that the 88th Congress pass an amendment to the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act that would extend enforcement provisions of that act to all employees of underground coal mines regardless of size; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Local Union 6321, each Member of the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate, the Director of the U.S. Bureau of Mines, and directors of mining departments in coal mining States, and that it be printed in the United Mine Workers Journal."

Unanimously adopted by the international executive board, United Mine Workers of America, this 14th day of December 1962.

Sincerely yours,

John L. Lewis, President Emeritus; Thomas Kennedy, President; W. A. Boyle, Acting President; John Owens, Secretary-Treasurer; International Executive Board; John T. Kmetz, John Ghizzoni, Ewing Watt, W. J. Hynes, Joseph Yablonski, Peter Phillippi, Mart F. Brennan, Wilbert Killion, Joseph T. Kershetsky, Sam Nicholls, Louis Austin, Joseph Shannon, John A. Hupton, Henry Allal, John L. Mayo, R. O. Lewis, Edward Boyd, James W. Ridings, William Mitch, David Fowler, Arthur Biggs, John H. Delaney, R. J. Boyle, Carson Hibbitts, George J. Titler, C. J. Urbaniak.

## Washington: City Hall of Nation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Richard Wilson which appeared in the January 13, 1963, issue of the Des Moines Sunday Register:

WASHINGTON: CITY HALL OF NATION?

(By Richard Wilson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—President Kennedy is about to propose a domestic Peace Corps, a force of social workers and well-doers who would carry the light from Washington, D.C., to the slums and depressed areas of America.

This venture would cost only $20 million, employ up to 5,000 young people in its earliest stages, and doubtless expand later on as do all such Government undertakings.

It is hard to find out where and why the idea of a domestic Peace Corps originated. However the idea was originated, it was heartily welcomed by Attorney General Robert Kennedy, campaign manager for John F. Kennedy in the 1960 presidential election.

SPREADERS OF LIGHT

Bobby Kennedy is entranced by the idea. What could be more rewarding than having ardent young Kennedy people, clear-eyed idealists, braving the dangers of the urban jungles, spreading the gospel and serving the cause selflessly and without pay?

At last a New Frontier concept emerges which is as wide in scope, and with the same promise of success, as the early concepts of the New Deal for the creation of new communities to give homes and the good life to the ill-housed, ill-clad, and ill-fed. Only a few surviving today can remember the fate of those communities.

Some of the difficulties—and this is not historical exaggeration—were that housewives tore out the screens the easier to throw the dishwater into the front yard, and the gleaming new bathtubs were found to be convenient places to store coal. These were projects which the now snow-maned Rexford G. Tugwell and the late Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt were glad to forget, and they have gone down in history unsung and abandoned.

BETTER LIFE

But nevertheless the spirit lives on, and could have been dimly perceived when John Kennedy announced during the 1960 presidential campaign the still unconfirmed information that 17 million Americans go to bed hungry every night.

The currently used figure is that 32 million persons in the United States live at a lower level than America is capable of providing for its citizens.

This is a variation on Franklin D. Roosevelt's phrase, "One-third of the Nation ill-fed, ill-housed, ill-clothed" in the great depression of the early 1930's, a condition which in somewhat different form the Kennedys seem to imagine still exists.

If Congress in a careless moment should approve this venture some good will no doubt result. The harm that will be done will be to shift to Washington in still another field responsibilities and costs that should lie with local communities. The success of a domestic Peace Corps would be its undoing. Mayors and welfare boards would demand as a political right an equal share of free welfare help at a steadily rising cost to the Federal Government. In many areas, of course, local communities would not welcome the intrusion of outsiders in their welfare problems.

Fully in step with the program for sending Washington-trained volunteers to fight the good fight in the Nation's slums is a new proposal by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman to expand the food stamp plan and make it national in scope.

This former New Deal program has been on a trial basis in eight depressed areas and will soon be expanded to 40 new localities. It is being projected on a basis to give 4 million people surplus food at an annual cost of $375 million a few years hence.

THE NEW SOCIETY

As these programs and plans emerge, and fall into a pattern with other projects, the true significance of the New Frontier in its domestic phases becomes a good deal clearer. From the evidence now available the shadowy shape of the new society can be seen. It amounts to Federal responsibility for local affairs on an ever-widening scale:

Local schools with Federal support which will surely have to meet Federal standards; if not now, then before very long.

Federally financed hospital and medical care on an ascending scale heading toward the nationalization of all medical services.

Local welfare activities supplemented and possibly in the end controlled by Washington standards.

Financing and control of local projects for mass transportation, sewage disposal, public services.

And Federal responsibility for enforcing social standards.

Washington would then become truly the city hall of the Nation.

## Watching Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Kranish which appeared in the January 1963 issue of Western Aerospace:

WATCHING WASHINGTON

(By Arthur Kranish)

Twice in its 2 years of existence the Kennedy administration came within a breadth of liberating Cuba, the Caribbean and the Western Hemisphere of Soviet imperialism. Twice the President and his close advisers retreated from the brink. Only history will decide whether these events represent caution, wisdom, or cowardice.

But in the brief time we have for reflection before another crisis robs us of our complacency or our will, an assessment of the lessons of Cuba might be instructive. This assessment may be contrary to almost everything publicly proclaimed by the administration. In a sense it is an argument, an attempt to stir debate and perhaps to shake the widespread conviction that we have achieved victory and peace in our time.

We can first of all deduce from the little we have been told that the widely heralded shakeup of our intelligence system in the first year of the Kennedy administration was a failure. The professionals apparently scoffed at refugee reports of a Soviet missile and military buildup. The repeated questioning by opposition Congressmen served to place a political cast over the pros and cons and clues, and an intelligence-gathering machinery badly shaken by the events at the Bay of Pigs was in no mood to gather facts or reach conclusions which would obviously find no favor at the White House. We can ask, therefore, whether the new concept of unified intelligence best serves the Nation, or whether information is being tailored to meet the measurements of expediency.

Fortunately, no political filters are being supplied with our aerial reconnaissance cameras. And so the evidence in the now-famous photographs could not be explained away. If the administration kept those cameras flying on a constant basis during the months preceding the second Cuban crisis, it deserves full credit for seeing to it that these missions were carried out with skill, tact, and thoroughness. But if these missions were on a reduced, catch-as-catch-can

schedule, and vital early clues to a missile buildup were missed as a result, then an explanation is certainly in order. We have no information to support either theory, but there are many who refuse to believe that the delivery, preparation, and installation of so many missiles and aircraft was as sudden and secretive as the administration would have us believe.

If it was sudden and secretive, we have a superb argument against those who believe that space reconnaissance, spies in the sky, black boxes, and inspection teams can guard us against another massive buildup elsewhere in the world.

If it was not sudden and secretive, if it was as brazen and open to observation as later photographs would have us believe, then we can rightly ask whether or not the administration knew, while it was issuing frequent public denials, that the Soviets were engaged in creating a vast nuclear arsenal 90 miles from our shores.

For a brief period, it seemed as though our national response to the events in Cuba was unmistakable. Mr. Kennedy, with superb courage and control, made it abundantly clear to the Soviets and to a shocked world that the newly discovered buildup would not be tolerated and that we were as prepared as Mr. Khrushchev to play the nuclear blackmail game.

It is obvious now that Khrushchev—through caution, wisdom, or cowardice—was unwilling to enter that kind of contest. And so the missiles and aircraft, or most of them, were withdrawn, and the West, we are told, won its first major victory against Communist expansion since the days following World War II. And Mr. Kennedy and his administration won the stunned admiration of the free world.

These breathtaking events were followed by a pleasant rift in the Sino-Soviet ranks and perhaps even by a major loss of initiative by the entire Communist bloc. We may well have lived through one of these periods in history when tides turn, foundations crumble, and cliches collapse.

For if we have truly won peace in our time, we may have also paid a price for that victory. One fee is the further erosion of a treasured American freedom—the right of the press to find and print the truth, in the belief that it is the truth that will keep us free. Those who manage the truth (a word that approximates the news) have decided for themselves that there are times of expediency when the weapons of tyranny can be superimposed upon a system that has weathered revolution, civil war, economic disaster and two wars for world survival.

And if we have won peace for ourselves, have we not mortgaged away the liberties of our neighbors? Have we not consented—at the price of peace—to the enslavement of the Cuban people? Have we not acknowledged something that just a few months ago any American would have regarded as unthinkable—the firm establishment of a Soviet colony, armed and apparently invincible, almost at our border? Americans in uniform die each day, as they died at Corregidor and on the fields of France and the hills of Korea—to reclaim an inch of foreign soil for freedom. Yet twice, in our own hemisphere, we have decided that we are not our brothers' keepers. Is life that dear? Is peace that sweet?

If we have won the victory that the Cuban events represent to many, we may have future opportunities to ask such questions. As the strongest nation in the world, we will someday have to accept the moral obligations of strength. In the Cuban crisis, despite our strength and our will, we permitted the Soviets to enslave still another mass of humanity. We must ask ourselves whether our national mission in the world is to preserve our safety or to extend the blessings of liberty to our fellow man. If the Communist bloc is weakening, will there be other Berlin riots, other Hungarian revolts, other opportunities to light the spark and feed the flames of freedom? Can a strong nation, conceived in liberty, be dedicated only to its own peace and safety and security? Is that our message to a neighbor in chains?

## Pennsylvania Has a New Governor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker. On Tuesday, January 15, at 12:08 p.m., our friend and former colleague, William Warren Scranton, became the 103d chief executive of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

In a brief, dynamic inaugural address he made a sincere plea for unity toward progress. He is not unmindful of the grave responsibilities he has assumed nor does he approach the challenges fearfully. Those of us who know him best are confident he will meet each problem conscientiously and solve it to the best of his ability.

I know his host of friends on both sides of the aisle wish him well, and Godspeed in his new and responsible position.

Following is the text of his inaugural address:

My fellow Pennsylvanians, nearly 300 years ago a God-fearing man carved the first bits of civilization out of the land that lay west of the Delaware. His name was William Penn. He had an idea. It took root in our soil. His idea was that men and women are resourceful and imaginative. He believed that, given a chance, they could turn back a wilderness, chisel out a monument to human dignity, and live in peace and prosperity. In an age rife with human hatred—with religious bigotry, with political persecution—he had the wisdom, and the courage, to launch a holy experiment.

He made Pennsylvania the bastion of freedom—the temple of tolerance, the showcase of economic enterprise. He believed freedom is more than a cliche. He believed courage is more than a slogan. He believed human willpower more than a match for all the obstacles of nature or economics. He believed human ingenuity capable of solving human problems. He believed indifference and despair can be put to rout by human hope.

But, most of all he believed in himself; he believed in his fellow men; he believed in Pennsylvania. That was three centuries ago.

Three months ago I was campaigning through a Pennsylvania town. The day was dreary. A cold rain had drizzled down all morning. A young man with tired eyes, a sad voice and a scared handshake told me: "Pennsylvania is no place for me."

And, a day later, I campaigned through a sun-drenched suburb. Other people with other, quite different, problems.

Another young man, this one with a kind of "I'm going places" look about him grasped my hand. He looked me in the eye. He said: "I can't for the life of me figure out why anybody would want to be Governor of this State." And he explained, "Pennsylvania is going nowhere." That was 3 months ago.

Three days ago I pondered what to say on the day that I became Governor of this State. I thought of William Penn 300 years ago. But I remembered the young man of 3 months ago.

With this memory the vim and vigor of the campaign seemed to sour. The flush of election victory paled. The brave hopes of just yesterday seemed puny. The awful responsibility seemed to dwarf the high honor of the office I was about to assume.

But then more of Pennsylvania came to mind. More of what we have been taught and know of Pennsylvania. More of her heritage. More of her people—and their pride and their faith—the hands I had clasped, the warmth of their welcome.

I remembered the face of the woman. Woman of a town blasted by industrial migration. Plants closed. Gates locked. Menfolk idle. I remembered the courage in the face of the woman.

I remembered the eyes of the man. Man out of work. Tiny worry lines around those eyes. The haunting fear that self-respect might flee, but even stronger, the challenge: "Give me a chance, and you'll see what I can do." I remembered the hope in the eyes of the man.

I remembered the hands of the farmer. A sower of seeds. A cultivator of life. A man close to God. Hands flecked with soil, so the tan of the skin seemed almost one with the tan of the earth. Hands that make things grow. I remembered the pride of those hands.

I remembered the arms that swung a lunch pail. Skilled arms. Strong sinews. A cadence to his walk that said: "I do a day's work. I do it well." Perhaps the proudest boast of man. I remembered the fresh, pungent smell of independence.

I remembered the frown of the young college student. Inquisitive. Prove it or I won't believe it. Why can't Pennsylvania move ahead? Who says my only opportunities lie elsewhere? Is it wrong to care? What are you going to do about it? Yes, I remembered the anxious student.

And, I remembered the brow of a businessman. Furrowed? Yes, but perhaps even more accurately, concerned. "I have a duty here. A role to perform. I want Pennsylvania to climb to the top. I'm busy and it's easy to find excuses, but point the way and I'll do my share." Yes, I remember the concern, the willingness, in that face.

And, suddenly, I knew that Pennsylvania today is not really very different than the Pennsylvania of three centuries ago.

Yes, the challenges wear different faces. Problems assume different guises. But truly, we hold the same trump cards.

Resourcefulness, imagination, fortitude. And one more—faith.

The Pennsylvania that responded to the 17th-century promise of William Penn's holy experiment.

The Pennsylvania that nurtured an 18th-century Ben Franklin and became the cradle of liberty.

The Pennsylvania that was strengthened by a 19th-century influx of brave, stout hearts from the Old World.

The Pennsylvania that in the 20th century has remained basically strong and vital, desipte a buffeting from history's greatest technological revolution.

That Pennsylvania—don't tell me that Pennsylvania can't lick its problems, because I know it can.

We still have the same God-given natural resources, the same advantages for commerce and industry, the same progressive spirit that brought us greatness in other years, in other ages.

But, these things must be tapped. Resources and advantages and spirit must be put to work. Human courage and human

hope must drive the motors of human effort and human toil.

Some of Pennsylvania's problems can be solved soon, others can only be solved in time. But nothing will happen, nothing will move, unless the labor begins today.

The State government has an obvious and vital role in that labor. As a Pennsylvanian, no one can convince me that our State is incapable of that labor. No one can convince me that other States and other governments are more capable.

Of course, there are those who would prefer to dwell more on our fears than on our hopes.

There are those who would prefer to curse the darkness, rather than light a candle. Blame the past, rather than work to assure the future.

There are those who would prefer to gossip of yesterday's divisions, rather than work on today's need for unity.

Show me a Democrat who was wrong or shortsighted, I will show you a Republican who was. And vice versa.

Show me a businessman who was selfish, I will show you a labor leader who was. And vice versa.

Show me a citizen in Pennsylvania who has suffered by someone's lack of concern, and I will show you another citizen who has caused suffering by his lack of concern.

But let us hope that in the showing, both you and I will grow wiser and learn that today's opportunities are far more important than yesterday's mistakes.

With these opportunities, Pennsylvania is on the march. Toward greatness for herself. Toward progress, for her people.

Our Commonwealth has the resources, the human strength, the get-up-and-go from which greatness is made. There is work to do, lots of it, but Pennsylvanians have never shirked from that prospect.

In both the executive branch and in the legislature, all of us must vow today to do our part to bring about a new era in Pennsylvania progress. We must have the wisdom to keep what should be kept; the courage to change what should be changed.

With the help of God let us embrace the challenge, let us welcome the labor.

Let us stand tall—as Pennsylvanians.

Let us walk proudly—as Pennsylvanians.

## Going Now and Paying Later

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Jenkin Lloyd Jones is a humorous picture of the modern philosophy well pictured by the slogan "Go now, pay for it later."

In the meantime we are still floating in a sea of red ink supported by barrels stuffed with paper dollars.

The article follows:

GOING NOW AND PAYING LATER

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

The American people have taken first-class passage on a ship bound from Buffalo to the Big Rock Candy Mountains via the Niagara River. So far there have been cocktails and canapes and caviar for just about everybody.

You get a lot of funny people on a cruise, of course. Occasionaly, some loudmouth has started running around the deck waving a chart, calling attention to the gradually increasing current, and pointing excitedly to that attractive cloud of mist up ahead. But the rest of the passengers have thrown these alarmists overboard. Anyone with a lick of sense knows that the faster the current the quicker we'll get to where we're going.

Not only is the ship traveling faster than we thought it would, but it is lighter, too. It used to be loaded down with a lot of gold, but most of that is gone. There was the cost of protecting our friends abroad who would rather not go to the expense of protecting themselves. And there was foreign aid.

And then some of our newly prosperous pals from Europe came aboard and hauled away the gold on which they had a claim. It was really funny to see them wrestling the heavy ingots ashore when we would have been glad to give them our paper dollars as surety for our debts to them. You would almost think they doubted the future value of our dollars.

We've got a pretty quarrelsome crowd aboard. Every few minutes the propellers quit turning or the water doesn't run in the faucets or the deckhands throw down their swabs and paintbrushes. The crew wants easier work and more money. The passengers want more service, bigger staterooms, fancier meals, and cheaper tickets. And the captain says everybody is right.

The U.S. Government will end this fiscal year 1963 next June 30 with a deficit of about $8 billion. The President's economic advisers had, in contrast, forecast a surplus of about half a billion for the same period. Never has the arithmetic been so far off.

Yet the President is pushing a sweeping program of tax cuts. He makes the point (and he couldn't be righter) that the tax burden is now so great that it is slowing down the economy's expansion. In other words, taxes have removed so much of the incentive to take risks and earn profits that we are not producing as well as we might or creating jobs or providing new opportunities for our young people. Amen.

But, at the same time, there is no inclination to cut Government spending. For fiscal 1964 it looks as though we're going to have a $100 billion budget. This will be greater than in the peak years of World War II. The national debt limit, now at $308 billion, will have to be raised this spring as usual. If we honestly added in the unfunded actuarial liabilities for social security, the figure would be about $65 billion higher.

Our trouble is that we can't tell the difference between our needs and our wants any more. That devilish word "need." We need low-cost housing. We need to be first on the moon. We need interstate highways. We need medicare. We need more aid for education. These are all desirable things. But change each "need" to "want" and you get closer to the truth. A need is a necessity. A want is a desire. We are being drowned in our "druthers."

And, simultaneously, we are becoming rebellious about paying the cost of what we have. Of course, we haven't been quite paying the cost. The steady progression of the national debt is eloquent testimony to our refusal to meet our bills. But, as the President correctly asserts, even though we have taxed ourselves too little to meet our expenditures we have taxed ourselves too much. The fires of enterprise are getting smothered and the steam gage may soon be dropping.

What is the way out? You'd never guess—unless you've been reading the papers. Government officials, business braintrusters, union leaders have discovered a marvelous escape hatch. You don't have to cut spending. What you do is cut taxes and then the rapid growth in the gross national product will so expand the tax base that the deficit will be overcome and we'll be put ashore on the Happy Isles.

This is probably the finest piece of economic bluebird twittering since F.D.R. waved his cigarette holder airily and dismissed the national debt with the remark, "After all, we only owe it to ourselves."

In the meantime, the able and busy people of Europe's Common Market, whose warwrecked industrial plant was largely rebuilt by United States funds and who have cheerfully shucked off on American taxpayers most of the cost of their common defense, are now beginning to whip the pants off us in many fields of competition. Their steel makers blow oxygen into their converters while we still blow air. Their featherbedding problems are insignificant. Their currencies grow harder while ours grows softer.

But, so far, we've had a pretty good ride down the Niagara River. In spite of the squabbling and grabbing the guzzling and gobbling have been good.

And there was that wonderful sign over the ticket office back on the dock:

"Go Now, Pay Later."

## Richard L. Maher Knighted in the Order of St. Gregory the Great

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Richard L. Maher, one of Cleveland's outstanding citizens and an eminent journalist of long standing, was recently honored by His Holiness Pope John XXIII, as a Knight of St. Gregory. This high honor was conferred on Mr. Maher because of his many years of outstanding service in charity work and service to youth in the Greater Cleveland area.

Under leave granted, I include an article apeparing in January 15 issue of the Cleveland Counselor:

RICHARD L. MAHER KNIGHTED IN THE ORDER OF ST. GREGORY THE GREAT

A past grand knight and former district deputy from Cleveland Council has received the honors of papal knighthood from Pope John XXIII.

Richard L. Maher, who served as grand knight of Cleveland council from 1934 to 1936 and was district deputy for the East Side of Cleveland in the mid-1940's, has been designated a Knight of the Order of St. Gregory the Great.

Announcement of the honor which came to Brother Maher along with 16 other laymen of the Cleveland diocese was made in mid-December by Archbishop Edward F. Hoban.

For Maher this is the third of a series of honors that he received this year. Last spring he was named by the Catholic Youth Organization to receive the Duo Decum Award for his work among youths of the diocese.

In June, he was chosen by the Ripon Club as the recipient of its first annual Good Government Award.

Maher, who is politics editor of the Press, is treasurer of the Catholic Charities Corp.

He has served as a member of the board of trustees of the Catholic Charities for nearly 10 years—the last year as treasurer.

His elevation to the Order of St. Gregory came, it is understood, because of his charity

work. In addition to his service with the Charities Corp., Maher has been a member of the Catholic Youth Service Advisory Board for years and served three terms as its chairman.

His work for Catholic Charities was recognized earlier when he was invited to address one of the section meetings of the Golden Jubilee Convention of Catholic Charities in New York City in 1960.

Other honors have been heaped upon him. In 1948 he was designated Catholic Man of the Year. A few years ago Xavier University at Cincinnati named him an honorary alumnus because of his work for the university. Two of his sons attended Xavier.

Maher has served as a councilman of St. Raphael's Parish, Bay Village, since its founding in 1946.

In his newspaper work, Maher has received many honors. Several times he was cited by the Cleveland Newspaper Guild for his work, winning the best reporting award for several years. He also only recently was reelected a director of the Press Club of Cleveland.

Maher joined Cleveland Council in 1926—and was elected grand knight when he was scarcely 30 years old. Under his direction Cleveland Council paid off much of the debt it had accumulated in the early depression days, and was launched on its period of progress.

When he became head of the council, after serving as chancellor and deputy grand knight, the council had just over 1,100 members. In 2 years he lifted the membership to 1,586—more than half of them insurance members.

In 1959 Maher was designated dean of the Ohio Legislative Correspondents Association, having covered sessions of the general assembly for 25 years.

With his wife and family, Maher lives at 28626 Bruce Road, Bay Village.

Two of his sons, Francis R., and Thomas P., are members of the council. A third son, Edward J., is a law student at Georgetown University. His daughter, Lucile Helen, is a school nurse in Las Vegas, Nev.

## Flights Over Heavily Populated Areas Should Be Held to Minimum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Jefferson Park Press, which is published in my district by Mrs. Morton Steinman, recently carried an excellent editorial regarding flights of jet aircraft over heavily congested areas. The editorial was written by this fine newspaper's public affairs editor, Miss Sally Swanson, who, like myself, has followed the problem of jet operations out of O'Hare Field over my district for some time.

Miss Swanson is indeed an authority on this entire subject of jet operations and the tremendous problems which these jets are creating for hundreds of thousands of people in my district.

This editorial appeared a few days after a privately owned propeller-driven airplane encountered heavy icing conditions while on its final approach to O'Hare Field and crashed into a house in my district. The tragedy brought death to four passengers of the aircraft, which was demolished, and only through a miracle spared the occupants of the private residential dwelling in my district into which the plane crashed.

This tragedy points up again the absolute folly of the Federal Aviation Agency in permitting aircraft coming in on instruments during bad weather to fly across the entire length of Chicago and its 3½ million population to get into the landing pattern for a southeast approach to O'Hare Field when these very same airplanes could just as easily fly into proper position along the lake shore out over Lake Michigan.

At the time I said it is absolutely illogical—and even tragic—to compound the incident of air fatalities by directing these airplanes over the city during inclement weather. Unfortunately, my ardent appeals to the FAA seem to fall on deaf ears, and the entrenched bureaucracy continues to do business as usual, using approach and landing patterns that were developed a decade ago when jets were still on the drawing board.

It is my sincere hope that perhaps an aroused press in this country will be able to finally impress upon the FAA that while no one is suggesting any reduction in safety standards, nor is anyone suggesting flight operations that would make it impossible for the airlines to keep up with progress, the fact of the matter is that there are better ways of flight operations than permitted at present by the Federal Aviation Agency.

I hope this editorial will serve as a basis for arousing the FAA out of its apparent apathy. There are more than 1 million people in the vicinity of O'Hare Field who are entitled to more consideration than they have been getting heretofore from the FAA.

It would appear to me that if the people who are now in charge of the FAA are incapable of doing an adequate job, they should be replaced forthwith by FAA Administrator Halaby; and they should continue to be replaced until he finds a team of people who can give the residents of my district the kind of safety standards in heavy jet operations to which they are rightfully entitled.

Miss Swanson's excellent editorial follows:

WHAT IF A JETPLANE CRASHED ON NORTHWEST SIDE?

(By Sally Swanson)

Although it occurred out of the Press papers' territory, the crash last Wednesday of a light plane into a Portage Park house focuses attention on a threat to the entire Northwest Side. A threat too grim to put into words.

Bad as last week's accident was—taking lives of four of the plane's passengers and critically injuring the other two—the tragedy would have been compounded manifold had persons on the ground been in the path of the crashing plane.

And this was a relatively small craft. Imagine, if you can, the devastation that would result if one of the giant commercial jets that roar over our area plowed through a local neighborhood.

The Northwest Side's Congressman, Representative ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, who flew here from Washington Thursday, called the flight pattern of the ill-fated plane "totally illogical," and asked that all planes landing at O'Hare from east or southeast follow the lake shore north of the North Shore suburbs before turning west.

A letter this week from the Bryn Mawr-Higgins Community Club says that the crash points up the club's objections to air traffic over thickly populated city neighborhoods.

We realize that planning approach routes for the world's busiest airport is not uncomplicated, but we feel that safety of thousands of people in their homes should be a first consideration.

And thus we wish success to both Congressman PUCINSKI and the Bryn Mawr-Higgins Club in efforts that may spare the Northwest Side a major disaster.

## What Next in Cuba?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, since the talks between the United States and Russia on Cuba have been officially closed, many people are inclined to settle back with a feeling of well-being, contemplating what appears to them to have been a victory for the United States. Many of us, however, are cognizant of the fact that the situation which existed prior to the discovery of Russian missies on the island of Cuba, is still very much in existence. The public pronouncements of Dictator Castro, both in Cuba and East Berlin, certainly do not indicate any cessation of the Communist drive to take over South and Central America.

An editorial printed in the Arizona Republic on Saturday, January 12, 1963, outlines the problem so well that it should be read by every Member.

The article follows:

WHAT NEXT IN CUBA?

When President Kennedy lifted the naval blockade of Cuba, he did so only after receiving Khrushchev's assurance of onsite verification of the removal of Soviet weapons.

The other day, with onsite inspection seemingly as remote as ever, Adlai Stevenson agreed with Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vasily Kuznetsov that "the time has come for the (U.N.) Security Council to close its book on the case."

Despite this obvious backdown in the American position, many editorialists throughout the Western World are hailing the unresolved Cuba crisis as a victory for the United States. But is it?

Is it a victory for the United States that some 17,000 Russian troops remain in Cuba? Is it a victory for the United States that 25,000 political foes are languishing in Castro's jails? Is it a victory for the United States that some 7 million Cubans remain as inexorably under Communist control as they were before the October blockade announcement? Is it a victory for the United States that our primary condition for removing the blockade has been denied? Is it a victory for the United States when its Government in effect repudiates the Monroe Doctrine and its several expanded compacts? Is it a victory for the United States that

a communized Cuba continues exporting revolution throughout the Americas?

Long before the October blockade announcement, President Kennedy pledged, "communism is not negotiable in the Western Hemisphere." Yet he did in fact negotiate with communism in the Western Hemisphere by promising Khrushchev that, in return for onsite inspection, the United States would not invade Cuba or sanction an invasion by our allies or by Cuban exile groups. The fact that the no-invasion pledge no longer remains in effect, inasmuch as Russia has chosen not to permit onsite inspection in her Cuban satellite, does nothing to refurbish the national honor tarnished by the original no-invasion pledge.

Within days after his emotional, fighting speech to Cuban refugees in Miami's Orange Bowl, President Kennedy disclosed to reporters at Palm Beach his true feelings about Castro's Cuba—a disclosure which a New York Times columnist said means that the U.S. Government fully "accepts the status quo" of having Castro rule Cuba.

No wonder Guatemala's anti-Communist President, Miguel Ydigoras, recently announced his country's retirement from "the front line of the fight against Castro communism." Why, he asked angrily, with an eye toward the U.S.A., should his small nation be constantly in conflict with Cuba, while other countries "receive the Ambassadors of Russia, Byelorussia, Bulgaria, Poland, Lithuania, and Czechoslovakia"?

The remainder of the anti-Communist world can only await answers to President Ydigoras' question.

## Schacht's Decision a Matter of Regret in City Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on January 11, 1963, the Alameda Times-Star, Alameda, Calif., carried an editorial expressing regret on the retirement of Vice Mayor Richard P. Schacht from the City Council of Alameda.

Mr. Schacht has been a great public servant and, during 6 years on the Alameda City Council, has contributed much to his community through the use of his time and energy and the ideas which he offered.

His dedicated service should be an inspiration to others who might aspire to public office.

I believe that the editorial in my hometown newspaper is a fitting tribute to this distinguished Californian, and under unanimous consent, I am pleased to insert it in the RECORD:

SCHACHT'S DECISION A MATTER OF REGRET IN CITY POLITICS

The announcement yesterday by Vice Mayor Richard P. Schacht that he will not seek reelection is a matter of regret.

His decision, resulting from the "steadily increasing demands of his law practice," is one that has been duplicated countless times in the history of the country, but it is not for that reason made any more palatable. On the contrary, it offers merely another example of how difficult it is for able men to stay in office once the public is fortunate enough to get them there.

Schacht, through his 6 years of experience on the council, is a man who has a valuable fund of knowledge of the city, its problems and how to meet them. He has shown that in a variety of ways in his official capacity.

Furthermore, he is a stanch member of the Democratic Party, one of a minority on the council and one with a more than usual dedication to the principles of the Democratic Party. That, too, he has evidenced in many ways as many of those acquainted with him know, and it is of especial interest to us in this respect that he showed that dedication again this week in his remarks during consideration of the proposed charter revision apropos both an elective mayor and the division of the city into districts so as to assure a fair representation to the entire population on the city's governing body.

Though Schacht did not wholly agree with the stand taken by the Times-Star on these points, he did let it most emphatically be known that he was for both having the mayor of the city elected by all the citizens, rather than by the members of the council, and also for the districting of the city in such a way as to assure the maximum benefit of the democratic process—two points that are truly fundamental to the democratic process here.

## Origin of "The Star-Spangled Banner"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, one of the many things for which Marylanders can be proud is that "The Star-Spangled Banner" was composed in Maryland by a Marylander as a result of a battle in Maryland between American and British forces in 1814. Following is an excerpt from the 1941 edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica giving the origin of "The Star-Spangled Banner":

EXCERPT OF THE ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA 1941 EDITION

The origin of the "Star-Spangled Banner" is well known and agreed upon by historians even to smaller details. Francis Scott Key, an American lawyer, had been delegated to negotiate the release of a prominent physician, Dr. William Beans, who had been captured by the British fleet in Chesapeake Bay in 1814. He secured the physician's freedom but was detained aboard the British flagship during the projected bombardment of Baltimore. On the night of September 13–14 the British opened fire upon Fort McHenry, one of the forts defending Baltimore at the mouth of the Patapsco. Under the cover of night, Key could not determine the issue of the battle but at dawn he was overjoyed to see the American flag still flying over the fortress. He then composed the poem, apparently having in mind a tune often employed before in American patriotic songs, that of "Anacreon in Heaven" composed by John Stafford Smith (1750–1836) as the club song of the Anacreontic Society, an association of musicians in London. After Key's return to shore "The Star-Spangled Banner" was set up in type and distributed throughout Baltimore, where it attained an almost instantaneous popularity. Less than a week afterward it was published with an account of its authorship in a Baltimore newspaper, and soon the song was known and sung throughout the Nation. The main facts about its origin and adoption have been set forth in detail by O. G. T. Sonneck in his "Report on the 'Star-Spangled Banner,'" issued by the U.S. Library of Congress in 1914. Among other published reports may be mentioned P. H. Magruder's description of the first and the final text in the Proceedings of the U.S. Naval Institute, June 1927. In 1933 the original manuscript of the verse was sold for $24,000.

## Can President Deliver the Hoped-for Tax Cut?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, having been told of our great prosperity and bright future by the President of the United States, and then, in the same message, that the economy is "sluggish" and that we need a lot of pump priming—$10½ billion over the next 3 years—to get the country moving, it is perhaps well to read the following article. This was written by Mr. J. A. Livingston and appeared in the Washington Post of January 16. It brings us down to earth and to the facts of life. We need to be reminded of both.

The question is one of finances and it cannot be dealt with and solved by campaign oratory.

CAN PRESIDENT DELIVER HOPED-FOR TAX CUT?

(By J. A. Livingston)

To examine President Kennedy's state of the Union message politically is to conclude that he's a confident optimist. He expects to be around in 1965 to push his tax program through. The $10 billion net reduction is phased over 3 years.

In the first year, there'll be a $6 billion cut—enough to whet appetites for the second bite.

This reduction ought to give the economy a boost sufficient to ease the President into 1964 with a prosperity slogan for the November election:

"We got the country moving again."

And then if he's elected, the third phase should be readily attainable. In planning so far ahead, the President profits from the recent past.

The 1960 recession contributed much to Richard Nixon's defeat. President Kennedy made much of the economic malaise during the campaign and overemphasized it in his first state of the Union message saying:

"The present state of the economy is disturbing. We take office in the wake of 7 months of recession, 3½ years of slack, 7 years of diminished growth, and 9 years of falling farm income.

"Business bankruptcies have reached their highest level since the great depression. Since 1951 farm income has been squeezed down by 25 percent. Save for the brief period in 1958, insured unemployment is at the highest peak in history. Of some 5½ million Americans without jobs, more than 1 million have been searching for work for more than 4 months."

Those are words to rue—first, because they were ill timed and much too dolorous. Such a catalog of ills, coming from the President, was not conducive to cheer and confidence. Hardly were the words said than the bottom of the recession was reached. The upturn began—and with little or no impetus from the new administration.

They are words to rue—also because, fundamentally, conditions hardly have changed. In arguing for a tax cut, the President noted that we are "on the side of the hill, not the top. * * * America has enjoyed 22 months of uninterrupted economic recovery, but recovery is not enough. * * * Persistent slack * * * has kept unemployment at or above 5 percent for 61 out of 62 months."

The President is treating a condition with a theory. After the postwar boom, the rate of economic expansion slowed—as pent-up wants were satisfied. This was natural, expectable. Meanwhile, other countries—able to profit from our industrial leadership, know-how, and aid—moved faster than we. This also was natural.

Now we have before us this theory: Our tax structure is a drag on industrial activity, on consumption. As prosperity increases, the tax collector skims more and more of the income stream. Recovery spending—is cropped off at the top.

Whether this theory is sound, I don't know. We have had top-offs of recoveries recurrently in the United States. The industrial cycle is to business what "The Children's Hour" is to Longfellow—"a pause in the day's occupation." Will changing the tax structure change that?

But this is clear to me. The top rates—both corporate and individual—have been far too high. Getting them down will add zest to the profit motive—to risk taking, experimentation, and innovation.

Thus, the state of the Union message raises economic hopes. But it also raises problems.

Piling an immediate loss of $6 billion in revenues on a deficit of about $7 billion will not meet unanimous approval in Congress. Hearings will be protracted. Getting the legislation out of committee will be a tedious process. And the form the legislation takes is likely to differ drastically from what the President has proposed.

All the while, Wall Street and businessmen will be watching—worriedly. Will the President be able to deliver? Anticipation, which encourages expansion and investment, will be adulterated by anxiety which palsies initiative.

## Private Versus Public Power Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RICHARD H. POFF
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the January 14, 1963, issue of the Roanoke-World-News, entitled, "Private Versus Public Power Again."

PRIVATE VERSUS PUBLIC POWER AGAIN

The objections now being raised by the U.S. Department of Interior and the Army Corps of Engineers to the Appalachian Power Co.'s power dam projects on the New River in Grayson County furnish glaring proof of the lengths to which bureaucracy will go to outmaneuver and supplant private enterprise.

Appalachian applied to the Federal Power Commission for license to erect hydroelectric facilities at Boyer Ferry and near Fries, a dual dam arrangement similar to the Smith Mountain and Leesville Dams on the Roanoke River.

The Interior Department has asked that Appalachian Power Co. be denied license because the project would nullify an Army Engineer's plan for a dam on the New River near Galax, study for which supposedly was authorized in 1941. Further, say the objectors, the FPC is without authority to issue a license.

The question at once arises: If private enterprise is willing and able to put up the money for investment to create such a great hydroelectric facility why should Federal agencies object? Certainly this would save vast sums for the taxpayers.

The answer, of course, is bureaucracy and the insatiable desire of public power supporters. The battle with state socialism is never ending. The spenders want the Government in the power business without regard to the cost or the lack of efficiency.

To begin with, the Appalachian's two proposed dams would be far more efficient as a flood control and conservation measure than the single dam desired by the Army Engineers.

Secondly, such a facility, built, owned, and operated by private industry, would yield considerable tax revenue to the county in which it is located. The Federal facility would pay nothing. Only by removing land from local taxation and building at public cost can Federal power deliver what it calls cheaper power to consumers.

Another question which automatically suggests itself is this: How long does a congressional authorization for Federal study preempt a field of operation? Surely not forever. It seems rather evident from the failure of Congress to appropriate money for the Army Engineers project that Congress doesn't think much of it.

What about the Interior Department-Army Engineers argument that FPC lacks authority to issue a license to Appalachian Power Co.?

Turn back to 1940. After a lengthy case, first tried in the U.S. District Court for Western Virginia, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled: (1) The New River is navigable and therefore (2) Appalachian must get its license from the FPC. The Power Commission thereupon issued a license for erecting the Claytor Dam near Dublin.

It would seem that the Supreme Court's opinion is still the rule-of-thumb unless the present Court members feel like overturning the verdict of their predecessors on the Bench.

It is not without significance that Representative TUCK, in whose district Grayson County lies, is in favor of the Appalachian plan. So is Representative RICHARD H. POFF in the Sixth. Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON has restated his backing for the company and it is our recollection that Senator HARRY F. BYRD also is on record in that direction.

Here, then, is a readymade opportunity for business and industry to go to bat for private, revenue-producing enterprise. We trust that they will waste no time in making themselves heard.

## Freedom of the Seas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, an informative article dealing with the question of freedom of the seas, by Rear Adm. John D. Hayes, U.S. Navy, retired, was published in the December 1962 issue of Shipmate, the monthly magazine of the U.S. Naval Academy Alumni Association.

The article follows:

FREEDOM OF THE SEAS—SENSELESS SLOGAN OR MEANING TOOL FOR THE COLD WAR?

(By Rear Adm. John D. Hayes)

In November 1960, the following appeared in my column, "With a Round Turn," under the heading, "Freedom of the Seas in a Cold War. Why?"

"Has it occurred to any of us who are supposed to understand sea power that the inroads which the Soviets have made into the free world in the past few years has been possible only because we have granted them the freedom of the seas which we control.

"How do arms get to Egypt and Syria? How does oil get to Cuba? Where does the gasoline come from that fuels Soviet aircraft in the Congo operating independently of the United Nations? How did Khrushchev get to the last United Nations meeting?

"Freedom of the seas is a Western idea, conceived for an entirely different world from that in which we live today. Is it realistic to continue such a concept in a continued cold war, waged by a closed society?

"It does seem time that the whole idea of freedom of the seas be reviewed by the Nation and the Navy that is alone able to control the sea."

Two years later the American people suddenly discovered that they had allowed the Soviet Union to extend this freedom into a license unmatched since the days of piracy, with nuclear bombers and IBEM missiles imported into Cuba. This bold attempt at either destruction or blackmail came within days of success. The American people faced the threat by exercising their control of the seas. A blockade was established and the aggressive weapons declared absolute contraband (although neither of these terms, recognized in international law, were used). The exercise of control of the seas, even in this mild form, was enough to bring about the most abject retreat that the Soviets have so far made in the cold war.

The perceptive Cat Brown, 1921, at the time of the Lebanon crisis, stated to a television interviewer that Premier Khrushchev did not understand seapower. Perhaps so, but this wily realist must have decided that the American people did not know much about it either. Otherwise they would have used their powerful Navy as a diplomatic persuader rather than massive retaliation, brinkmanship, and the "big bang."

The several situations mentioned above indicate how we allowed the Soviets to use the seas against our own best interests. In another case we failed to use it to our own advantage. During the Korean war we did not interdict supplies brought in by sea to support the Chinese Communists through invoking the doctrine of continuous voyage as was done in World War I. I have no idea how much the Soviets used this means of logistic support, but whatever it was, it relieved the Trans-Siberian Railroad. The inability of that railroad to support a Pacific war—a repeat of 1904–5—eventually forced a truce on the Chinese.

On May 25, 1962, it was announced on a television program that at least one Soviet ship was in the area of our nuclear tests in the central Pacific. The commentator added: "There is nothing that we can do about it." He was referring to a sea area that the Japanese had successfully kept closed for 20 years and for whose control the American people had spent both blood and treasure. Yet, with the strongest Navy in the world, they were told "there was nothing that we

could do about" this Soviet violation of our strictest security at sea.

"FREEDOM OF THE SEAS," THE SLOGAN THAT ALMOST DESTROYED US

Cases such as these must have induced Premier Khrushchev to make the trial in Cuba. Our lack of action he attributed to a reluctance to face hard issues but my belief is that it was a slavish and misunderstood devotion to a slogan. Sir Julian Corbett, able historian of the British Navy, wrote almost a half century ago: "Freedom of the seas," is one of those ringing phrases that haunt the ear and continue to confuse the judgment.[1]

Freedom of the seas cannot exist so long as naval warfare is allowed to exist, since without substantial permission to command the seas, navies, except as mere adjuncts to armies, cease to have meaning.

The seas are free in peace but they never have been free in war. We are told today almost constantly that we are in a cold war. *Ipso facto*, the seas should not be free today.

The seas have been free in peace only because the British Navy kept them so. Actually the concept that no individual nation has the right of domination of the high seas is of comparatively recent origin. The trend now is the other way with various nations, including the United States and the Soviet Union, claiming rights to certain sea areas outside their territorial limits. Nevertheless, Great Britain has never used her naval power to restrict commerce to her own advantage and neither has the United States. There is certainly no assurance that this will still be the case if naval power should fall into other hands.

In time of war, however, the British have never hesitated to close the seas to her enemies. The United States, as a neutral, gave lip service to the doctrine that private property in the form of ships and cargo should be free to use the seas in time of war but when the chips were down we followed British practice, in the Civil War, and in World Wars I and II.

Julian Corbett again succinctly stated the case: "In time of peace freedom of the seas exists already; in time of war it does not exist, never has existed, and at no time has it ever been put forward in its entirety by serious authority as an ideal of international politics."

In summary, freedom of the seas is a free world gift in time of peace but subject to control in time of war. In the age in which we live, peace and war are no longer distinguishable. What can be sharply defined in this cold war condition is who belongs to the free world and who does not.

In modern times, threats to the free world have come from land power. In every case it has been turned back by control of the seas. On the other hand, this control of the sea, by itself alone, cannot threaten the existence of any state.

NAVAL POWER CAN KEEP COMMUNIST AGGRESSION LOCKED WITHIN THE LITTORAL OF EURASIA

Geographically, communism is land power while the free world is a great sea state. The natural boundary between them is the littoral where the land mass of Eurasia meets the sea. The free world has the advantage of a salient into Communist land power in the form of the peninsula of Europe which has been successfully supported from the sea twice in our century. In today's cold war, naval power, using the belligerent rights granted it by international law, can keep communism from again breaking out of that littoral as it was allowed to do for the first time in the case of Cuba.

[1] Corbett no doubt felt that "seapower" was another of these phrases as he did not use the term in his extensive writing on the history of the British Navy.

At the same time, land transportation being what it is, naval power cannot impose an effective blockade on the Soviet Union and its contiguous satellites. The failure of the attempt to do so on the Korean Peninsula, 1951–53, proves this. Naval power can only be used offensively in conjunction with the power of the other two armed services. Used alone it is restricted to the defensive and in this manner contributes in a large degree to the stalemate of the cold war which is about all we can hope to accomplish by military means. The permanent stopping of the dynamic Communist ideology must be done in some other way.

Today with no real peace but only a spectrum of wars—cold war, limited war, general war, total war and the grades between—our aim is to keep the situation in the cold war stage, on our terms. The most logical way of doing this, now that the Soviets refused to face the test, is to exercise our control of the seas as we see fit, employing such belligerent rights allowed by international law as we care to use.

When wars were limited to the armed forces, a merchant could go about his business at sea without becoming involved unless he wanted to. The principle of immunity of private property which we call freedom of the seas was a byproduct of the limited wars of the 18th and 19th centuries. Such immunity became a casualty of the 20th-century total wars. Cold war is milder in form than limited war so there is no reason why the doctrine of immunity of private property cannot be applied in this form of conflict.

The U.S. policy with regard to Cuba at present is consistent with this doctrine as it was propounded by John Adams and Woodrow Wilson. Private property, whether ship or cargo, is exempt. Contraband, that is whatever can be used to disturb the delicate balance of power, is not. We, who possess naval power, must alone determine what is contraband and whether it is absolute or conditional as defined by the early writers on international law and by our own Chief Justice Salmon P. Chase. We should decide when blockade will be resorted to and in what form.

NAVAL METHODS OF STOPPING COMMUNIST AGGRESSION

Wherever communism has succeeded, it has been in the shadow of armed might. Naval power can easily stop inroads of communism into the sea state of the free world by stopping the shipment of its arms beyond the littoral of the continent of Eurasia. The methods used can be the conventional visit and search such as the recent boarding of the Lebanese freighter under Soviet charter. There is always the danger in such procedure of submarine attack and there is no need to keep ships on this arduous duty at high cost and to the detriment of their training. Air surveillance and diversion to an inspecting port, the modification of the visit and search procedure adopted in World War I, will accomplish the same thing. Another means available, which also had its precedent in World War I, is the issuing of written documents, called "navicerts" at the port of departure, certifying to the contents of the cargo.

One saving feature of the laws of war at sea is that the actions of naval officers are reviewed by civilian judges in prize courts. Nothing parallels this in martial law. It may be necessary some day to again invoke prize courts but such courts must, as always, be those of the naval power itself. For the time being, the prospect of delay and inconvenience may be sufficient to deter shipping owners from chartering their vessels for purposes of Communist aggression. If not, there is still another tool which the British used effectively during World War I—bunker control. Except in the Black Sea, oil fuel is everywhere under the control of the free world.

The Soviets retreated when we confronted them at sea. It is in this area where we should patiently press our advantage and not be exasperated into an invasion or a "surgical"[2] air strike on missile or airbases in Cuba. The blackmail is over now, to regain the initiative the Soviets must employ the force they have in that country and this force has to be supported from overseas. A blockade can therefore keep the situation in the realm of cold war. If for this purpose, the blockade has to be made more extensive, it will still be less cruel on the Cuban people and more deflating to Castro than other military action.

A CODE FOR SEA LAW AGAINST AGGRESSION

What is needed now is a code for the law of the sea in a cold war, and it is ready and waiting. It may be found in a draft convention on the "Rights and Duties of States in Case of Aggression" prepared by the Research in International Law of the Harvard Law School and published in the American Journal of International Law, October 1939. (Note the date.) This document defines aggressor states, defending and codefending states and supporting states, and outlines measures that may be taken at sea against the aggressor state.

It also states: "Nothing in this convention shall be deemed to entitle any state to deprive the aggressor of territory or to impair the political independence of the aggressor, as a penalty for aggression."

SOME LITERATURE ON FREEDOM OF THE SEAS

One of the important facts of the Cuban situation which naval people should not overlook is the failure of the experts who have been writing about strategy and defense in the nuclear age to foresee what actually did happen and to provide any guide for action in handling it. Such best sellers as Henry A. Kissinger's "Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy" (1957) and Hahn and Neff, "American Strategy in the Nuclear Age," do not have a word on the kind of confrontation that actually took place. Neither does the newest work, Waskow, "The Limits of Defense" (1962). These books, it would now appear, are to be the only casualties of the crisis.

For any enlightenment of the subject of control of belligerent shipping in the cold war of the nuclear age, a reader must go back to a political scientist of more than a generation ago, Pitman B. Potter. His short but definitive "Freedom of the Seas, in History, Law, and Politics," traces this doctrine in international law, treats its modern interpretation in World War I, and offers some solutions which might stand the test of our time. He alone of the many writers on the subject then did not fall into the trap of finding an easy solution in the League of Nations.

No Navy man will go wrong who searches for guidance on any maritime question in the writings of Alfred T. Mahan. In this case it can be found in one of his little known works, "Some Neglected Aspects of War." This compilation of essays contains one by Julian Corbett, "Capture of Private Property at Sea," in which this writer in his incisive style lays bare the whole problem. Another by Mahan himself, "Belligerent Merchant Shipping," indicates why his associate at the Hague Conference, Alfred D. White, wrote of him: "When he speaks, the millennium fades, and the strong, severe actual world appears."

McGeorge Bundy, the President's adviser on national defense, in his biography of

[2] It is frightening that in such serious situations, our planners still communicate in Madison Avenue slogans whose purpose is to hide reality.

Henry M. Stimson, published in 1947, wrote of "the peculiar psychology of the Navy Department, which frequently seemed to retire from the realm of logic into a dim religious world in which Neptune was God, Mahan his prophet, and the U.S. Navy the only true church." What he now thinks of Mahan and sea power is not known.

## Hon. Wayne N. Aspinall, of Colorado, Discusses Need for Public Land Law Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, on December 11, 12, and 13, 1962, the National Association of Counties held a conference on matters relating to grazing, water, and revenue in conjunction with the meeting of the association's western regional district. Many thought-provoking papers were presented.

One of the outstanding presentations was made at a general session by the Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL, chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Because of the importance of this paper, I bring it to the attention of the Members by setting it forth in full as part of my remarks.

Not only does the message that follows outline some of the important work to be undertaken by your Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs during this Congress, it also sets forth the philosophy and principle underlying the chairman's approach:

A WESTERN LEGISLATOR VIEWS THE 88TH CONGRESS

(By Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL, of Colorado)

The President has said that we are living in climactic times. This is true, not only in the specific areas to which he was referring, but also in the fields of public land law and the development of public land areas with which this western regional district of the National Association of Counties should be, and I think is, vitally concerned.

Actions taken in the 88th Congress that will convene on January 9, 1963, may well shape the future patterns into which western communities will be required to mold themselves for years, and possibly decades, to come. I believe that the development of a revised, revitalized, and possibly brandnew public land policy will be one of the major accomplishments of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives in the next Congress. For my part I intend, within the limits of our physical capabilities, to assign to the Public Lands Subcommittee sufficient time in the months ahead to assure adequate review and study of existing processes and proposed modifications. In this work we shall cooperate with the administration and thoroughly examine any and all proposals that may be submitted for our consideration.

In discussing our physical capability to handle legislation, I would like you to keep in mind a few factual details: In the 87th Congress, 909 pieces of legislation were referred to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; the full committee met 67 times and the six subcommittees met a total of 283 times in Washington. The 87th Congress was, as we all know, a long one and despite this, although we scheduled meetings every working day until the very end of the session, an equal division of the 283 meetings would have given the six subcommittees approximately 47 meetings each which, at 2 hours each, would provide 94 hours for both hearings and deliberation. (Actually in the 87th Congress the Public Lands Subcommittee, which is the one with which I am most concerned today, met 57 times in Washington.)

Local government and county commissioners should be interested in substantial portions of our work in addition to that of the Subcommittee on Public Lands. The Subcommittee on National Parks, for example, reported favorably in the last Congress, and there were enacted, 12 bills authorizing the establishment of new units of the National Park System of which 3 were major and 9 smaller elements; the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation passes on projects that have a lasting effect on local affairs; the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs considers legislation involving Indian lands which form such a large portion of the land mass of some of the Western States; and the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining has jurisdiction over the mining and mineral leasing laws as well as mineral resources of the public generally, all of which are of vital and immediate interest to local governments.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs must not only consider legislation referred to it, but, in addition, it has the responsibility for legislative oversight of the Department of the Interior and the exercise of surveillance over the administration of statutes authorizing current activities. The importance of this legislative oversight responsibility can best be judged by a few examples of areas in which we can expect the committee to be active during the next Congress.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and its staff are keenly aware of the interest of county officials in these various matters. We not only welcome but solicit your views and recommendations. But, remember you and your counties, like everybody else, cannot have your cake and eat it. You cannot pick and choose those instances in which you want the law followed and those instances in which you would rather wink at the law. This is part of the reason that we examine the operation of existing law to determine compliance on the one hand or the need for revision on the other hand.

We know, for example, that there are revenue-sharing formulas that make it inviting in some areas to continue the management of public land areas by either the Forest Service or the Bureau of Land Management, that is management and retention in Federal ownership instead of placing the property in a position where it could be sold even though after sale property developed for private use would be placed on the tax rolls. At this point let us acknowledge that there are important differences between revenue sharing and payments-in-lieu of taxes, and that, particularly where construction has been emplaced, the shared revenue is sometimes paid to a county that has not suffered and may have even benefited from a Federal project.

Many of us have become deeply concerned by the fact that the Bureau of Land Management seems to lose sight at times of the opening sentence of the Taylor Grazing Act which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to do certain things "in order to promote the highest use of the public lands pending its final disposal." The attempt to designate these public lands as a "national land reserve" implies retention rather than preparation for disposal. In addition we have noted the Bureau's applications for funds to enter the recreation field on a large scale on public lands where the construction of recreation facilities would certainly be inconsistent with plans for the final disposal of the land contemplated by the Taylor Grazing Act. We shall therefore be concerned in the immediate future with a review of the proposed Bureau of Land Management recreation program to see, first, whether it is consistent with existing legislation and, second, to what extent it is proposed to establish duplicate administrative machinery by failing to utilize the services of the National Park Service as a management agency of these new proposed recreation areas.

I am sure you are all aware of the fact that the last Congress enacted a law making it possible to bring certain Federal district court actions outside the District of Columbia against government officials and agencies. Suits can now be brought in the specified instances within the judicial district in which, among other things, real property involved in an action is situated. I supported this legislation and am gratified that after years of effort it has been enacted. However, unless administrative remedies are first exhausted one cannot sustain any law suit. It therefore becomes imperative that we remove roadblocks to administrative consideration of cases as a necessary ingredient of full operation of this new law.

Many of us in the last year have become increasingly concerned with the extensive backlog of appeals before the Director of the Bureau of Land Management and the Secretary of the Interior. We have, accordingly, been pursuing an analysis of present procedures to determine whether the committee should initiate legislation to facilitate consideration of cases on administrative appeal. I am sure you all realize that a 2 to 3 year lag between appeal and decision not only frustrates the individual's rights but can have a direct impact on the availability, use, and development of public lands which are matters of great concern to county commissioners trying to plan ahead.

I do want to acknowledge the efforts made by the Department and the cooperation that has been given to the committee and its staff by the Department of the Interior Solicitor, Mr. Frank Barry, who shares the platform with me this morning. Some progress has been made. However, in a report 2 weeks ago from Assistant Secretary Carver, who informed me of the introduction of new procedures designed to expedite appeals, it was pointed out that the backlog of appeals to the Secretary had been reduced between July 1, and October 1, 1962, from 793 to 726 cases. (At this rate it would still take 2½ years to clear up the existing backlog; but, it is definite progress.)

The Department had been requested to either institute positive procedures to assure reduced appeal time or to recommend to the 88th Congress legislation to accomplish the purpose. But, whether or not the Department makes significant inroads in its current backlog, the committee must look to the long-range program. I hope, therefore, that we will have time to hold hearings looking toward a constructive solution.

Another matter that the committee has been studying in one phase of the operation of the Recreation and Public Purposes Act of 1926. A special Public Lands Subcommittee, at my request, looked into a specific transaction in the adjacent town of Henderson, Nev., where a land area was made available for private recreational use as a so-called public golf course without any formal notification or hearing by Department officials. The examination of this one

case led to a general review of the law as it applies to nonpublic bodies and groups; but no hearings could be held because of the lack of time. I understand that the subcommittee is presently completing its report and I expect that this matter will be pursued in the next Congress.

You, as county officials are, I know, very much concerned that public lands be devoted to some use, whether it be recreational or for intensive development and occupancy for residence or business. Our committee has in the last 5 years reviewed all proposed withdrawals over 5,000 acres and considered legislation for those involving defense utilization. In addition to continuing these procedures during the next Congress I have the assurance of Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman that the Forest Service will cooperate with us in an effort to enact new-type statutory withdrawals in those instances where it will be possible to protect the public interest while providing for multiple use through a partial withdrawal that cannot be effected administratively.

The principle of multiple use is part of the history of our basic public land policies. Traditional policy, which I vigorouosly support and which I take every opportunity to espouse, has always equated conservation with wise use. What makes our proposed approach different is that we plan to apply this idea of multiple use of tracts of land required for governmental use.

In the past, wherever an agency of Government required the use of a parcel of land, it was withdrawn from appropriation under the public land laws under an express or implied executive authority. As a result of our coordination of proposed withdrawal actions we know now that there are areas in which it will be possible to withdraw the land for surface use but permit subsurface exploration and development. In addition to the National Forests, we have determined that this approach will be feasible in connection with Corps of Engineers reservoir projects.

A partial withdrawal, however, cannot be effected administratively. The general laws do not contemplate that type of action. Accordingly, it will be necessary to consider individual withdrawal bills while, at the same time, the committee studies the practicability of establishing general guidelines to meet the modern requirements.

The obvious reason for the current emphasis on developing new means of assuring multiple use is the growing scarcity of usable land for the various programs, purposes, and uses for which the people of the United States have legitimate demands. Those of us who are familiar with the development of the West know that it could not have taken place without the use of public lands. This city of Las Vegas has grown through the use and development of public lands and their transformation into privately held lands. Likewise, I know that many of your counties rely for your revenues on taxes levied on real property that once was nontaxable because it was public land; and I can see you looking eagerly and hopefully for new additions to the tax rolls.

Here our responsibilites for legislative oversight and for consideration of bills will probably merge again. We know that our land laws generally need modernizing; and, in recent years, recommendations for modification have been made by both the previous Republican administration and the present Democratic administration. Our committee has held hearings on several proposals and heard conflicting views. The bills before the committee last year ranged from the relatively minor proposal to repeal the Pittman Act, which establishes special procedures for land grants for agricultural development in the State of Nevada, to full-scale major revision of the nonmineral public land laws.

As I indicated at the outset, the most important business for the West that I foresee in the 88th Congress will probably see the climax of these and other studies leading toward revision of the basic public land laws. In order to put this projected action in focus I would like to review with you a few salient background factors, including the fundamentals of our land laws.

Article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution imposes on Congress the responsibility and authority for the disposal of all Government property. When Congress fails to act it creates a vacuum into which the Executive may—no, I will say must—move to assure effective, efficient management. Congress did fail to enact general legislation designed to govern the use of public lands; and the executive branch has accordingly made its own rules as to which areas should be preserved as wilderness, which areas should be open for disposal, and which areas should be retained for recreational use.

In the consideration of legislation to dispose of reserved minerals, in proposals to make lands available for urban and business development, in bills to set aside wilderness areas, and in the several measures that have been introduced governing the withdrawal and reservation for specialized use of lands in excess of 5,000 acres, the central problem has revolved around the executive-legislative relationship in the management and disposal of our public lands. I submit that this will emerge as the clear-cut issue early in the 88th Congress. I promise you that we will meet this issue squarely and that I, for one, will insist that Congress shall not shirk the responsibility that it has under the Constitution.

This group knows, I am sure, that our committee reported a bill that in effect would have required an act of Congress for most future withdrawals and changes in use designations of public land areas in excess of 5,000 acres; and would also have set aside 6.8 million acres of land for wilderness preservation, with provision for additional areas to be safeguarded in the future. Incidentally, in this bill we adopted an amendment that was so ably recommended by your new president of the western regional district, Jim Stearns, who appeared before the Public Lands Subcommittee in his capacities, at that time, as vice chairman of the district and chairman of the Public Lands Committee of the California County Supervisors Association. The amendment to which I refer, of course, is the one that would require the views of local governments to be obtained before additional areas could be set aside and preserved as wilderness. I congratulate you on having elevated Mr. Stearns to the presidency of this body.

The bill we reported out, which I sponsored as a substitute for the wilderness bill, was, I am pleased to note, received with satisfaction by this organization and its many components including my own State of Colorado county commissioners whose voice, in the person of Fritz Schneider, is heard so clearly. The wilderness preservation advocates did not like the bill and some of the executive departments objected to the proposed limitation on their powers. This opposition was not unique in the recent history of related legislation. Many different proposals have been made in individual areas as well as for general application concerning the guidelines for the future management and disposal of public lands. None has met with universal approval nor has any met with sufficient approval to permit enactment without controversy. Accordingly, on October 15, 1962, I wrote to the President and invited him to use his offices to submit to the Congress when it reconvenes in January an administration proposal for the enactment of legislation to define once and for all the executive-legislative relationship. I have been assured by the White House that this matter is being given serious consideration and I look forward to working with the administration in the 88th Congress to obtain mutually acceptable legislation.

The constitutional provision I cited a moment ago is explicit. Nonetheless, we have areas of misunderstanding. For example, I find some of my good friends in the conservation movement completely missing the point of my objectives in this area in which I have been supported by recent committee actions. First, I hasten to assure you that I know of nobody on our committee motivated by any preconceived conclusion to obtain the use of public lands for any specific purpose.

There is a big difference between evaluating all uses and advocating particular uses. I would like to keep the record straight on a few things: I do not advocate any particular use—as a general proposition—as having any higher priority for allocation of public land areas than any other use; I believe that it is imperative that added areas be set aside for recreational use; I believe that we should preserve some wilderness areas; and finally I think that, after considering all possible uses, it is proper, if found to be in the national interest, that areas of public lands be reserved for limited or even single purpose use.

The important ingredient, that even some of my friends overlook, is that this procedure must place the responsibility for authorizing less than full multiple use in the hands of the Congress, the entity of the Federal Government closest to the people, and therefore most capable of acting as the landlord for the people themselves. In general enactments Congress has repeatedly, in words and substance, provided for the broadest possible multiple use; in specific bills we have set aside national parks for the enjoyment of all the people as recreational havens. We must now move on and either enunciate specific policy guidelines for the executive to carry out, or, in some way, pass on each specific major set-aside of public lands for limited or single purpose use.

The failure of Congress to act has permitted the Executive to set aside within national forests, exclusive of the Minnesota canoe areas, almost 14 million acres of land for wilderness preservation. If we fail to act and the Bureau of Land Management likewise sets aside for preservation of recreational development large units of public domain lands, we shall have no one to blame but ourselves if we later disagree with that action.

The 88th Congress will, I expect, bring these matters into focus for decision. Bearing in mind that the Homestead Act was enacted 100 years ago, the basic mining law 90 years ago, and the Taylor Grazing Act almost 30 years ago, I think we can all agree that the tremendous expansion of the country since the end of World War II requires some modernization of our public land laws. I think it is imperative that county commissioners individually and collectively, through organizations such as this, let us have your views. You, the commissioners, are closest to the people whose areas are being affected. In the final analysis we in Congress must legislate in the overall national interest; but, in doing so, we, at least, will give every consideration possible to local and regional needs before overriding them for the greater good of the greater number.

The only limtation that we will have on the extent to which the Committee delves into these various subjects that I have mentioned, as well as others such as my own bill to permit local taxation of personal property within Federal areas, will be the physical limitations of time. We should devote whatever time is necessary to each of these matters; and yet, as I demonstrated earlier, we

will be fortunate if the Public Lands Subcommittee has a total of between 90 and 100 hours in which to consider all of the matters within its jurisdiction.

I hope that these remarks will serve to bring about among you, as well as others, a little better understanding of my own approach and some of our problems. Possibly you will be able to help when someone criticizes us for failing to act more quickly.

## A Brilliant Milestone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the city of Pomona, Calif., is an outstanding and progressive American city. It possesses citizens with wonderful community spirit and ability, and unusual natural resources. As a result Pomona has made great strides. I feel honored to represent this community in the Congress.

Pomona this year observes its diamond jubilee. Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the January 6, 1963, Pomona Progress-Bulletin outlining Pomona's rich and interesting history:

A BRILLIANT MILESTONE

Just as the diamond is the most highly valued of stones, so a diamond anniversary is a brilliant and precious milestone for any community.

As Pomona begins observance of such an anniversary with its diamond jubilee, a look back over the years shows a record of accelerating growth and progress that assures an even brighter future for the city and the area it serves.

Blessed with unusual natural resources—a wonderful climate, beautiful scenery, rich soil, abundant pure water, and a strategic location—this valley was a land of opportunity to the early day residents and has continued to be through the years.

Its greatest wealth, however, has always been found in the men and women whose vision, character, courage, and devotion has given the community aggressive and successful leadership.

In its earliest pioneer days, this was a land of big cattle ranches. They went out of the picture with the drought of the early 1860's. Hay and grain were giving way to vineyards and deciduous fruit orchards in the late 1880's when Pomona was incorporated, and development of citrus groves was on its way.

By the turn of the century, Pomona Valley was the very center of the southern California citrus industry. The Richards Ranch in north Pomona was said to be the largest navel orange grove in the world, and for a time the packinghouse in San Dimas was the largest lemon-shipping house in the country.

So the valley excelled in citrus as it had in raising cattle and horses and subsequently in building an enviable reputation for its canned deciduous fruit.

Pomona citrus growers were among the first to ship their fruit cooperatively, and took a leading part in the founding of the California Fruit Growers Exchange—now Sunkist, Inc.—which was at one time the largest cooperative shipping organization in the world. It played a major part in making the southern California citrus industry world famous.

In the early 1920's the desire of the people of Pomona to provide a showcase for agriculture, horticulture and animal husbandry prompted chamber of commerce and other leaders to launch the Los Angeles County Fair. Today the fair is, as it has been for many years, the largest and most beautiful county fair in America.

Pomona early became known as a city of fine homes, schools and churches. At one time the per capita giving for missionary work exceeded that of any other community in the West. Pomona churches through the years have sent and maintained missionaries in many parts of the world including Africa, India, China, Japan, Central and South America.

From the city's early days its residents wanted the best in education for their children, and were willing to make sacrifices to provide it. They established a splendid system of public schools from kindergarten through college.

Pomona College, founded during the same year as the city's incorporation, is today the outstanding liberal arts college of the West. But Pomona was only the first college. Now there are 12 fine schools on the college level in the Pomona Valley area.

As the schools were developed, special attention was given to music and art. Today Pomona takes pride, with its neighbor communities, in being a well rounded cultural center.

In the field of medicine, too, Pomona has developed steadily. The multimillion-dollar Pomona Valley Community Hospital, for example, is the heart of one of southern California's outstanding medical centers.

Pomona people have had visions in other fields as well. Before Pomona College was scarcely a year old, its president, the late Dr. Cyrus G. Baldwin, had secured the cooperation of electrical engineers in the building of a hydroelectric powerplant in San Antonio Canyon. The powerline that brought electric energy from that plant to Pomona pioneered the vast electrical industry of today.

First recognition in the industrial world came to this city with the organization of the Pomona Manufacturing Co., later named the Pomona Pump Co., and now the Pomona works of Fairbanks, Morse & Co. Its deepwell pump, the Pomona pump, became known over much of the world.

Today, Pomona industries are supplying products to meet a broad field of needs, including those of the space age. Its electronic, missile, and other plants are being supplemented rapidly. They will provide employment for many new residents, thus further fortifying Pomona Valley's stable economy.

Pomona has made rapid strides in recent months, so rapid that some persons describe its development as explosive.

Wishing to develop an outstanding core business district, Pomona businessmen inaugurated a revitalization program which included building offstreet parking lots and the Pomona Mall. This program has attracted nationwide attention.

With the construction of a $4½ million superior courts building, Pomona's importance as a judicial center will be fully realized. This and many other assured developments in the civic center area and elsewhere are giving Pomona increasing momentum. This community has been building the foundations for a bright future that should offer great new opportunities for its citizens.

A great statesman might have been thinking of a community such as Pomona when he said, "The past is but a prolog for the future."

## The Fiscal Problems of Our Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the fiscal problems of our country are paramount. I, therefore, under unanimous consent, include the following three editorials in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Wall Street Jounal, Dec. 17, 1962]

THE POSSIBLE AND THE PERFECT

Every criticism President Kennedy directed at the tax structure Friday night is absolutely right. If it were simply a question of lowering rates to get the economy going faster, there would be no quarrel instead of the angry national argument that is in fact developing.

As Mr. Kennedy said, the present tax system "siphons out of the private economy too large a share of personal and business purchasing power * * * it reduces the financial incentives for personal effort, investment, and risktaking." Those are exactly the incentives that could spell greater growth.

In addition, the endless tinkering with taxes in an effort to make them somewhat less burdensome has created a patchwork that distorts private economic judgments and makes certain types of activity more profitable than other and more valuable undertakings. All this, the President wisely said, "inhibits our growth and efficiency."

The President is probably correct, too, when he says that as a practical matter Federal spending is going to continue rising. He had hoped to propose tax cuts in the frame of a balanced budget; instead he will do so in a swirling sea of red ink. Yet to defer tax cuts until spending is reduced and budgets balanced might be, to borrow a phrase of his, to force the possible to wait on the perfect.

He may even be right when he argues that lower tax rates might not seriously augment the deficit for very long. Certainly increased economic activity could produce more revenue for the Government from lower rates.

Unfortunately it is right there that some of the trouble begins. While higher spending is as sure as Mr. Kennedy and his advisers can make it, the economic impact of lower taxes is a guess at best. And Government planners are notoriously poor guessers.

They estimated a modest surplus for fiscal 1959 under President Eisenhower and they got a $12.5 billion deficit. For the current period they estimated a small surplus and they are getting a deficit now calculated at nearly $8 billion. What the figure will be in the budget Mr. Kennedy proposes next month is not known, but nobody denies it will be another deficit.

This seemingly perpetual round of deficits in good times and bad, for any excuse or none, is what gives so many Americans the jitters about tax cuts that could aggravate the already unbalanced arithmetic. People simply cannot understand why it is that, even if defense and space spending must rise, the Government is so unwilling to pull back on obviously less essential projects. The President's promise to hold the line on such projects in the forthcoming budget is not going to reassure them—not with all experience to the contrary.

For that reason we believe the President's refusal to base tax cuts on lower spending

is not only a drastic economic error but may be a political mistake as well. Such a skilled political practitioner must be aware of the mood of the country. You would think he would want to capitalize on it by going before Congress with recommendations for both tax and spending reductions. If he would do that, he could stop worrying about the polls, his legislative program, Nelson Rockefeller, or just about anything else.

That is not demanding an unattainable perfection but only common economic sense. The honest truth is that we can and should have both lower taxes and lower spending. If politics is the art of the possible, the President is overlooking a magnificent possibility.

---

[From the Shelbyville (Ind.) News]

DON'T SPEND IT—YET

Information on the administration's forthcoming tax program, leaked to the press in advance of the President's message to Congress on that subject, indicates a contemplated gross reduction of $8 billion to $10 billion in tax receipts, but to be offset by $3.5 billion of increased revenue that is now seeping through those so-called loopholes.

Furthermore, it has been revealed that reductions are to prevail over all tax brackets, from the poor man's 20 percent to the millionaire's 91 percent and including the 52-percent corporate income tax.

The avowed purpose is to stimulate business so as to relieve unemployment. But it is difficult to see how a cut of these overall proportions and spread so thin can offer significant relief in any quarter.

Speculation on the effects of a proposal yet to be presented are rather idle, of course.

But it now seems plain that there will be strong resistance in Congress to tax-cutting without similar reductions in spending, especially when the current fiscal year that ends next June 30 is expected to show a deficit of around $8 billion—and perhaps even more.

Representative JOHN BYRNES, of Wisconsin, for one, has declared that if the President will cut nonemergency spending, taxes can be cut, too. And he is expected to have plenty of company in both Houses among Congressmen and Senators who have been listening to constituents who are far more concerned about the welfare of this Nation than of that of others on which we have been spending huge sums—and who are not as happy about all those costly Federal "help" programs on the domestic level as some politicians like to think.

The thought of adding even a few billions of dollars to a national debt of $300 billion is disturbing to those of us who are naive enough to cling to the idea that nations should pay their bills as well as people—and who remember enough history to recall that a score of once-great nations have perished because they didn't.

---

[From the Greenfield (Ind.) News, Jan. 10, 1963]

TAX CUT ALREADY EARNED

Most prominent subject for action in the new session of the U.S. Congress, just now beginning, as seen by the political prognosticators in Washington, is the Presidential proposal for a cut in income taxes, more or less "across the board" and irrespective of whether or not the cut is accompanied by a reduction in spending.

There is by no means unanimity of opinion as to the exact details of this reduction, but if any action by the new Congress seems fairly sure, it would be that some sort of a reduction in income tax is in the cards. The reason or excuse for such a cut at this time is as a means of speeding growth, employment, prosperity, by providing more money for investment in business and industry and, therefore jobs, and by permitting the people to retain a greater portion of their incomes to spend in obtaining what they desire.

It all seems very kind and charitable on the face of it and is a tacit admission that income taxes for the last 25 years have been far too high. With that we heartily agree and include that spending has also been allowed to be maintained at too-high a level. The very fact that tax collections have been allowed to remain at such a high level, year after year, was in itself an invitation to high spending and extravagant waste in public business.

And the fact that a cut in taxes is looked upon as a sure-fire remedy for an insufficient rate of growth is, in itself, an admission that taxes at present levels are not good and have contributed to a dwarfing of virility, ambition, and growth.

But, when we look the whole field over; not just focusing on Federal income levies alone, we see that there is a certain amount of deception and sham in the tax-cutting proposals.

For instance: Just as of this present month, substantial new drains have been put upon the pocketbook of the consuming public by the Federal Government and it will take a considerable cut in income tax rates to merely even up to the citizen and make his position as tenable as it was even last year.

The social security tax against all payrolls and the earnings of the self-employed, was substantially increased as of January 1. It will place in the Treasury hundreds of millions of additional dollars each year, and two further increases in coming years has also been provided in the statutes. In addition the "medicare" proposal if it should be passed, would up the rate still further, at a rate of nearly $2 billion a year.

Also, as of January 7, every postal rate in the book was raised substantially. First-class postage was raised 25 percent. Second class was raised 10 percent this year, with two additional 10-percent raises to go on next year and the next. So on through all postal categories. This will raise annually added hundreds of millions. When there is a postal deficit it is made up out of tax collections, so the manipulation of postal rates is directly tied to the income tax. Therefore, it can be easily seen that it will take a relatively large cut in the income tax to put the average taxpayer on balance so that he will actually be paying less than he was in 1962 to the Government in all forms of assessment. In other words, we have here a considerable bit of hocus-pocus.

We bet a lot of you hadn't even thought of that.

---

## Gen. Curtis E. LeMay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, news reports speculate that Air Force Chief of Staff Gen. Curtis E. LeMay will not be reappointed at the end of his term in July. This would be a great loss to the Air Force and to the country.

It would also be positive indication that along the New Frontier, you must muzzle your dissenting comments or look for another line of work. This administration has, through press releases, told Federal employees to speak out on matters within their jurisdiction. With fanfare, State Department officers are told to try something new, be imaginative.

Yet in General LeMay we have a man whose strong convictions and honest beliefs caused him to speak out against the proposed abandonment of manned bombers. Apparently his reward will be an end to his services.

This would be most unfortunate. There are few men more dedicated to the security of this Nation than General LeMay. All of us know him for his outstanding performance as head of our first line of defense—the Strategic Air Command. His high sense of duty and his complete devotion to the Air Force and the defense of this country have won him a place in the ranks of our greatest military leaders.

It would be a grave loss indeed to have the country deprived of his services, knowledge, and abilities because he had the courage to speak out for what he believes we need for our own defense.

A forceful editorial from the Omaha World-Herald of January 11 deals directly with this matter, and I include it at this point.

DISPOSING OF LEMAY

This newspaper's Washington Bureau says it now seems almost certain that Gen. Curtis LeMay will not be reappointed as Air Force Chief of Staff when his term ends in July.

Admirers of General LeMay—and we believe that this includes almost all of his countrymen—should have been prepared for this shock.

The man who commanded SAC in its formative years and who, perhaps more than any other man, is responsible for creating America's bomber force, has all but been shoved out the door of the Pentagon.

He was overruled on the Skybolt missile. The fate of the proposed RS–70 hangs by a slender thread. The whole concept of the manned bomber is being thrown overboard by the Kennedy administration. If the "whiz kid" civilians in the Pentagon have their way, they may scuttle the U.S. Air Force as we have known it.

Civilian supporters of the Air Force are bitter about this treatment of Curtis LeMay. We surmise that the officers and men of the Air Force are even more disturbed. For if the ideas, the knowledge, the lifelong experience of General LeMay can be cast aside in such cavalier fashion, how much attention will be paid to the views of other airmen?

The day General LeMay is thrown to the wolves may prove the sorriest day for American airpower since other so-called "bright boys" in another era court-martialed Billy Mitchell.

---

## Progress and the Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert in the RECORD an excellent address delivered by Mr. Kenneth H. Klipstein, president of the American Cyana-

mid Co., before the Society of Chemical Industry on October 19, 1962. On that date, Mr. Klipstein received the coveted 1962 Chemical Industry Medal of the American Section of the Society of Chemical Industry.

Mr. Klipstein is an outstanding leader in the chemical industry and his remarks should be read by all who are interested in the achievements of the American chemical industry and the preservation of the free enterprise system:

PROGRESS AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

(Remarks by Kenneth H. Klipstein, president, American Cyanamid Co.)

No recognition that may come to a man is more gratifying, more to be cherished than that which his peers and lifelong colleagues may choose to bestow upon him. This is a day unlike any other in my life. Through me, you have also highly honored all of my associates, past and present at American Cyanamid Co., and on their behalf, as well as my own, I thank you with all sincerity.

It has been good to spend my life in the chemical industry, seeing it grow and taking part in one of the high adventures of all time. My fervent wish is that this adventure never cease for others—that men never run out of opportunities to be uncovered, problems to be solved, frontiers to be explored.

One of the purposes of the founders of the Society of Chemical Industry was to provide for "the discussion of all matters bearing upon the practice of applied chemistry."

I would like to invoke that purpose tonight. The matter I mean to discuss has considerable bearing upon the practice of applied chemistry. It is not exaggeration to say that it may even determine whether the practice of applied chemistry as we know it today shall continue to exist.

MANY ATTACKS ON INDUSTRY

The chemical industry is under attack—on many fronts.

We see a challenge posed to our patent system—at the very time when other nations are taking steps to strengthen protection for their own inventors.

We see mounting alarm over possible pollution of our air and water, without recognition of the preventive steps being taken by industry.

We see a concerted attack on the pharmaceutical industry by critics who seem to forget what has happened to life expectancy in recent years.

We see the public being frightened over the use of agricultural chemicals, despite their enormous benefit to our food supply.

We see new trade and tariff provisions which, depending on how they are applied, might undermine whole segments of the chemical industry.

At a time when images are often considered more important than the very things they portray, there are many who see us only as contaminators and polluters.

All these problems stem largely from the same root: namely, the deplorable lack of public understanding.

People don't know enough about what we are, about what we do, and why we do it. To us here tonight, the development of synthetic organic pesticides is one of the major accomplishments of the chemical industry. We are proud to have been able to place these amazing tools into the hands of those charged with providing our food and protecting our health.

To the readers of the book, "Silent Spring"—and there are many because it is the current book of the month—synthetic organic pesticides would appear to be a national hazard, and their makers eager to tamper with the balance of life itself in order to turn a profit.

The author writes that "for the first time in history virtually every human being is subjected to contact with dangerous chemicals from birth to death." The fact is that all life is biochemical and all matter is chemical. We have always been—and will be—exposed to chemicals from birth to death. A few are dangerous; most of them are harmless; others, many of them created by man, are beneficial; some are indispensable to sustain life.

OTHERS DANGERS ALSO EXIST

Air, salt, and water are all chemicals and can all be dangerous, but without them, no living thing could survive. Burning is a chemical reaction; it is a process of oxidation. Fire can bring about fearful destruction. The loss of life and property which it can cause may be terrible. Yet we would not want to do without flame for cooking and heat and power and we could not live without respiration.

There is always another side, but unfortunately, rebuttals never have the force or persuasiveness of the original charge.

It is small wonder then, lacking the necessary understanding, that many people are trying to impose tighter controls on us. They seem to feel we must be prodded into rectitude and legislated into virtue.

My concern over what the public knows and thinks about us is occasioned by the fact that the public can, if it chooses to do so, prevent us from effectively doing our job.

They can do so by giving tacit approval to policies and regulations which will ultimately stifle our enterprise. From the start, the great lifeline of applied chemistry has been the freedom to innovate—the freedom to set our own research goals and pursue them in the light of our own knowledge.

RESEARCH MAY BE AFFECTED

To carry on research and not only to carry it on but expand it proportionately to the growth of knowledge, complexity of industry and diversity of application, entails a need for more and more scientific personnel and more funds to support their activities. If our critics are successful in prosecuting their cases, inevitably we will see the effect creep into our balance sheets. Cost of plant investment, cost of raw materials and conversion costs are not subject to arbitrary cuts, but if profits disappear, something will have to give. Reluctantly, it may have to be research. There have been instances in the past when this has happened and we know the demoralizing results. Not only for self-preservation must we gain public support but also in order to discharge our obligations to the public in its very own interest. To secure public support, we will first need public understanding.

People mistrust the unknown. In many primitive languages, the word for "enemy" is the word for "stranger". Despite its explosive growth and the important position it occupies in our economy, the chemical industry is a relative stranger. Perhaps we are too diverse, too complex, too interrelated, too technical, and too ever-changing.

We do, however, have one common denominator. Unseen and unrecognized, we are at man's service in countless different ways. We are a silent servant of mankind.

I think the time has come for us to speak out.

First, however, let us make certain that all we do is truly in the public interest. By this I do not mean a cursory check to reassure ourselves that we are acting within the letter of the law. What I do mean is a sincere, searching appraisal of our actions and of their probable consequences on the society which we inhabit and which nurtures us.

This we must do not through charity and benevolence, not through gratitude, not through a sudden desire for popularity. We must do it for the most hardheaded, realistic business considerations, born of the clear knowledge that a free society does not long tolerate harmful or undesirable elements in its midst.

We must do it for the very simple reason that if we fail to, someone else will most assuredly do it for us. We have seen in our lifetime the growth of the assumption that of all social and economic institutions, only government can be trusted to be guardian of the public interest. Yet there are many things which the individual, acting singly or in variously organized groups, can do for himself that the government cannot do better.

FOR THE PUBLIC INTEREST

I do not want to leave the impression that the chemical industry is in any special need of self-scrutiny, or that such scrutiny will uncover shameful evils. Rather, I suggest that a continuous appraisal of the social impact of our policies and actions—a public interest audit, if you will—is essential if we are to discharge one of our most pressing and important responsibilities.

This is the responsibility to explain to the public what we are trying to do.

The consuming public tends to think of the chemical industry in terms of test tubes and fumes without realizing what a giant we really are. Everybody is familiar with aluminum and copper, but ammonia means little more to the man on the street than a household cleansing agent. He would be astonished to learn that more ammonia is produced each year in America than aluminum and copper combined, with zinc, lead, and magnesium thrown in for good measure. The production of sulfuric acid is three times that of ammonia. Our industry's dollar sales are about twice as large as those of the steel industry.

OPEN HOUSE IS NEEDED

There are more than 12,500 chemical plants in the United States, in every kind of community and in every corner of the country. Let the people see what we are doing. Let us proclaim open house and extend a cordial welcome to all so that they can begin to appreciate how much what we do means to them. Let us prove to them that chemicals are what they eat, what shelters them from the elements, what protects their health, what guarantees our national safety, what provides both the necessities and the bountiful luxuries of the good life. Let us help them come to the realization that the word "chemical" is not just an abstract noun, but rather refers to thousands of articles of everyday use in every home.

Let us enlist the help of our own employees. They should all be supporters of our cause, along with their families, their friends, and their neighbors. They have a vested interest in the welfare and continued success of our industry. More than that, they should be proud of the contributions they are making to the general welfare. They should be knowledgeable and enthusiastic ambassadors. They should be, and they can be.

We never hesitate to appropriate time, creative energy, management skills, and adequate funds for those projects which are directed toward generating greater sales and increasing profitability. After all, the primary responsibility of a business enterprise is to create a profitable return on investment in plant, property, and equipment. If we recognize, and I belive we are beginning to, that lack of public understanding of the chemical industry may result in a serious potential hazard to our continued growth and well-being, then we must devote the same serious attention to solving this problem as we would to a decision involving a major expansion program.

You all remember the little rhyme about—

"When in trouble,
When in doubt
Run in circles,
Scream and shout."

This we have no need to do. It is fortunate that we have a good story to tell, an honest story and an interesting and exciting one.

OUR PRODUCTS HELP ALL

Let us tell it in terms of our products. The chemical industry is so varied that it defies definition. Together, we make so many different things that no single classification has been devised to encompass them all adequately. All the better. We can tell people that our products contribute to every waking and sleeping moment of their lives. We are important to them for as many reasons and and in as many ways as the multitude of products we produce.

Let us tell our story in terms of their interest, not ours. What we are asking for—what we need—is their consent. Public permission to carry on our affairs free from unreasonable restrictions and legislative or regulatory harassment. The easiest, surest way to gain this consent and to keep it, is to demonstrate to the public that what we do it useful, is beneficial, even indispensible to them. What could be more convincing?

Let us tell our story in terms of what we have already done, of the contributions we have made to the growth and creation of our industries which in turn have provided jobs and wealth; of the contributions we have made to better health and a longer, richer lifespan; of the contributions we have made to our national security.

MAN HAS BENEFITED

Let us, to show what more we can do, tell our story in terms of technology. A century ago, man was obliged to devote a major part of his time and energy struggling against his environment. Today, he can confidently penetrate every corner of his planet, establish himself, and prevail. He can communicate instantly anywhere on earth; he can change the face of his lands and harness the primary energy of matter; he has already smashed the chains that bind him to the earth and now calmly prepares for the voyage that will soon take him up and into the limitless arch of space itself.

The instrument which made all this possible is science, conceived as abstraction and converted into fruitfulness by our great industrial establishment.

Let us, in telling our story, by all means talk about research. We can say to the public: we ask your consent and your support for the sake of all the new things which we want to provide for you, and which we will provide for you if you will only allow us to.

Let us tell our story in the schools, to the citizens and the voters of tomorrow.

Let us tell it to women of our land, in their many clubs and organizations. They may not be interested in industrial trends or technological breakthroughs, but they are interested—to the point of militancy—in the welfare of their families, the purity of the food they prepare, the safety and quality of the thousand and one inanimate objects which touch their lives and to which—largely unbeknownst to them—the chemical industry makes important contributions.

Let us tell our story to our elected officials; it is important that they should be informed about our programs and our problems, because information is the material out of which they fashion their legislative judgments. Let us remember that ultimately elected officials only mirror the desires of their constituents. As astute an observer as Abraham Lincoln recognized this when he pointed out that "public opinion is everything. With public opinion nothing can fail. Without it, nothing can succeed."

Let us tell our story through every means at our command—through our sales and technical service forces, through the advertising we do, through trade associations and through community groups. The effort must be massive to achieve its objective.

CONTROLS ARE ON INCREASE

Unless we take the initiative, both in word and deed, tighter controls will surely follow. This trend is already evident in our national economy. Every year, more and more goods and services are bought and paid for by the Government; every year, Federal regulation expands in scope and direction; every year, Government enlarges its field of activities; increasingly, Government assumes responsibility for protecting those it claims cannot protect themselves; and Federal expenditures for research and development have far outstripped those of private research and now total nearly $12 billion as compared with $4 billion for private research.

It would be absurd to suggest that there exists a basic, irreconcilable conflict between Government and the business community. It is in fact one of the paradoxes of our times that business—and especially big business—should be the very instrument which Government has chosen to achieve the national goals. Business is expected to provide the impetus for continued growth and prosperity; it is expected to maintain America's ability to compete in the world's markets; it is expected to provide employment to keep pace with our expanding population.

DIFFERENCES OF OPINION

Obviously, a serious, permanent breach between business and Government is unthinkable. But while both can agree on major objectives, it would be less than realistic to ignore the divergence of opinion on how these objectilves can best be reached.

In our democratic process, divergent opinions are subjected to the test of the ballot box. This is why it is essential for us to tell our story; why it is essential to think through carefully the consequences of all our actions; both in long-term effect and in immediate impact.

Our chemical industry is still a growth industry. Today, the opportunities before it are as great as ever before.

And so too are the problems it faces.

But we have had problems before, and have learned to deal with them.

I am convinced that the chemical industry can continue to solve its problems and can continue to grow—provided only that it is given the freedom to act.

Let us all do whatever is necessary to make sure that it continues to enjoy that freedom.

---

## Target Date: January 9, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an item entitled "Target Date: January 9, 1963" by Mr. Maurice Ries, an authority on the Committee on Un-American Activities. The article deals with the attack that was supposed to have been made on the opening day of Congress to eliminate this important committee.

The article follows:

TARGET DATE: JANUARY 9, 1963

Let's understand each other. Your Committee on Un-American Activities in the U.S. House of Representatives is an absolutely legal, absolutely constitutional arm of the U.S. Government. If it weren't, would the Congress have kept the committee in existence for a quarter of a century? In August 1963, you see, the Committee on Un-American Activities will be 25 years old.

And experience will make it more effective with every passing year.

Listen to the objectors and you'd never learn that everything the Committee on Un-American Activities does has one basic purpose: legislation. Under orders from the Congress, it works to ascertain what old laws need to be revised, what new laws need to be passed, in order to control those who menace the United States of America—whether by penetration, persuasion, or propaganda; by sabotage, subversion, or spying. Thus its hearings, public and private: so information may be collected under oath. Thus the publication of its findings: so Congress and public may be kept informed.

These activities are not intended to harass but to place facts on the record. If such operations reveal disloyal organizations and expose traitors, why, a nation not only has the right, but the obligation to protect itself.

In its time, the committee has investigated Nazis, Fascists, Japanese imperialists, and Communists. Significantly, when it was looking into totalitarianism of the right, the Committee on Un-American Activities almost never was accused of being unconstitutional or of acting illegally. But when it turned the spotlight on the totalitarian left, a withering fire erupted from every sector of American opinionmaking, from the topmost levels of Government down through education, press and pulpit, to the Communist Party itself.

Identified Communists—which is to say, identified traitors—are leading vicious nationwide onslaughts upon the Committee on Un-American Activities (being careful always to mislabel it "the un-American Committee," and its members "the un-Americans." One prong of their attack seeks to slash the committee's congressional appropriation. They say this investigative unit of the House of Representatives costs far too much money. Yet in truth the committee's appropriation is one of the tiniest droplets in the roaring cataract of the Federal budget. The funds allocated to the committee have been estimated to cost each man, woman and child in the United States the enormous sum of eighteen one-hundredths of 1 cent per year.

In the Communist-led offensive, January 9, 1963, is being termed the target date for smashing the House Committee on Un-American Activities. On that red-letter day, say Moscow's American puppets, they will flood the Congress with petitions. Heavy with leftwing signatures, these documents will demand that the House abolish the committee.

It would be no more brazen if the Kremlin announced that January 9, 1963, is to see an all-out Soviet atomic attack on the United States.

If nuclear aggression actually were being announced, no citizen in his right mind would do nothing. That's why Americans should be rallying to the defense of the Committee on Un-American Activities—now, before the bombs begin to fall.

It is heartening to know that good citizens already have been rallying. For example, at the last national convention of the American Legion, in October 1962, the representatives of three and a half million members of the Legion voted unanimously to support

the committee. This means that not just this number of American Legionnaires, but three and a half million American families threw in behind the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Such support for America's first line of domestic defense promises hope for America itself. If Americans can save the Committee on Un-American Activities, they have it in their power to save America.

And make no mistake about it—the committee is at the top of the Communists' hate list. The most recent (October 1962) issue of the World Marxist Review, a behind-the-Iron-Curtain publication which admits it is the global "Theoretical and Information Journal of Communist and Workers' Parties," reaches across an ocean to hack at the House Committee on UnAmerican Activities. It slashes at the committee, by name, on pages 69, 70, and 72. In fact, on the latter page all Communists, and particularly those in the United States, are given their newest instructions from Moscow: (1) fight anti-communism; (2) make Americans believe that the Communist Party, U.S.A., is not run by the Kremlin; (3) force Washington to adopt a hands-off Cuba attitude; and (4) "struggle against the ultraright and against the reactionary policies of the Kennedy administration, and for restoring the Bill of Rights, abolition of the House Un-American Committee, repeal of the anti-Communist laws, particularly the McCarran Act, lifting the ban on Communists in industry, in the unions, and in other popular organizations, for a ban on the fascist organizations, prohibiting their hate literature, and removing the fascists from the Armed Forces."

Abolition of the Committee on Un-American Activities. Those are orders, comrade—Moscow's orders. And Moscow intends to see that they are obeyed.

Sure, let our foes strip the United States of her internal defenses. Let them leave her naked before the domestic assault. That way, we'll find out whether the internal danger really exists.

Tragically, however, by the time we have found out, it will be too late.

## The Five Future Wonders of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, in the January issue of Reader's Digest is an article by Mr. Don Wharton entitled "The Five Future Wonders of the World." The first "wonder" described is the Snowy Mountains Scheme in Australia, which is of special interest to me because many of the major features of this great undertaking—which will make possible the development of a vast desert into a fertile, productive area of rich farmland and pasture—were designed in my home State of Colorado, in the Denver office of the Bureau of Reclamation.

The Bureau worked on this gigantic project, not as a part of our foreign aid program, but simply under a straight contract at the invitation of the Australian Government and with Australian financing. Bureau experts have been making their technical knowledge and skill available to foreign countries for many years. The in-service training program of the Bureau's Engineering Center in Denver has foreign alumni all over the world who are now leaders in the resource development of their own countries.

More than a hundred Australian engineers came to Denver to be trained for planning and construction of the Snowy Mountain Scheme, and we have had consultants cooperating down under during the entire job, which is now half completed. These reclamation technicians are still there and probably will remain in Australia until the project is finished in 1975.

We hear a great deal lately about the superior accomplishments of Soviet engineers and of our lagging in scientific fields. I think it is time we take a good look at some of the achievements of our own Government engineers. For example, I recall that several years ago, out of seven projects designated by the American Society of Civil Engineers as "modern civil engineering wonders of the United States," two were built by the Bureau of Reclamation—Hoover Dam and the Columbia Basin Project—both internationally known engineering developments. And today the vision and technical skills of engineers from this same Federal Government agency are being translated into reality in Australia, an achievement that author Don Wharton says "will go a long way toward transforming the face of the 'land with the big thirst.'"

It is highly significant to me that practically all the projects designated by Mr. Wharton as "modern wonders" relate to water conservation. This points up the burgeoning importance of water development not only here in America, but also throughout the world.

We in the West have always been poignantly aware of the necessity for conserving our meager water resources. We have shuddered at the awful waste of letting untold billions of gallons of this precious commodity flow through arid areas, unused, to return to the sea—gallons we so desperately need to irrigate our fields, to bring a water supply and electric power to mountain valleys and broad barren plains so that families may establish homes and communities and industries can move in to build the economy and utilize our great wealth of natural resources.

The face of this continent, as well as that of the Australian Continent, is being changed by great engineering marvels that divert and store water and put it to beneficial use. I am proud of the part our engineers in Denver and elsewhere are doing to realize the long-held dream of converting deserts into gardens.

Mr. Wharton's article follows:

The 1960's may well become the greatest construction decade in history. All around the globe man is at work on mammoth projects, turning engineers' dreams and blueprints into concrete-and-steel wonders that will soon affect the lives of countless millions.

Though experts cannot say of a single undertaking, "This is the most important civil-engineering project now under construction in the free world," there is agreement that the projects described here [1] can suitably be referred to as "The Five Future Wonders of the World."

**Australia—Snowy Mountains Scheme: The Snowy Mountains, highest land mass in Australia, located almost 300 miles from Sydney, are drained by three rivers. Two of them, the Murray and the Murrumbidgee, catch the water on the inland side of the divide and carry it 500 miles westward to convert semidesert country into lush pastures and farms. But never have these two river basins provided enough water to irrigate more than a fraction of the good land.**

Meanwhile, the Snowy River gathers even more water on the eastern side of the divide and carries it southeast through a narrow coastal strip which has ample rainfall. By one of the largest individual engineering undertakings ever attempted, this water, pouring in waste into the Tasman Sea, is going to be forced through the main dividing range in long tunnels to provide an additional 650 billion gallons of irrigation water per year for the desert country. As the waters are switched from east to west, they will be rammed into a series of shafts that will drop them through power stations to generate 2,500,000 kilowatts of peakload electric power.

The Snowy Mountains scheme will cost about a billion dollars, and will involve construction of 9 major dams and several smaller ones, 10 power stations, some 100 miles of tunnels and more than 80 miles of aqueducts. Just to open up the deserted area for construction forces has required 300 miles of roads, over 400 miles of tracks, 150 miles of powerlines. A complete radio network was established to link construction sites, and parachute drops were used for regular delivery of supplies to remote camps. The project is so immense that the Australian Government established a special immigration program to attract technicians and skilled workers. Eventually, people from 30 nations were employed.

Last spring, Snowy construction reached the halfway mark—well ahead of schedule. For instance, the huge Eucumbene Dam was built in 2 years instead of the 4 allowed by the contract. It creates Lake Eucumbene, which holds nine times the amount of water in Sydney harbor. From this lake, the heart of the project, runs a 14-mile tunnel, the interior of which is 21 feet in diameter. Much of the work was done 1,800 feet underground. In the process, the world's speed record for comparable tunneling was broken; yet, on breakthrough, the alinement error was only three-eighths of an inch.

One power station is located 1,200 feet underground, in an L-shaped excavation 568 feet long. For a year excavation and construction had to go on simultaneously, with 28,000 cubic yards of concrete moving in as 66,000 cubic yards of rock debris moved out.

Scheduled for completion in 1975, the Snowy scheme will go a long way toward transforming the face of the "land with the big thirst."

United States—Chesapeake Bay Bridge-Tunnel: At the mouth of Chesapeake Bay a crossing 17.6 miles long is scheduled to open early in 1964. It is being built in what amounts to open ocean, where there are high waves, tricky currents, huge tides and occasional hurricanes.

Never before has man spanned such a long stretch of exposed navigable ocean water. How to do it? To tunnel the whole distance was too expensive and impractical. To use

[1] Selected from 107 projects in 26 countries, with the evaluation and counsel of the American Society of Civil Engineers after its consultation with national engineering societies in other countries. Military construction is excluded.

high bridges over the ship channels was not advisable—the Navy feared that a bomb-wrecked bridge span would block the channel to Hampton Roads, which contains the world's largest concentration of naval installations. So the answer was a novel combination of tunnels beneath the main channels, medium-height bridges over minor channels, and low-level trestles over the rest. Cost: approximately $140 million.

The crossing starts from the Norfolk side as a 3½-mile trestle carrying the highway 28 feet above average high water. Then it encounters an island, dips into a mile-long tunnel 98 feet below average low water, climbs out onto another island, becomes a trestle again for 3¾ more miles. It crosses a third island, dips into another mile-long tunnel, climbs out onto a fourth island. Then it runs along 4½ miles of trestle, rises into a steel bridge clearing average high water by 75 feet, drops down onto 2 more miles of trestle and causeway, climbs up into another bridge with 40 feet of clearance, then glides down onto a short trestle to the shore of the Delmarva (Delaware-Maryland-Virginia) Peninsula.

Wasn't it fortunate that those four islands were there to anchor the tunnel-ends and to link them with the bridge sections? They weren't—they are completely man-made. Each is constructed in water 30 to 40 feet deep, rises another 30 feet above the surface, covers some 8 acres at the top, is made of 1½ million tons of sand and 300,000 tons of rock.

Many tunnels are bored, but the 2 for this crossing are being built out of sections prefabricated on shore—a series of 37 huge double-walled steel tubes, each nearly as long as a football field and as wide as a street. Each tube shell is constructed on a shipway in Texas, launched like a ship, and towed 1,700 miles to Norfolk, Va., where it is outfitted. Then it is taken to the tunnel site, where a deep trench has been dredged in the bay bottom. As concrete from a floating mix plant is pumped between each tube's inner and outer shells, the tube gently sinks to the bottom. Once all the tubes are in and connected, crews with torches will cut successively through the watertight bulkheads at the ends—and when the gaps between the sections are filed in and a ceiling is added, there will be a mile-long tunnel ready for finishing touches of tile walls and fluorescent lighting.

The Netherlands—delta plan: In February 1953 the worst storm since 1421 struck the Netherlands, tearing huge breaches in the dikes, inundating 1 out of every 22 acres of the country's land area, destroying or damaging 47,300 houses, farms, and schools, and drowning nearly 1,800 persons. In 1952 the Dutch had begun to draw up a plan for the prevention of further salting of fertile land and for reclamation of land by the closing of some river estuaries. After the 1953 storm the matter became much more urgent; recurrence of such a disaster had to be prevented. The result is the delta plan, the most ambitious, costly, and comprehensive program to hold back the sea ever undertaken anywhere. Work on it began in 1955, will continue at least through 1978, entailing expenditures estimated at more than $750 million.

The target is the southwestern part of the Netherlands, where five arms of the sea (four wide and one narrow) reach far inland. Through them roll heavy seas and high, powerful tides. The delta plan will close four of these sea arms and one river with massive dams at their funnellike mouths, and three of the closures will be further reinforced by secondary dams deeper inland. One sea arm and one canal will be left open so ships will still be able to reach Antwerp and Rotterdam.

One dam has been completed, across the Veersche Gat; another is well underway, a third just started. Work on the fourth, closing the Eastern Scheldt, will begin in 1965. All are being built facing the open sea in depths and against tidal currents greater than ever before dealt with.

The Veersche Gat dam is almost 2 miles long, deliberately located right where the arm joins the North Sea. It could have been built farther back, but the Dutch engineers wanted to get the most experience possible in preparation for tougher jobs on other sea arms. For example, the tide used to jam 20 billion gallons of water through the Veersche Gat before the dam was built. But at the Eastern Scheldt engineers will be confronting a tide of 290 billion gallons. The dam there must be 5 miles long.

The most intriguing dam is the one being built across the Haringvliet, a 13-year job now more than half done. The three other dams are solid, to create large inland lakes. But the Havingvliet must carry water from the Maas and Rhine Rivers to the sea, plus a huge discharge of winter ice. So the three-mile dam includes two-thirds of a mile of concrete-and-steel sluiceways: two rows of 17 steel gates, each weighing 425 tons, each 185 feet wide. Hydraulic machinery will open and close the flaps.

In addition to providing flood protection, the delta plan, by shortening the coastline 500 miles, will reduce seawall maintenance. And by keeping the sea water out of the river estuaries it will check the increasing soil saltiness, which is now impairing agricultural production in the southeastern Netherlands, and bring better distribution and control of badly needed fresh river water.

United States—New York Narrows Bridge: Now being thrown across the Narrows at the entrance to New York Harbor, this bridge will have the world's longest main suspension span—4,260 feet from tower to tower. That means that more than four-fifths of a mile of steel will hang in the sky 228 feet above the ship channel between Brooklyn and Staten Island.

Engineering News-Record has observed that "everything about the Narrows Bridge is big, bigegr, or biggest." The double-decked central span, containing 12 traffic lanes, will be the heaviest ever built. The four steel cables must hold up a suspended deadweight of 84,000 tons, plus their own weight of 39,000 tons, plus a potential live weight, from traffic, of over 10,000 more tons. This requires huge anchorages at the two ends, solid monoliths of concrete and embedded steel faced with granite above water, as high as an 18-story building, shaped and weighted so that the weight of the bridge will not tip them over or pull them bodily into the water. One block weighs 410,000 tons—that's heavier than the Empire State Building. Each of the two bridge towers, rising 690 feet above average high water, with foundations reaching down 105 feet on one, 170 feet on the other, has two legs—each leg is big enough to squeeze in the Washington Monument with room left over for most of the Statue of Liberty.

One startling aspect of all this immencity: Because of the curvature of the earth, the towers, though perfectly perpendicular to the earth's surface, are 5 inches farther apart at their summits than at their bases.

This bridge is destined to become a spectacular landmark. A ship's captain informed me that when one of the towers had been built up to only half its full height he had sighted it from 20 miles at sea. Everyone coming to New York by ocean liner will pass under the span; plane passengers will spot it easily; motorists will drive out of their way just to cross it. When completed in 1965, this engineearing marvel will be the world's costliest bridge—$325 million.

France-Italy—Mont Blanc Tunnel: For nearly 4 years French and Italian teams have been working on the world's longest vehicular tunnel—the Mont Blanc Tunnel under the Alps. Motorists have long been able to cross the Alps easily in summer. But through the snowy winter, traffic bound for Italy from France, Britain, the low countries, and much of Switzerland has run into a formidable broadblock. Motorists had either to ship their autos on flatcars through the Alpine rail tunnels, or to detour eastward to the Brenner Pass, or to skirt the Alps by heading south to the French Riviera. By mid-1964, autos, trucks, and buses will be able to roll through this new 7¼-mile shortcut whose midpoint will be almost 6,000 feet below ground surface. The tunnel will provide the first straight-line all-year route from Paris to Rome, speeding the trip in summer, and cutting the distance 140 miles in winter. It will put Geneva and Turin only 172 miles apart, as against today's 596 in winter.

The more-than-$40-million tunnel is being financed mainly by France and Italy, with extra money from both the canton and city of Geneva. It will be operated as a toll road by the construction companies that drilled shafts from the two ends that met last August 14. Both teams ran into difficulties, which delayed the opening a year. One blast broke open a glacier-fed stream, which spurted icy water at the rate of more than 11,000 gallons a minute. The French were beset with 29 serious accidents, with 5 fatalities. The Italians, slowed by troublesome rock, also lost five men in the digging operation. Then, one night last spring, a huge avalanche swept down on the workers' quarters, killing three more men.

The Mont Blanc Tunnel (it does not go under Mont Blanc itself, but slightly to the northeast under two peaks of the Mont Blanc massif) will carry a two-lane highway with narrow walkways on either side. Every 1,000 feet there will be an emergency bay for repairs—long enough for large truck-and-trailer units. The tunnel is expected to handle 40,000 trucks and buses and some 400,000 cars a year, all covering in 15 minutes what now sometimes takes as long as a day.

## America Nears the Waterfall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. DURWARD G. HALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in recent years we have heard many speakers telling us where the United States is "going in a handbasket," but now for the first time a talented writer tells us where we are going on a steamboat. I commend to the attention of this House the logbook of this frighteningly delightful cruise as kept by Jenkin Lloyd Jones in the Washington Evening Star of January 16, 1963:

GOING NOW AND PAYING LATER

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

The American people have taken first-class passage on a ship bound from Buffalo to the "Big Rock Candy Mountains" via the Niagara River. So far there have been cocktails and canapes and caviar for just about everybody.

You get a lot of funny people on a cruise, of course. Occasionally, some loudmouth has started running around the deck waving a chart, calling attention to the gradually increasing current, and pointing excitedly to that attractive cloud of mist up ahead. But the rest of the passengers have

thrown these alarmists overboard. Anyone with a lick of sense knows that the faster the current the quicker we'll get to where we're going.

Not only is the ship traveling faster than we thought it would, but it is lighter, too. It used to be loaded down with a lot of gold, but most of that is gone. There was the cost of protecting our friends abroad who would rather not go to the expense of protecting themselves. And there was foreign aid.

And then some of our newly prosperous pals from Europe came aboard and hauled away the gold on which they had a claim. It was really funny to see them wrestling the heavy ingots ashore when we would have been glad to give them our paper dollars as surety for our debts to them. You would almost think they doubted the future value of our dollars.

We've got a pretty quarrelsome crowd aboard. Every few minutes the propellers quit turning or the water doesn't run in the faucets or the deckhands throw down their swabs and paint brushes. The crew wants easier work and more money. The passengers want more service, bigger staterooms, fancier meals and cheaper tickets. And the captain says everybody is right.

The U.S. Government will end this fiscal year 1963 next June 30 with a deficit of about $8 billion. The President's economic advisers had, in contrast, forecast a surplus of about half a billion for the same period. Never has the arithmetic been so far off.

Yet the President is pushing a sweeping program of tax cuts (and he couldn't be righter) that the tax burden is now so great that it is slowing down the economy's expansion. In other words, taxes have removed so much of the incentive to take risks and earn profits that we are not producing as well as we might or creating jobs or providing new opportunities for our young people. Amen.

But, at the same time, there is no inclination to cut Government spending. For fiscal 1964 it looks as though we're going to have a $100 billion budget. This will be greater than in the peak years of World War II. The national debt limit, now at $308 billion, will have to be raised this spring as usual. If we honestly added in the unfunded actuarial liabilities for social security, the figure would be about $65 billion higher.

Our trouble is that we can't tell the difference between our needs and our wants any more. That devilish word "need." We need low-cost housing. We need to be first on the moon. We need interstate highways. We need medicare. We need more aid for education. These are all desirable things. But change each "need" to "want" and you get closer to the truth. A need is a necessity. A want is a desire. We are being drowned in our druthers.

And, simultaneously, we are becoming rebellious about paying the cost of what we have. Of course, we haven't been quite paying the cost. The steady progression of the national debt is eloquent testimony to our refusal to meet our bills. But, as the President correctly asserts, even though we have taxed ourselves too little to meet our expenditures we have taxed ourselves too much. The fires of enterprise are getting smothered and the steam gage may soon be dropping.

What is the way out? You would never guess—unless you've been reading the papers. Government officials, business braintrusters, union leaders have discovered a marvelous escape hatch. You don't have to cut spending. What you do is cut taxes and then the rapid growth in the gross national product will so expand the tax base that the deficit will be overcome and we'll be put ashore on the happy isles.

This is probably the finest piece of economic bluebird twittering since F.D.R. waved his cigaret holder airily and dismissed the national debt with the remark, "After all, we only owe it to ourselves."

In the meantime, the able and busy people of Europe's Common Market, whose war-wrecked industrial plant was largely rebuilt by U.S. funds and who have cheerfully shucked off on American taxpayers most of the cost of their common defense, are now beginning to whip the pants off us in many fields of competition. Their steelmakers blow oxygen into their converters while we still blow air. Their featherbedding problems are insignificant. Their currencies grow harder while ours grow softer.

But, so far, we've had a pretty good ride down the Niagara River. In spite of the squabbling and grabbing the guzzling and gobbling have been good.

And there was that wonderful sign over the ticket office back on the dock:

"Go now, pay later."

---

## "Flights of Angels Sing Thee to Thy Rest"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, on the day after Christmas, the American theater lost one of its greatest and most productive figures when Lawrence Langner died at the age of 72.

Variety notes that:

Langner was best known as a cofounder, codirector and, in recent years, coadministrator of the Theatre Guild, and in that capacity he was influential in the production of early works of George Bernard Shaw, Eugene O'Neill, Robert E. Sherwood, Sidney Howard, Maxwell Anderson, S. N. Behrman, William Saroyan and William Inge. He was the motivating energizing force of the Guild. In a practical sense he was the Guild.

It is with deep regret that I inform this House of his passing. In tribute to him, I offer the following editorial from the Westport Town Crier, which expresses far better than I can the immense sense of loss that is felt by the community in which he lived:

"FLIGHTS OF ANGELS SING THEE TO THY REST"

When one wakes up to his morning newspaper to find that a great and disinguished national figure in one of the useful fields of human endeavor has died, there is an understandable feeling of regret and loss. But when a neighbor dies—a neighbor whom you know as a dedicated, talented, and sensitive human being—there is a sense of personal loss that cannot but outweigh the distant regrets at a lost talent.

It's that way with Lawrence Langner.

The obituaries have recorded that Mr. Langner was the architect of one of the most distinguished theatrical enterprises in our generation, that he was more than a passing playwright, that he was responsible for discovering and promoting literally dozens of the brightest lights of the theater world, and, on top of it all, was a highly successful and authoritative lawyer. But within this cold recital, there was a sense of dedication and a variety of drive that are rarely come upon.

Mr. Langner's tastes in the theater were catholic. All he demanded of a theatrical performance was that it be a good one. He relished good comedy as much as he did good Shakespeare. He saw nothing inconsistent between the most serious dramatic work of Eugene O'Neill—one of the Theatre Guild playwrights—and the lilting gaiety of Rodgers and Hammerstein's "Oklahoma." He was no theatrical "nice Nellie," but his taste was impeccable.

Lawrence Langner was a man of strong feelings about his beloved theater. He believed, of all things, that actors should be able to act, not just to imagine themselves a pomegranate or a pumpkin. And even more startling, he felt that they should be able to enunciate their lines with the clarity—if not the exaggerated emphasis—of an earlier day. He had little sympathy for the faddish avant garde in the theater; he could be indignant about the obscenities of an Albee.

His aversion to the self-conscious and the precious in the theater was no deeper than his distaste for the deliberately tinselly and overcommercial. During his last years he took a dimmer and dimmer view of the state of the Broadway theater, asserting that technical costs were far out of hand and that a sheeplike public would support only the big brassy musicals and the most pat of sex comedies. He admitted to exceptions to this rule, but could prove with dollars and cents that the critical success could seldom attract a large enough audience to pay its costs.

His enthusiasm for an American Shakespeare Theater, and recently for an American theater of comedy, was largely based on his conviction that this country was not offering enough opportunity for a new crop of actors to learn their trade—and that both the stylism of Shakespeare and the subtleties of comic playing might well be lost in a shuffle of formless plays and playing.

Our community has known Mr. Langner for many years. We have been favored by having his Westport County Playhouse here, which for so long has represented the standard in summer playhouses. While he and his wife, the talented Armina Marshall, had retired from direct participation in the playhouse for the last few years, there was never an opening night that did not see them there to keep an eye on things. Mr. Langner also tried to bring his Shakespeare Theater to our community, and moved it elsewhere only when he was deeply hurt by stupid and unjustified criticism on the part of a few.

Mr. Langner had not been well during the last several years, but he made few concessions to his infirmities. He found time not only to direct the guild, to watch over the playhouse, and to keep the Shakespeare Theater moving ahead; in addition, he organized the enormously successful international tour, designed under State Department auspices, to show the rest of the world some of the finest in American drama and performance. And just so there were no idle moments, he was actively advancing his dream for a year-round theater far off Broadway—one of the ways he saw through which the theater might escape the overpowering mechanics that is frustrating its originality and vigor in midtown Manhattan.

Mr. Langner is one more of those immigrant Americans (he came from New South Wales) to whom this country owes so much and who have done so much to shape its developing culture. Anyone who enjoys the theater, and recognizes it as an integral part of the Nation's life and culture, must be grateful to Mr. Langner both for advancing its cause and for working to maintain a standard of taste and excellence that has so often been ignored both by tyros and get-rich-quick invaders. We will all miss him. But we can take some satisfaction in the conviction that the fine things that he built will continue to flourish as a living memorial to his contributions.

## The Just and the Unjust

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JACKSON E. BETTS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written about the new regulations of the Internal Revenue Service with respect to entertainment expense allowances. But, one of the finest treatments of the subject is contained in the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of January 8, 1963. It points out with statements and cases some of the absurd consequences of these regulations.

Some administration officials refer to these new rules as the end of the expense account era. For the vast majority of American taxpayers who honestly report their tax liabilities, the allegation of expense account living is unwarranted. But these honest taxpayers will find the new expense account regulations to be unduly burdensome on them. This, of course, constitutes a significant change of an accepted way of doing business, and for that reason, I feel that every comment on the subject should be given wide publicity. Every businessman, and especially the small businessman, should have the opportunity to learn the full impact of these rules. At the same time it might be appropriate for Congress to review this portion of the tax law passed at the last session since these rules go beyond the original congressional intent.

The editorial follows:

THE JUST AND THE UNJUST

We guess we don't run in the right social circles.

For years we have been reading those books about wild living in the suburbs and wondering somewhat plaintively why the excitement seems to pass us by. In years of suburban living the wildest shock to the even tenor of our domesticity was the day the dog drank up the cocktails and bit the mayor. It was weeks before we were forgiven.

For almost as long, we've been reading about all this notorious high living on the expense account, boats and all that, and groaning over what we seem to have missed. After a quarter century in that den of iniquity, Wall Street, no one has tempted our journalistic virtue with even so much as a night at a hunting lodge, much less a seagoing voyage. Where, indeed, are all those expense-account yachts?

True, we aren't without sin, as defined in the new dogma of the Internal Revenue Service. We suffer business luncheons dreadfully often and when we turn in the voucher we don't deduct the $1.25 we would have spent anyway for the blue plate special. A man is entitled to some recompense for punishment in line of duty.

When business takes us to Peoria or Dubuque, as it does all too often, we take an aperitif before dinner, choose the steak over the chicken-a-la-king and sometimes splurge on the movies, charging the lot to the stockholders. If it weren't for their business we wouldn't be there at all, and frankly we have better steaks at home.

Moreover, the children being more or less at the age of discretion, we have lately taken our wife along on some trips. We haven't persuaded the curmudgeonly auditor to okay her expenses, but not long ago we drove to Washington on legitimate business (if talking to a Senator is legitimate) and our wife rode along in the car. Even that baleful auditor didn't ask us to reimburse the company for the equivalent price of her bus ticket.

Give or take a few details, this is not unlike the situation of thousands of businessmen in a country where men at work are ceaselessly traveling to and fro. The door-to-door salesman and the flying corporate executive are brothers under the skin; they are working also when they pass the time of day with the lady at the door or the business acquaintance across the luncheon table. Sometimes the smartest business is not to talk business at all but to be friendly, interested; to listen and to learn. Only ignorant and petty minds could imagine that the free lunch is all beer and skittles.

But now it turns out that all this is under the suspicion of undermining the public morality and the solvency of the U.S. Treasury. In any event the Government is going to treat all the people as crooks until proven otherwise.

This suspicion of malefaction flows from every word of the new regulations on record-keeping, pedantic in language and picayune in detail, drawn up by the Internal Revenue Service.

Hereafter you must account to the Government not only for your yacht but the beer you buy a business acquaintance. The documents for any entertainment, no matter how trivial, must include the amount, date, place by name and address, type (martini or ham sandwich), explanation of the benefit to be returned for this bounty, the name of the recipient, and sufficient documentation to explain your extravagance to the satisfaction of any revenue agent who subsequently examines your tax report.

And if perchance on a trip you spend more than $25 in any day you must itemize everything else too—the day you left home, day you got back, every telephone call, meal, cup of coffee, taxicab and bus fare. If you want your books to balance, you'd better even keep track of the postage stamps for the letters to the home office.

The sheer absurdity of this avalanche of paperwork is only the beginning. The metaphysicians of Mr. Mortimer Caplin's bureaucracy have now gone off to mull such esoteric questions as: What, precisely, constitutes a "business meal"? What is the allowable difference in cost between a lunch for a life insurance prospect ($5,000 policy) and the prospect for an electric dynamo ($5 million sale)? Can you also buy lunch for the prospect's wife, or do you suggest she go eat in the drugstore? What if your own wife is along too—do you leave her back in the hotel room to munch a hamburger and watch television?

As ridiculous as these questions sound, they are precisely the sort of thing that must now be decided upon at the highest levels, and Mr. Caplin confesses—quite understandably, we think—that it will be some weeks before we can expect any official enlightenment. It has never been easy to decide how many angels can dance on the head of a pin.

Yet it is neither the absurdity of the paperwork nor the ridiculousness of the metaphysics that is the true evil.

Here is a situation in which the Government is, no doubt about it, confronted with a problem. Some people do hide yachts in expense accounts, just as some do hide misbehavior in the suburbs, and the Government has power to deal with the real tax cheaters. But the vast majority of the people everywhere lead quiet, placid, and upright lives, and the vast majority of those whose taxes support the Government give an honest accounting of their affairs.

Yet here we use the majesty of the law to treat every taxpayer as a potential cheater, because pinhead minds can think of no other way; the integrity of all must be insulted, and the conduct of their affairs made insufferable, because of the sins of the few.

Now completely apart from this question of expense accounts, this is a philosophy of Government which is evil in itself. We once had an example of this when, to stop a few people from drinking too much, we adopted prohibition which treated all men as potential alcoholics. Surely the results have not left our memory.

The results of this noble experiment can also be foreseen. These new rules will give trouble only to honest men. The real operator—the man who is really out to cheat on his taxes—can drive a truck through them.

The smart lawyers are already figuring out the perfectly legal loopholes; beyond that, those with larceny in their hearts will not be disturbed, because they will show records, receipts, and paper accounts by the carload. As sure as the sun rises tomorrow, today's rules will have to be followed tomorrow by new rules upon new rules tightening the rules.

And while all this is going on, the honest man—the man who takes a business trip to do an honest job for his company and with no desire to cheat either his company or his country—that man will see himself not merely laden with burdensome paperwork but with the fear that everything he does is under suspicion.

Because he honestly tries to keep honest records, all the records will be there, and he can be called up a year later, 2 years later, and find that what he did in good faith is adjudged wrong by some petty bureaucrat imbued with the idea that any expense account must conceal some wickedness. The smart operator will have his lawyers; the little taxpayer will be helpless against the insolence of office.

We submit that to order the public affairs in this manner is an affront to the public morality, just as it would be for the State to require of every citizen a detailed accounting of his home coming and going, because some men cheat. That Government governs illy which can find no other way to deal with malefactors than to maltreat all of its citizens, the just and the unjust alike.

## A Moratorium on New Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the need for sound fiscal policies in the Federal Government has always been a matter of prime importance to the welfare of the Nation.

During these times of mounting costs and in view of the proposed tax reduction this problem has been magnified even more.

In an editorial on January 6, 1963, the Los Angeles Times discusses this matter and comments favorably on a recommendation by our colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Representative JOHN BYRNES, calling for a moratorium

on new spending projects that do not deal with actual emergencies.

I believe the Times editorial will be of interest to many Members of Congress:

A MORATORIUM ON NEW SPENDING

The skirmishing in the battle over Federal tax reductions sought by President Kennedy has produced a sound suggestion from Representative JOHN BYRNES, of Wisconsin.

BYRNES, ranking Republican on the Ways and Means Committee, says that an administration moratorium on all new spending projects "not designed to deal with actual emergencies" would advance the cause of tax reduction.

It is pretty generally agreed that a reduction in Federal taxes is desirable. Some pressure groups are hoorahing for limiting the tax cut to personal incomes in the lower brackets, but such demagoguery is to be expected. This would not accomplish the stimulus to industry on which the hoped-for reduction in unemployment depends.

Any tax reduction proposal should include substantial corporate and personal income tax cuts in all brackets.

However, there is opposition among practical men, truly concerned with the national welfare, to any tax reduction without some balancing reduction in Federal spending.

They fear, with reason, that the reduction would cause a budget imbalance estimated at between $12 billion and $20 billion. Such a deficit, they argue, would adversely affect our shaky balance-of-payments position in world trade as well as the national credit. Our Fort Knox gold reserve could evaporate if the world lost confidence in our fiscal policies.

Mr. Kennedy's in group advisers are all for bulling ahead with the tax cut, without much thought to reduction in the spending program. It is fairly obvious that the prudent bloc in Congress will resist.

However, Representative BYRNES' plan for a nonemergency spending moratorium offers some hope that the national benefits of a broad tax cut can be salvaged.

It is probable, as he says, that it would be impractical to demand a dollar-for-dollar matching of reduced spending and reduced taxes. But it is practical and logical to suggest that nonemergency programs for siphoning off Treasury funds be abandoned until the tax reduction program has a chance to stimulate industry and increase revenues. This would keep the budget deficit within reason.

If the administration can see its way clear to forgo some of its medicare and other New Frontier proposals, which are largely 1964 vote bait anyway, there is a chance for a sound tax reduction program that will benefit the country.

## Going Now and Paying Later

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, as Congress considers the budget for fiscal 1964 which will contain an apparent deficit in excess of $10 billion, the following article by Jenkin Lloyd Jones appearing in the Washington Evening Star of January 16, 1963, seems to me to be very pertinent:

GOING NOW AND PAYING LATER—GOVERNMENT SPENDERS CANNOT TELL DIFFERENCE BETWEEN NEEDS AND WANTS

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

The American people have taken first-class passage on a ship bound from Buffalo to the Big Rock Candy Mountains via the Niagara River. So far there have been cocktails and canapes and caviar for just about everybody.

You get a lot of funny people on a cruise, of course. Occasionally, some loudmouth has started running around the deck waving a chart, calling attention to the gradually increasing current, and pointing excitedly to that attractive cloud of mist up ahead. But the rest of the passengers have thrown these alarmists overboard. Anyone with a lick of sense knows that the faster the current the quicker we'll get to where we're going.

Not only is the ship traveling faster than we thought it would, but it is lighter, too. It used to be loaded down with a lot of gold, but most of that is gone. There was the cost of protecting our friends abroad who would rather not go to the expense of protecting themselves. And there was foreign aid.

And then some of our newly prosperous pals from Europe came aboard and hauled away the gold on which they had a claim. It was really funny to see them wrestling the heavy ingots ashore when we would have been glad to give them our paper dollars as surety for our debts to them. You would almost think they doubted the future value of our dollars.

We've got a pretty quarrelsome crowd aboard. Every few minutes the propellers quit turning or the water doesn't run in the faucets or the deckhands throw down their swabs and paint brushes. The crew wants easier work and more money. The passengers want more service, bigger staterooms, fancier meals and cheaper tickets. And the captain says everybody is right.

The U.S. Government will end this fiscal year 1963 next June 30 with a deficit of about $8 billion. The President's economic advisers had, in contrast, forecast a surplus of about half a billion for the same period. Never has the arithmetic been so far off.

Yet the President is pushing a sweeping program of tax cuts. He makes the point (and he couldn't be righter) that the tax burden is now so great that it is slowing down the economy's expansion. In other words, taxes have removed so much of the incentive to take risks and earn profits that we are not producing as well as we might or creating jobs or providing new opportunities for our young people. Amen.

But, at the same time, there is no inclination to cut Government spending. For fiscal 1964 it looks as though we're going to have a $100 billion budget. This will be greater than in the peak years of World War II. The national debt limit, now at $308 billion, will have to be raised this spring as usual. If we honestly added in the unfunded actuarial liabilities for social security, the figure would be about $65 billion higher.

Our trouble is that we can't tell the difference between our needs and our wants any more. That devilish word "need." We need low cost housing. We need to be first on the moon. We need interstate highways. We need medicare. We need more aid for education. These are all desirable things. But change each "need" to "want" and you get closer to the truth. A need is a necessity. A want is a desire. We are being drowned in our druthers.

And, simultaneously, we are becoming rebellious about paying the cost of what we have. Of course, we haven't been quite paying the cost. The steady progression of the national debt is eloquent testimony to our refusal to meet our bills. But, as the President correctly asserts, even though we have taxed ourselves too little to meet our expenditures we have taxed ourselves too much. The fires of enterprise are getting smothered and the steam gage may soon be dropping.

What is the way out? You'd never guess—unless you've been reading the papers. Government officials, business braintrusters, union leaders have discovered a marvelous escape hatch. You don't have to cut spending. What you do is cut taxes and then the rapid growth in the gross national product will so expand the tax base that the deficit will be overcome and we'll be put ashore on the Happy Isles.

This is probably the finest piece of economic bluebird twittering since F.D.R. waved his cigaret-holder airily and dismissed the national debt with the remark, "After all, we only owe it to ourselves."

In the meantime, the able and busy people of Europe's Common Market, whose war-wrecked industrial plant was largely rebuilt by U.S. funds and who have cheerfully shucked off on American taxpayers most of the cost of their common defense, are now beginning to whip the pants off us in many fields of competition. Their steelmakers blow oxygen into their converters while we still blow air. Their featherbedding problems are insignificant. Their currencies grow harder while ours grows softer.

But, so far, we've had a pretty good ride down the Niagara River. In spite of the squabbling and grabbing the guzzling and gobbling have been good.

And there was that wonderful sign over the ticket office back on the dock: "Go now, pay later."

## China and India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, over many months there have been millions of words published concerning relations between China and India but very little by writers whose qualifications include both study and long residence in the area discussed. One notable exception was the late George Sokolsky, whose lifetime of study and stay of many years in the Far East enabled him to make notable contributions in our understanding of the Orient, especially China.

In his article on "China and India," published in the Washington Post of November 19, 1962, there is a most perceptive treatment emphasizing that the history of China is the bloody story of periodic losses of territory and subsequent irredentism.

The article follows:

CHINA AND INDIA

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Before it is possible to understand the war between Red China and India, it is necessary to realize that Nationalist China on Formosa remains silent.

Prior to 1925, the flag of China consisted of five bars: one for each of the component people of the country—the Chinese, the Manchus, the Mongols, the Tibetans, and the Moslems. More realistically than either the later Kuomintang or the Communists, the early revolutionists particularly recognized the racial complexity of China.

In a book I wrote in 1932, "The Tinder Box of Asia," is a map of China which includes parts of India but also areas that are now in Russia. I then wrote:

It must be noted that China does not politically recognize the loss of Mongolia and Tibet or the lessening of its authority in Sinkiang, Turkestan, and were China today sufficiently powerful to regain these territories by warfare, she would fight for them. But in every moment of dynastic weakness in Chinese history, the periphery of the empire was reduced, large areas becoming either wholly independent or colonies of other countries. China's long and bloody history is a recital of just such losses of territory and subsequent irredentism.

This was written in 1932; the irredentism is taking place today. That is normal to every Chinese, whether Nationalist or Communist. Nehru surely knew all about that, because he can read maps as well as anyone. It is possible that as early as the Bandung Conference (1955) Krishna Menon realized that sooner or later, India would have to fight for a boundary between China and India which the British delineated and protected. Without the British to do the job, India had to depend upon the United Nations or very clever diplomacy. The Communists did not give him enough time.

The Chinese never forget Chinese cultural unity even when they fight each other. Sun Yat-sen's revolution was originally designed to drive the Manchus from China. They were then ruling the country. The Ming Dynasty, which had been defeated by the Manchus, had attempted to erect a vestigial government on Formosa. This failed.

There was no successor Chinese dynasty, so a Republic was established.

The Republic did not work out because it could not establish a center of power. What is not recalled these days is that the early revolutionary movement of Sun Yat-sen was profoundly influenced by the Black Dragon Society of Japan. Neither India nor Indian philosophy played any role in the development of the revolutionary party, called the Tungmenhui.

The last Ming Emperor was conquered by the Manchus in 1644; the Manchus were overthrown in 1912. To the Chinese, this is just a moment in history and China can always wait.

This must be understood if one is to realize that China is now going back to about 1795, to the Chienlung Line, which not only must take China to the Bay of Bengal, but includes, in Turkestan, territory now Russian and the maritime provinces of Siberia. And China will seek to take it all, sooner or later.

The races in eastern Siberia are numerous. What in the West are called Tatars at one time or another were among the peoples of China. These races are not Russian by any scientific measurement.

Khrushchev apparently cannot defeat the principle of location which is so dear to the Oriental conception of life—the family, the clan, the village are realities; Peking and Moscow are far away. To the latter one offers obedience until it becomes unnecessary. The West seeks complicated explanations; in the East, it is simple.

## National Accident Prevention Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, when Congress reconvened last week I introduced H.R. 133, a bill to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to establish a National Accident Prevention Center.

The Health and Safety Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, held hearings on this legislation last year and I was very pleased to find that it received favorable comments, not only from some executive departments, but from the various organizations that are directly concerned with matters of accident prevention.

Having received so much encouragement, I again introduced this bill on the opening day of this Congress and I am hopeful that we will be able to report it to the floor of the House at an early date and that it will have the support of this body at that time.

Mr. Speaker, to indicate some of the favorable reaction to this legislation I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the National Association of Municipal Judges at their convention in Miami, Fla., during November 25 and December 1, 1962:

Whereas automobile accidents continue to inflict untold tragedy in rising numbers on our streets and highways; and

Whereas expanded research into human factors and accident prevention motivation of drivers would immeasurably aid further understanding of the driver, driving characteristics and accident causation, and potentially prompt positive safety and licensing approaches and provide direction to those having responsibility in these areas: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the National Association of Municipal Judges, in convention assembled at Miami Beach, Fla., representing judges from 45 States and every Canadian province, approve in principle the aims, objectives, and purposes of the establishment of an Accident Prevention Research Center, national in scope, and under the Accident Prevention Division of the U.S. Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and construction of facilities, necessary staffing and budgeting incidental thereto.

## The Just and the Unjust

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of January 8, 1963:

THE JUST AND THE UNJUST

We guess we don't run in the right social circles.

For years we have been reading those books about wild living in the suburbs and wondering somewhat plaintively why the excitement seems to pass us by. In years of suburban living the wildest shock to the even tenor of our domesticity was the day the dog drank up the cocktails and bit the mayor. It was weeks before we were forgiven.

For almost as long, we've been reading about all this notorious high-living on the expense account, boats and all that, and groaning over what we seem to have missed. After a quarter century in that den of inequity, Wall Street, no one has tempted our journalistic virtue with even so much as a night at a hunting lodge, much less a seagoing voyage. Where, indeed, are all those expense-account yachts?

True, we aren't without sin, as defined in the new dogma of the Internal Revenue Service. We suffer business luncheons dreadfully often and when we turn in the voucher we don't deduct the $1.25 we would have spent anyway for the Blue Plate special. A man is entitled to some recompense for punishment in line of duty.

When business takes us to Peoria or Dubuque, as it does all too often, we take an aperitif before dinner, choose the steak over the chicken-a-la-king and sometimes splurge on the movies, charging the lot to the stockholders. If it weren't for their business we wouldn't be there at all, and frankly we have better steaks at home.

Moreover, the children being more or less at the age of discretion, we have lately taken our wife along on some trips. We haven't persuaded the curmudgeonly auditor to okay her expenses, but not long ago we drove to Washington on legitimate business (if talking to a Senator is legitimate) and our wife rode along in the car. Even that baleful auditor didn't ask us to reimburse the company for the equivalent price of her bus ticket.

Give or take a few details, this is not unlike the situation of thousands of businessmen in a country where men at work are ceaselessly traveling to and fro. The door-to-door salesman and the flying corporate executive are brothers under the skin; they are working also when they pass the time of day with the lady at the door or the business acquaintance across the luncheon table. Sometimes the smartest business is not to talk business at all but to be friendly, interested; to listen and to learn. Only ignorant and petty minds could imagine that the free lunch is all beer and skittles.

But now it turns out that all this is under the suspicion of undermining the public morality and the solvency of the U.S. Treasury. In any event the Government is going to treat all the people as crooks until proven otherwise.

This suspicion of malefaction flows from every word of the new regulations on record-keeping, pedantic in language and picayune in detail, drawn up by the Internal Revenue Service.

Hereafter you must account to the Government not only for your yacht but the beer you buy a business acquaintance. The documents for any entertainment, no matter how trivial, must include the amount, date, place by name, and address, type (martini or ham sandwich?), explanation of the benefit to be returned for this bounty, the name of the recipient and sufficient documentation to explain your extravagance to the satisfaction

of any revenue agent who subsequently examines your tax report.

And if perchance on a trip you spend more than $25 in any day you must itemize everything else too—the day you left home, day you got back, every telephone call, meal, cup of coffee, taxicab, and bus fare. If you want your books to balance, you'd better even keep track of the postage stamps for the letters to the home office.

The sheer absurdity of this avalanche of paperwork is only the beginning. The meta physicians of Mr. Mortimer Caplan's bureaucracy have now gone off to mull such esoteric questions as: What, precisely, constitutes a business meal? What is the allowable difference in cost between a lunch for a life insurance prospect ($5,000 policy) and the prospect for an electric dynamo ($5 million sale)? Can you also buy lunch for the prospect's wife, or do you suggest she go eat in the drug store? What if your own wife is along too—do you leave her back in the hotel room to munch a hamburger and watch television?

As ridiculous as these questions sound, they are precisely the sort of thing that must now be decided upon at the highest levels, and Mr. Caplin confesses—quite understandably, we think—that it will be some weeks before we can expect any official enlightenment. It has never been easy to decide how many angels can dance on the head of a pin.

Yet it is neither the absurdity of the paperwork nor the ridiculousness of the metaphysics that is the true evil.

Here is a situation in which the Government is, no doubt about it, confronted with a problem. Some people do hide yachts in expense accounts, just as some do hide misbehavior in the suburbs, and the Government has power to deal with the real tax cheaters. But the vast majority of the people everywhere lead quiet, placid, and upright lives, and the vast majority of those whose taxes support the Government give an honest accounting of their affairs.

Yet here we use the majesty of the law to treat every taxpayer as a potential cheater because pinhead minds can think of no other way; the integrity of all must be insulted, and the conduct of their affairs made insufferable because of the sins of the few.

Now completely apart from this question of expense accounts, this is a philosophy of Government which is evil in itself. We once had an example of this when, to stop a few people from drinking too much, we adopted prohibition which treated all men as potential alcoholics. Surely the results have not left our memory.

The results of this noble experiment can also be foreseen. These new rules will give trouble only to honest men. The real "operator"—the man who is really out to cheat on his taxes—can drive a truck through them.

The smart lawyers are already figuring out the perfectly legal loopholes; beyond that, those with larceny in their hearts will not be disturbed because they will show records, receipts, and paper accounts by the carload. As sure as the sun rises tomorrow, today's rules will have to be followed tomorrow by new rules upon new rules tightening the rules.

And while all this is going on, the honest man—the man who takes a business trip to do an honest job for his company and with no desire to cheat either his company or his country—that man will see himself not merely laden with burdensome paperwork but with the fear that everything he does is under suspicion.

Because he honestly tries to keep honest records, all the records will be there and he can be called up a year later, 2 years later, and find that what he did in good faith is adjudged wrong by some petty bureaucrat imbued with the idea that any expense account must conceal some wickedness. The smart operator will have his lawyers; the little taxpayer will be helpless against the insolence of office.

We submit that to order the public affairs in this manner is an affront to the public morality, just as it would be for the State to require of every citizen a detailed accounting of his home-coming-and-going because some men cheat. That government governs illy which can find no other way to deal with malefactors than to maltreat all of its citizens, the just and the unjust alike.

## Timely Remarks by Arthur Hoppe of the San Francisco Chronicle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD have shown continued and avid interest in the timely remarks and witticisms of Arthur Hoppe who writes for the San Francisco Chronicle.

It is my pleasure to bring to their attention the following articles which appeared during the later part of December 1962 and early January 1963:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Dec. 9, 1962]

WE MUST KEEP CALM! (GULP)

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Everybody is now hitting the streets with inside reports of how the White House solved the Cuba crisis. And everybody commends our leaders for keeping cool. Through sheer grit. Everybody, that is, but Mr. Eugene Burdick, the author. Washington, says Mr. Burdick suspiciously, boasts "an abnormally high consumption" of tranquilizers.

"And no one," he says, "can say these drugs help in achieving wisdom in the vital decisions made there." No one but me and my friend, Mr. Glenn Dorenbush. For we have pieced together our own inside report from other inside reports, a pharmacopoeia and two racing forms. Help? These drugs merely saved the world, that's all.

Precisely at 10:32:27½ a.m., a familiar figure strode into the Cabinet room, took his place at the table's head, swallowed two blue pills and said: "Gentlemen, bad news. Those are missile sites in Cuba. We have already ordered a blockade. We must now consider what other stringent steps we should—ho-hum—take. If (yawn) any. What do you think, LYNDON? LYNDON? Dean, he's overdone it. Give him a pep pill. Meanwhile, you can talk for awhile, Adlai."

A balding, sad-eyed man gulped down three magenta and two puce pills and said firmly: "A blockade is immoral and illegal. Little Cuba is no threat to us. We are a great and prosperous nation and * * *"

"Adlai," interrupted the familiar figure. "You're going to have to start taking the same brand we take. Your euphoria level is too high. What do you say, McGeorge?"

A bespectacled man leaped to his feet, swallowed two reds, three whites, and a blue from the pillbox at his place and delivered a 28-minute harangue on how we must blow up Cuba, Russia, the Common Market, and Basutoland, winding up shouting: "I can't stand it any more. Bombs. Rockets. Incredible tensions. Press the button, Chief. For Pete's sakes, let's get it over with."

"Bobby," said the familiar figure with a frown, "hand me McGeorge's pillbox." He took a pill from it, tasted it, and shook his head. "Just as I thought," he said. "Jellybeans. McGeorge, you can no longer sit in on our meetings until you learn to take your medicine like a man. And now (yawn) who's for a nap? LYNDON? Dean, give him some black coffee."

Right. This is a clear-cut issue and I disagree wholeheartedly with Mr. BURDICK. If there's anything I consider wise these days, it's tranquillity in government. Have you ever heard of a shot fired in tranquility? Nonsense. Will the world be blown to smithereens by the tranquil? Hardly likely.

No, sir, what all these disputed inside reports prove is that our leaders weren't tranquil enough. Except maybe Mr. Stevenson. As Mr. Lincoln said of Mr. Grant: "Tell me what brand he's eating; I want to send the prescription to Mr. Kennedy."

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Dec. 13, 1962]

WHY THE WHITE HOUSE WON'T HOLD WATER

(By Arthur Hoppe)

In trying to become an ace White House-ologist, I've meticulously explained the whole device of trial balloons. But, oddly, there's still some confusion. "How," inquires and indignant lady, "is a trial balloon filled with a leak?"

I thought everybody knew that. But, if not, best we go back and review.

Leaks, as you know from reading the papers, come from either administration sources, high administration sources, sources close to the White House, sources inside the White House, or inside White House sources. In that order of importance.

Let's start at the bottom. You get a job as an administration source, of which there are thousands. The rating (GS–13) and the pay ($12,500) aren't bad, but you have to eat in the cafeteria. So you start issuing leaks to all your friends and passing strangers. Like who in personnel stole Miss Pope's potted philodendron. Through diligence you get several people fired. Your work is noticed by your supervisors and you are promoted to high administrative source (GS–18, $17,250 and a seat in the junior executives dining room).

This entitles you to leak the inside story to the Peoria Weekly Foghorn and other lesser media. But only the inside story which will appear on the inside pages. Such as the oversupply of graphite in the bureau of locks and bugles. It is, however, a gay, ego-rewarding position and most would be wise to stop here.

Not so. The dedicated go on to become sources close to the White House, hanging around the South Lawn buttonholing passing newsmen to issue leaks. This is a very arduous job. Especially in winter.

But, with luck, your work may catch the eye of the President. "Son," he will say, "your work has caught my eye. We need more men like you. Come inside where it's warmer." Thus you reach the pinnacle: becoming an inside White House source. Issuing leaks about who issued the leak that sunk you-know-who.

Inside White House sources, unfortunately, are often confused with sources inside the White House. The latter means newsmen in the pressroom, to whom inside White House sources leak, and the maids, staff antique dealers and the like, who just write books.

Now while newsmen are known as sources inside the White House and constantly leak to each other, they are also leaked to by inside White House sources. This is because the pressroom is near the door. And news-

men are thus also known as sources close to the outside world.

In practice, of course, there are vague areas between these clear-cut distinctions. While newsmen agree all gardeners are unofficial sources close to the White House, what about the doorman? Sometimes he is a source inside the White House; sometimes a source close to it. Depending on whether it's cold outside.

But, actually, all that's necessary to understand the news these days is to form the proper picture of our White House. Sort of like a giant sieve. A giant sieve leaking balloons which cut throats.

I'm sure this answers the lady's question. If not, don't bother me. I've decided not to become a White Houseologist. I've decided to become a Kremlinologist. It's simpler.

---

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Jan. 2, 1963]

CAN NIKITA SURVIVE THE BIG YURT CRISIS?

(By Arthur Hoppe)

As you may recall, I've decided to become a Kremlinologist. But, like butterfly collecting, there's not much money in it. So, in hopes of a little spare change, I'm writing a pamphlet entitled: "How To Become a Kremlinologist in Your Basement in Your Spare Time."

The first step, of course, is to analyze brief news items from Russia. I have one here by Associated Press which definitely throws light on the mysterious power struggle in the Kremlin. All of them do.

"B. Mambetov, Premier of the Republic of Kirghizia," reports A.P. from Moscow, "told the Supreme Soviet today that the old-fashioned yurts are overcrowded and 'do not correspond to the needs of modern-day living.'"

Now, it is immediately apparent to any Kremlinologist that Mr. B. Mambetov is anti-party and is clearly using yurts in an attempt to discredit, if not overthrow, Mr. Khrushchev. But, before rushing in, we must ask ourselves some serious questions. Not: "Who is B. Mambetov?" Nor: "Where is Kirghizia?" True, such questions have merit. But they are the sign of the overeager amateur. The question we must first ask ourselves is: "What are yurts?"

I'm glad you asked. Yurts, says Webster's, are tents made of skin "used by the Kirghiz and other nomadic tribes of Siberia." This is important, as it spares us talking about "the gross failure of the 1962 yurt crop" or "the long lines of housewives in front of the State-run butcher shops hoping to purchase a few kilos of yurts."

Thus armed, we are now prepared to turn to the mysterious power struggle in the Kremlin and ask ourselves the crucial key question: "Will yurts put B. Mambetov in the driver's seat?"

The way we go about it is this:

"The proven failure of the much-heralded 5-year yurts plan has given rise to speculation that Khruschev is on the way out. Desperate attempts are now being made inside the Kremlin, insiders report, to design a split-level yurt with picture windows for gracious indoor-outdoor living. But production would put a serious strain on the Soviet economy.

"Thus far, the great yurts crisis shapes up this way: The military, hitherto cooly warm to Khrushchev, are militantly proyurt. But the young intelligentsia, previously warmly cool, are intelligently antiyurt. As for the Khirghiz, on whom it blows both hot and cold, they are, it is widely known, sulking in their yurts.

"Waiting in the wings is the shadowy figure of B. Mambetov, a shadowy figure little known in the West. Long recognized by experts as the No. 2 man in many places, Mambetov may be in excellent position to seize the reins of power should the reins of power be seized. First of all, it cannot be gainsaid that Mambetov knows his yurts. And, secondly, as Khirghizia goes, so goes Azerbaijan. On the other hand."

But that should give you the idea. That should give you the idea anybody can be a Kremlinologist. All you need is my handy pamphlet and a dictionary. It's good for your ego and nobody ever proves you wrong.

In fact, you don't need a dictionary. Should you be asked, "What's a yurt?" just think like a Kremlinologist, always alert for tension and intrigue. And you will invariably find that a yurt, in the final analysis, is a hot potato.

---

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Jan. 11, 1963]

THE DIFFICULT ART OF APPRECIATING ART

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WASHINGTON.—As you may recall, I came back to Washington to find out whose Peace Corps is being sent into our American communities. And I will. But Washington is no place to get information. So, in the interim, I'm working on my book, "Strange Customs in Washington and Other Savage Lands." And already I've got a whole new chapter: "Culture and Other Taboos."

In Washington, the natives all worship culture. The more important the native, the more he worships culture. Worship is performed through a strange rite known as appreciating art.

While all the native tribes appreciate art, the numerous and important Kennedy tribe appreciates art most often. They are considered very devout in appreciating art and many lesser chieftains now attempt to emulate them.

Fortunately, I was able to attend an authentic native appreciating art ritual—a rare opportunity for an anthropologist. So I'm quickly setting forth my notes while I can. I only hope they reach the outside world.

This ritual was held for the painting of a dead Italian lady named Mrs. Mona Lisa. The Kennedy tribe borrowed Mrs. Lisa from France (which is a real country) so that all the other tribes could join with them in a mass appreciating art ceremony.

Unfortunately, when Mrs. Lisa arrived, the Kennedys, the solons, and the heads of many other tribes were out of town on various foraging expeditions. So Mrs. Lisa was locked up in a sealed vault for 3 weeks. But all the lesser natives said they appreciated it was here.

At last, however, the tribal chieftains returned and the rite began. It was held in the National Gallery, which the natives always speak of as a shrine. The male natives arrived in their traditional appreciating art costumes (black tie). And the female natives wore their traditional appreciating art expressions (arched eyebrows).

Mrs. Lisa was hung at one end of a small nave where, in Christian ceremonies, the altar would stand. The nave was crowded with lesser natives, each saying, "I never have enjoyed the painting much since the French put the glass over it."

Which is apparently some sort of dogma.

The more important natives, however, circulated in a rotunda just outside to perform a separate rite called, "Who's that with." For example, the man chatting with Senator HUMPHREY would say: "Who's that with George Ball?"

And the man next to Mr. Ball would be saying, "Who's that with HUGH HUMPHREY?" The reasons for this ritual are obscure.

Several very high chieftains delivered sermons from the altar. Some in English, some in French. Due to the acoustics, they were understood to say, "Rowwowwow." Except those who spoke in French. They said, "Renhrenhrenhrenh." All sounded most sincere.

When it was over, a few lesser natives went up to look at Mrs. Lisa. But most went home to tell their friends where they'd been. Which is the main purpose of appreciating art. As it is practiced in Washington.

---

## A Great and Honest Politician

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Gould Lincoln which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of November 15, 1962:

A GREAT AND HONEST POLITICIAN

(By Gould Lincoln)

"There will always be a Democratic Party and there will always be a Republican Party, and frankly I think the best interests of the country are served by two great parties." This is the unqualified prediction of a great and skillfull politician—one who has given the lie by his own career to the oft-repeated statement that "all politicians are dishonest," and by one who has rendered great public service—James A. (Big Jim) Farley, of New York, chairman of the Democratic National Committee and Postmaster General during the first two terms of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt. His prediction was made during the National Broadcasting Co.'s television program, "Meet the Press," last Sunday. Mr. Farley had been asked whether he saw any time in the future when we might have a Liberal Party as opposed to a Conservative Party in this country.

Mr. Farley's whole life experience—he was born a Democrat and began his work in Democratic politics 52 years ago—has been an exemplification of his statement. He has been called a liberal, particularly when he was playing an important part in the Roosevelt New Deal, and he has been called a conservative. But he has always been a Democrat, loyal to the Democratic Party. He never has scratched a Democratic ticket. When he broke with President Roosevelt over the third term issue in 1940 and opposed the President's renomination, he still declared his support of Roosevelt in the election campaign that followed and voted for him. Just as he has supported every Democratic nominee for President and for State office in New York.

A PRACTICAL REPLY

The question put to Mr. Farley during the "Meet the Press" program was actuated by the strong divergence of the southern conservatives and the northern liberals in the Democratic Party of today, and a similar divergence in the Republican Party over the Rockefeller Republicans and the Goldwater Republicans. He was asked specifically: "Do you think that the liberal Democrats and the southern conservative Democrats belong in the same Democratic Party?"

Mr. Farley, ever practical, replied: "Well, it is not that they belong—there is nothing that you and I can do about it." And when he was pressed still further to say whether the southern conservatives and the northern liberals in the Democratic Party have much in common, he answered: "They have much in common in the different direction," which

sounds enigmatic, but after all is very practical. Up to now both wings of the party have desired victory at the polls, and they have had it.

Mr. Farley once told this writer that the Democrats "will continue to win as long as they hold the labor vote and the Negro vote." At that time, the solid South was taken for granted—as it still is, particularly in congressional elections, if not presidential.

PREDICTS KENNEDY REELECTION

Mr. Farley still sticks to this political estimate of Democratic strength. In his interview he made a number of predictions for the future. Principal among them was a forecast that President Kennedy will be reelected in 1964; that Governor Rockefeller of New York will be Mr. Kennedy's opponent, and that in another 2 years much of the Kennedy program will be enacted into law. Mr. Farley, ever frank, admitted that the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba in April 1961 had been a fiasco. But he insisted President Kennedy's recent strong stand against the Communist military buildup in Cuba would be maintained.

As a forecaster of election results he does not have to yield to any professional pollster. His most famous prediction was on the outcome of the 1936 presidential election. He said President Roosevelt would carry all the States except two and he did—all except Maine and Vermont.

Because of his break with F.D.R. over a third-term nomination, Mr. Farley has never been the choice of New York State Democratic conventions for Governor or Senator. It was then the conservative label was pasted on him by New Dealers and by members of the Liberal Party. Mr. Farley, however, then chairman of the Democratic State Committee, retained great political power, so great that he defeated F.D.R. on his own ground. In the 1942 Democratic State Convention he succeeded in nominating his candidate for Governor, although Mr. Roosevelt backed the late Senator James M. Mead. Mr. Farley commanded deep devotion and loyalty among the party leaders. His word was as good as his bond, and he always kept his promises to the leaders and to the rank and file. He remained State chairman until 1944.

Mr. Farley made it clear in his interview that he believes strongly in party organization. Today he remains one of the best loved and respected politicians in the country, although he has held no office since he gave up the State chairmanship. The one thing which cut him to the quick was President Roosevelt's failure to use him in any way in the great war effort this country made from 1941 to 1945. With his organizing ability and experience his services could have been of great value.

## Accident and Health Insurance Tax Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on January 9, 1963, I introduced a bill—H.R. 453—to provide a 20-percent tax credit for premiums paid by the taxpayer for health and accident insurance. The 20-percent credit is the equivalent of allowing a full deduction for insurance costs for a taxpayer in the first tax bracket. I first introduced this bill in July of 1962—H.R. 12693, 87th Congress, 2d session—and am reintroducing it in this Congress because I feel it is a sound and practical approach to the problem of encouraging voluntary health insurance.

This bill is intended to serve a twofold purpose: First, it remedies an inequity in the provision of existing tax law providing for a medical deduction; second, it will encourage more persons to obtain accident and health insurance.

The medical expense deduction presently available is confined to expenses in excess of 3 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income. This penalizes the taxpayer who insures himself and his family through accident and health insurance.

For example, taxpayer A, whose income consists of wages of $5,000 per year, purchases a medical insurance plan at a cost of $150 per year. Since $150 is not in excess of 3 percent of $5,000, he would not be allowed a medical deduction in any year for the cost of his medical plan. Taxpayer A continues the plan for 5 years at a total cost of $750. In none of the years was he able to deduct this as a medical expense. In the fifth year, he incurs $750 of medical expenses. This $750 of medical expenses is covered by his insurance. He gets no deduction because his medical expense was covered by insurance, although he has paid out a total of $750 over the 5 years for the coverage.

On the other hand, taxpayer B, who has the same $5,000 income as our first taxpayer, has no medical insurance. Taxpayer B deposits $150 a year in a savings account, on which he earns interest. In the fifth year, taxpayer B also incurs $750 of medical expenses. He uses $750 which he has saved to pay his medical bill. The first $150—3 percent of his income—is not includible as a medical deduction. Taxpayer B subtracts this $150 from his $750 medical bill, and takes a medical deduction for the balance—$600.

Thus, while both taxpayer A and taxpayer B had identical annual incomes and medical costs, B gets the benefit of the interest earned while his $750 was invested, plus a tax deduction of $600. From this simple illustration it is apparent that the present medical deduction favors the uninsured taxpayer, to the detriment of the insured taxpayer.

While I have taken taxpayers with an income of $5,000 for purpose of comparison, the effect is the same irrespective of the taxpayer's income. The taxpayers who carry medical insurance are penalized under the Federal tax laws because those taxpayers will not obtain any benefit from the medical deduction, while the taxpayers who do not carry medical insurance will have the benefit of a tax deduction if their medical expense in any year exceeds 3 percent of their income. Taxpayer A is, in effect, penalized for protecting the Government's revenues against the risk of a medical deduction.

In providing a tax credit for medical insurance for the taxpayer, the bill includes amounts paid by the individual for himself, his spouse, his parents, his spouse's parents, and his dependents. Thus, whether or not his, or his spouse's parents qualify as dependents within the meaning of our tax laws, the taxpayer would be permitted to claim the 20 percent credit. This will act as an incentive for children to adequately insure their parents against a major illness.

The effect of this will be to encourage individuals to provide for adequate medical protection: First, for themselves; second, for those dependent upon them; third, for those who might later become dependent upon them; and fourth, beyond this, it will encourage individuals to provide for adequate medical insurance in advance of their old age.

Some may find that if they waited until age 65 or over to take out medical insurance, the cost would be such that adequate coverage is not within their means. This credit would apply to the purchase of level-premium policies or paid-up policies during their younger years which would provide health insurance coverage for their later years.

In providing for a credit instead of a deduction, the bill would still permit the taxpayer to use the tax tables or to take advantage of the standard deduction. The standard deduction—which is reflected in the tax tables—is the equivalent of a deduction of 10 percent of the adjusted gross income. This use of the tables makes it unnecessary for the taxpayer to itemize all his personal deductions. It is in lieu of any other deductions permitted under our tax laws—such as charitable deductions, interest payments, personal taxes, and nonbusiness casualty losses. If medical insurance premiums are treated as an additioinal personal deduction, the 37 million taxpayers who today elect to use the standard deduction and the tax tables would either lose the benefit of the insurance deduction or the simplicity of the standard deduction and the use of the tax tables. They would have to account for each and every item of personal expense allowable as a deduction. This would materially complicate the filing of returns, particularly for those in the lower tax brackets.

On the other hand, with a 20-percent tax credit for medical insurance, the taxpayer who had an income of $5,000 would still be entitled to the $500 standard deduction. The tax credit provided by my bill would be taken in addition to—not in lieu of—the standard deduction. In other words, the medical insurance credit would be treated in the same manner as the 4-percent credit for dividends received and the $1,200 retirement income credit, both of which are taken in addition to the standard deduction.

Medical care is not solely a problem for those under the social security system, or those 65 years of age. A major illness can befall both young and old. Legislation which limits relief to a segment of the population is deficient. A young father may be just as hard pressed to meet the expense of illness in his family as would the retired person who himself became ill. The bill I have introduced provides tax relief for meeting

the medical expenses of both through private insurance. It does not attempt to socialize medical insurance as the Kennedy administration would do.

This bill makes no attempt to regiment our elderly citizens into a Government-conceived, adopted and controlled system of compulsory health insurance. It does not require that the taxpayer's insurance conform to certain standards set by the Federal Government before favorable tax treatment can be obtained. Many of our elderly citizens are at present adequately providing for themselves through private plans of their own choosing, and prefer to continue to do so. This bill recognizes that it is the right of the individual—young and old—to select the type of insurance program which best meets his needs—and to select it in a free and competitive marketplace.

The bill approaches the problem through the encouragement of private insurance—without Government interference and control. Unlike other concepts, it realizes that it is not only the role of the Government to encourage adequate health protection among those age 65 and over, but that our Nation is faced with a problem which transcends both age and economic standards. The bill would encourage individuals of all ages and income levels to provide health and accident insurance as a means of protecting themselves against catastrophic and prolonged illnesses.

We have made tremendous gains in public acceptance of health and accident insurance over the past decade. The problem is that medical expenses are so treated under existing law that the taxpayer, instead of being given an incentive to enroll himself or his family in a medical plan, is penalized for doing so. Recognition in the tax laws of the desirability of private health insurance is long overdue. The tax credit I propose, by correcting this inequity, would build on the gains we have made in the field of private health insurance.

## Best Stories of 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following: There will be a flood of stories and articles about the "Best Stories of 1962." My vote for the best is Art Buchwald's column, "Best Stories of 1962." It reads as follows:

(By Art Buchwald)

BEST STORIES OF 1962

Every year we pick the best news stories of the year. Many of them have never been reported before; others have been lost among the classified and real estate ads.

The first has to do with a stamp collector named Jonathan Kincaid, who used to buy sheets of newly issued stamps as soon as they were put on sale by the U.S. Post Office.

Mr. Kincaid, who made $80 a week as a contact man for a contact lens company, went down to the post office one day and bought a sheet of a new stamp that was honoring the aborted Bay of Pigs landing in Cuba. But when Kincaid got home he noticed there were American airplanes printed on the stamp, and since there were no airplanes at the Bay of Pigs, Kincaid realized that someone in the printing office had made a grave error.

He called up the newspapers and told them that he had a sheet of misprinted stamps that were worth $200,000.

The newspapers immediately called Postmaster General J. Edward Day and informed him of the printing error. They asked him what he intended to do about it.

Mr. Day was adamant. "When the U.S. Post Office makes a mistake, we should pay for it. We shall give Mr. Kincaid the $200,000 he is asking, and we will pay anybody else $200,000 for a similar misprinted sheet. To do otherwise would make a mockery of stamp collecting throughout the world."

PROBLEMS OF A STUDENT

The second story has to do with Abraham Lincoln Roosevelt, a Negro student who wanted to enroll at the University of Mississippi.

Mr. Roosevelt, a straight "A" student in high school, made his application to the admissions office, and was immediately accepted by the university. On his first day of school he was asked to join a fraternity, and several students invited him to the freshman prom. He was elected class president and cheerleader and a member of the exclusive Knife and Fork Club.

In a couple of weeks Mr. Roosevelt was editing the college humor magazine, was active in the dramatic society, chairman of the blood bank, member of the student council, manager of the football team, and captain of the debating squad.

By the end of the first term, Mr. Roosevelt flunked all his courses and was thrown out of the school.

"They made me do so many extracurricular activities," Mr. Roosevelt said bitterly, "I didn't have time to do any studying."

HAPPY ASTRONAUT

Maj. Carl Lemuel was selected as one of the original U.S. astronauts to go into space. Major Lemuel went through all the training and it was his turn to go up next. But a week before he was to be shot into space the doctors discovered he had a bad kidney, and said he couldn't possibly go into orbit.

In an interview after the medical examination Major Lemuel said, "I couldn't be happier. I was wondering how I was going to get out of it. I think anyone who goes up in one of those capsules is nuts, and it doesn't prove anything anyway."

NOTHING ELSE TO DO

EDWARD KENNEDY, a 30-year-old citizen of Massachusetts, decided to run for U.S. Senator on the Democratic ticket. A group of citizens came to him and said "TEDDY, your brother is President of the United States, your other brother is Attorney General, your brother-in-law is head of the Peace Corps. It will look awfully bad if there is another Kennedy in Washington. Why don't you give up the idea of running for Senator so that you don't embarrass the party?"

"But what else can I do?" Mr. KENNEDY asked.

The citizens thought and thought, but no one could come up with an answer.

## The Just and the Unjust

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to insert my remarks, I wish to call attention to the reaction of the Wall Street Journal of January 8, 1963, to the proposed regulations of the Internal Revenue Service in handling expense accounts.

I think the observations made in the following article are very meritorious:

THE JUST AND THE UNJUST

We guess we don't run in the right social circles.

For years we have been reading those books about wild living in the suburbs and wondering somewhat plaintively why the excitement seems to pass us by. In years of suburban living the wildest shock to the even tenor of our domesticity was the day the dog drank up the cocktails and bit the mayor. It was weeks before we were forgiven.

For almost as long, we've been reading about all this notorious high living on the expense account, boats and all that, and groaning over what we seem to have missed. After a quarter century in that den of iniquity, Wall Street, no one has tempted our journalistic virtue with even so much as a night at a hunting lodge, much less a seagoing voyage. Where, indeed, are all those expense-account yachts?

True, we aren't without sin, as defined in the new dogma of the Internal Revenue Service. We suffer business luncheons dreadfully often and when we turn in the voucher we don't deduct the $1.25 we would have spent anyway for the blue plate special. A man is entitled to some recompense for punishment in line of duty.

When business takes us to Peoria or Dubuque, as it does all too often, we take an aperitif before dinner, choose the steak over the chicken-a-la-king and sometimes splurge on the movies, charging the lot to the stockholders. If it weren't for their business we wouldn't be there at all, and frankly we have better steaks at home.

Moreover, the children being more or less at the age of discretion, we have lately taken our wife along on some trips. We haven't persuaded the curmudgeonly auditor to okay her expenses, but not long ago we drove to Washington on legitimate business (if talking to a Senator is legitimate) and our wife rode along in the car. Even that baleful auditor didn't ask us to reimburse the company for the equivalent price of her bus ticket.

Give or take a few details, this is not unlike the situation of thousands of businessmen in a country where men at work are ceaselessly traveling to and fro. The door-to-door salesman and the flying corporate executive are brothers under the skin; they are working also when they pass the time of day with the lady at the door or the business acquaintance across the luncheon table. Sometimes the smartest business is not to talk business at all but to be friendly, interested; to listen and to learn. Only ignorant and petty minds could imagine that the free lunch is all beer and skittles.

But now it turns out that all this is under the suspicion of undermining the public

morality and the solvency of the U.S. Treasury. In any event the Government is going to treat all the people as crooks until proven otherwise.

This suspicion of malefaction flows from every word of the new regulations on record-keeping, pedantic in language and picayune in detail, drawn up by the Internal Revenue Service.

Hereafter you must account to the Government not only for your yacht but the beer you buy a business acquaintance. The documents for any entertainment, no matter how trivial, must include the amount, date, place by name and address, type (martini or ham sandwich?), explanation of the benefit to be returned for this bounty, the name of the recipient and sufficient documentation to explain your extravagance to the satisfaction of any revenue agent who subsequently examines your tax report.

And if perchance on a trip you spend more than $25 in any day you must itemize everything else too—the day you left home, day you got back, every telephone call, meal, cup of coffee, taxicab and bus fare. If you want your books to balance, you'd better even keep track of the postage stamps for the letters to the home office.

The sheer absurdity of this avalanche of paperwork is only the beginning. The metaphysicians of Mr. Mortimer Caplin's bureaucracy have now gone off to mull such esoteric questions as: What, precisely, constitutes a business meal? What is the allowable difference in cost between a lunch for a life insurance prospect ($5,000 policy) and the prospect for an electric dynamo ($5 million sale)? Can you also buy lunch for the prospect's wife, or do you suggest she go eat in the drug store? What if your own wife is along too—do you leave her back in the hotel room to munch a hamburger and watch television?

As ridiculous as these questions sound, they are precisely the sort of thing that must now be decided upon at the highest levels, and Mr. Caplin confesses—quite understandably, we think—that it will be some weeks before we can expect any official enlightenment. It has never been easy to decide how many angels can dance on the head of a pin.

Yet it is neither the absurdity of the paperwork nor the ridiculousness of the metaphysics that is the true evil.

Here is a situation in which the Government is, no doubt about it, confronted with a problem. Some people do hide yachts in expense accounts, just as some do hide misbehavior in the suburbs, and the Government has the power to deal with the real tax cheaters. But the vast majority of the people everywhere lead quiet, placid, and upright lives, and the vast majority of those whose taxes support the Government give an honest accounting of their affairs.

Yet here we use the majesty of the law to treat every taxpayer as a potential cheater because pinhead minds can think of no other way; the integrity of all must be insulted, and the conduct of their affairs made insufferable, because of the sins of the few.

Now completely apart from this question of expense accounts, this is a philosophy of Government which is evil in itself. We once had an example of this when, to stop a few people from drinking too much, we adopted prohibition which treated all men as potential alcoholics. Surely the results have not left our memory.

The results of this noble experiment can also be foreseen. These new rules will give trouble only to honest men. The real operator—the man who is really out to cheat on his taxes—can drive a truck through them.

The smart lawyers are already figuring out the perfectly legal loopholes; beyond that, those with larceny in their hearts will not be disturbed because they will show records, receipts and paper accounts by the carload. As sure as the sun rises tomorrow, today's rules will have to be followed tomorrow by new rules upon new rules tightening the rules.

And while all this is going on, the honest man—the man who takes a business trip to do an honest job for his company and with no desire to cheat either his company or his country—that man will see himself not merely laden with burdensome paperwork but with the fear that everything he does is under suspicion.

Because he honestly tries to keep honest records, all the records will be there and he can be called up a year later, 2 years later, and find that what he did in good faith is adjudged wrong by some petty bureaucrat imbued with the idea that any expense account must conceal some wickedness. The smart operator will have his lawyers; the little taxpayer will be helpless against the insolence of office.

We submit that to order the public affairs in this manner is an affront to the public morality, just as it would be for the State to require of every citizen a detailed accounting of his home-coming-and-going because some men cheat. That Government governs idly which can find no other way to deal with malefactors than to maltreat all of its citizens, the just and the unjust alike.

## The Vast New Factor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call attention to the following editorial by Mr. Joseph Alsop which appeared in the Washington Post under date of January 14, 1963, entitled "The Vast New Factor":

THE VAST NEW FACTOR
(By Joseph Alsop)

"Heavy, heavy, what hangs over?" was the beginning of an old children's game like 20 questions. "Communist China" would be the winning answer, in the case of the new round of Soviet-American talks about a nuclear test ban, which will soon begin in New York.

The thought of Communist China naturally haunts the Soviets. The flat Chinese refusal to abide by a test ban was one of the two main factors—the other being Soviet military pressure to resume testing—which caused Khrushchev to torpedo the Geneva negotiations in 1961, when President Kennedy went so far to secure an agreement.

Today, the simmering discords of 1961 have boiled up to the point where an open, avowed, and final rupture between Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung appears to be almost unavoidable. And the seemingly inevitable break between Moscow and Peiping is, in itself, a vast new factor in the Soviet-American negotiations.

This is true because of the effect of a Sino-Soviet break on the problems of cheating. In 1961, it was out of the question for the United States to accept a test ban without some provision for inspecting inside China, since the Chinese would then have aided the Soviets to cheat despite their many disagreements.

If there is a final Sino-Soviet break, however, a test ban may seem a reasonable calculated risk despite its rejection by China; since the main danger of China-sheltered Soviet cheating will then have disappeared. In fact, China-sheltered Soviet cheating is already almost unimaginable, in the present embittered state of Sino-Soviet relations, even though the rupture is not formal and avowed.

This very great change in the contours of the test ban problem has of course been even more carefully weighed by the American policymakers than by the Soviet policymakers. The United States, after all, is the party to the bargain that will have to accept the calculated risk, if and when a test ban agreement is reached—which is still highly doubtful.

But there is another, perhaps even more important reason why the thought of Communist China haunts the American policymakers quite as powerfully as it haunts the Soviets. The President and those around him have lately been hard at work calculating the future effect on the general world balance of power of a Communist China divorced from Russia, on its feet again, and possessing atomic weapons.

There are two reasons why these fairly gruesome calculations are now being made at the White House. On the one hand, the time is at hand which was long ago named by the American forecasters as the first moment when the Chinese Communists might test their own atomic bomb. After that lower limit has been passed, there will be no telling when the first Chinese test may occur.

To be sure, the immediate effect of a Chinese test will be purely psychological. More time will be needed, after a test, before the Chinese can be said to have an atomic arsenal. But the Chinese problem, curiously enough, is rather simpler than the French problem.

The French nuclear program will only succeed if France creates an effective nuclear deterrent vis-a-vis the Soviets. The Chinese program will be successful, at least in part, if China merely has enough atomic weapons to overawe southeast Asia. Fewer weapons, and much less sophisticated weapons, will do for this purpose.

This is a real danger, if you accept as valid the other reason for the White House calculations about China. In brief, the President and a good many of those around him incline to take quite literally all that the Chinese have said, in their war of words with Moscow, about the United States being a paper tiger, about the Communist duty to use military power to bring about the Communist millenium, and so on and on.

If the Chinese really mean all that they have said on these topics, then the final Sino-Soviet rupture, if and when it comes, will mean that an aggressive China has cast off the last shred of moderating influence. The possibility that a Sino-Soviet rupture will produce this kind of aftereffect certainly needs to be weighed.

But there are other points to weigh as well. In the first place, the Chinese have been sounding very warlike, but the only country they have attacked is India, a self-announced paper tiger, and they have left even Chiang Kai-shek's offshore island severely alone.

In the second place, the picture of Communist China on its feet again and armed with atomic weapons is something of a scarecrow if Communist China has little chance of getting on its feet again. The moderate improvement in this year's harvest does not mean that Communist China is again a healthy country. The problem needs much more careful investigation.

Yet this new White House preoccupation, even if not entirely justified, is another proof that the Sino-Soviet row is changing everything.

## A Graduated Income Tax—Graduated Downward, That Is

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, all of us, I am sure, are deeply and genuinely concerned with the sluggish state of the Nation's economy, and in the weeks to come will be preoccupied with the increasing perplexity of what form of tax reduction will most effectively restore us to prosperity.

In the January 12 issue of the New Yorker magazine, the editor not only has grasped the lesson to be learned from a recent editorial in the Wall Street Journal, but he rephrases the lesson with such a clarity and lightness of touch that I would like to have it reprinted here for the enlightenment and amusement of those of my colleagues whose attention it may have escaped:

THE TALK OF THE TOWN

In the absence of other New York newspapers, we have been reading the Wall Street Journal more faithfully than usual, and learning quite a bit about economics. We are consequently becoming more conservative and apprehensive 5 days a week, and have only Saturday and Sunday, when the Journal does not appear, left in which to defrighten ourself. Just the other day, for example, the Journal warned the readers of its editorial page of what, it conceded, has been a hitherto unnoticed "especially adverse effect of the corporation profits tax as a drag against more efficient economic activity." Under the present fiscal scheme, the corporations that make the most money—and therefore, in Journal language, are the most "efficient"—pay the highest taxes. "The marginal producer pays less; nothing if he is sufficiently inefficient as to make no profits," the editorialist pointed out. This astonished us; we had always opposed the creation of a privileged fiscal class, but the danger of the anomaly had escaped us, "The effect of this • • • is to slowly shift the control of more of the Nation's resources into the hands of the less efficient producers and managers." (A trivial question, undoubtedly frivolous, momentarily crossed our mind: What would a man with no income eat while the control of the Nation's resources slowly shifted in his direction? Long acquaintance with the Journal's thought processes enable us to formulate the answer without posting a query to the editor: He would disguise himself as a native of an undeveloped country and live on surplus powdered milk wastefully distributed by the Agency for International Development.) What the Journal was advocating, in the interim before the income tax could be "replaced by some sort of expenditure tax," was relief for the big income. "Income taxes discourage savings because they treat consumption and savings equally—that is, your tax is the same whether you spend the money in riotous living or whether you save and make a contribution to the future economic growth of the country," it noted. "Moreover, the highly progressive rates especially restrict the amount of savings by falling most heavily on those incomes from which come the greatest savings." Since earners of low incomes indubitably spend a higher proportion of what they get than earners of high incomes—their pitiful irrelevant excuses for this can be ignored—the obvious remedy is a graduated income tax made progressive downward, or upside-downward, from no tax on incomes of a hundred thousand dollars and up (which furnish the most funds for investment) to a hundred percent on incomes of a thousand dollars and down (which are probably wasted on riotous living, since those earning them own few corporate shares). This would not eliminate the favored position of the man who makes no money at all, since even if he were taxed a hundred percent he would still pay nothing, but it would at least temper the injustice to his most efficient competitors, since they would pay nothing also.

## A Legal Lottery Helps Solve Some Pressing Social Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the American Zionist of December 1962.

It is interesting to see how Israel has turned the desire to gamble to the benefit of the nation. It makes one wonder what the revenue would be if such a lottery were instituted in this country. I suspect that the expectation of a direct financial return would be of greater interest to the average American than the more abstract and indirect return he now receives from his tax dollar.

The article follows:

GAMBLING OR SOCIAL SERVICE?
(By Helen Fried)

An American visitor to Israel scarcely expects to find a lottery operating openly. He comes from a country in which such enterprise is generally taboo.

Hence, when my host Simon and I were walking through a business district in Haifa and came upon a lottery booth, I was shocked. When I saw that Simon was ready to buy a ticket, I said, "Wait—is gambling considered respectable in Israel?

"Our lottery is not like American horseracing," Simon explained. "Israel's national lottery is legal, and the money that comes in through it we use for developing some of our most needed institutions. The lottery was estabilshed in 1951, when Israel was tragically short of hospitals and clinics for the chronically ill among the escapees from Hitler's death camps. After sufficient health institutions had been built, the lottery income went to building schools. More than 4,000 classrooms with facilities for over 200,000 children, have been built since the program has been in effect. How respectable does this sound to you?"

"Does that mean that the ends justify the means?"

"Let me tell you some more. Then you can judge for yourself. The 1,500 persons engaged in selling lottery tickets are elderly and handicapped. For nearly all, the earnings—which are only a little more than 6 percent of the gross sales—are their only income. Otherwise, most of them would be on the welfare rolls." There were warmth and pride in Simon's voice.

A memory of elderly men and women, still well-preserved physically, sitting around in the parks and squares of New York City with nothing to do, came to my mind. Perhaps they would welcome a chance to be useful, as Israel has made many of her aged citizens functioning parts of the society.

Slowly I began to feel that not all games of chance deserve to be condemned. Israel's national lottery hurts no one, and helps solve many social problems throughout the country. "I have to admit," I said to Simon, "your lottery provides jobs for those who are considered unemployable. And it is wise of the Government to restrict such jobs to the elderly."

That something like a national lottery would interest me, I never dreamed. But this socially useful device was new to me. "How much does a ticket cost, and how often are the drawings?" I asked.

"Each ticket costs 2 pounds, and the drawings are once a week. But as high as 58 percent of the income goes back to the customers, since the prizes include many for small amounts. No Israeli has ever become a millionaire overnight." Simon sat back and lit a cigarette.

"How do the ordinary wage earners respond to betting even as little as 2 pounds?"

"Well, I can see that you have never bet," Simon laughed. "Israelis, whether they are workers, managers or professional people, hardly ever squander money on lottery tickets. As few as three percent buy more than one ticket. By the way, most of the winners in Israel do not permit their name to be mentioned in the newspapers. Well, what do you think of our lottery now? Do you still think it's something that takes money away from widows and orphans?"

I pondered the question as we left the Technion for home. My first disapproving response to the lottery had not been changed by our talk. That attitude was too deeply ingrained by my living in a country where games of chance are regarded as morally wrong. But it had opened my mind to the possibility that a lottery managed as it is in Israel could be socially useful, providing jobs for needy men and women.

As we approached a lottery booth, I said to Simon, "Go ahead, buy yourself a ticket. I see no wrong in it now, and maybe this time you'll be lucky!"

## Actions of the Government in the Congo-Katanga Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, many letters are being received by Members of this House relative to the actions of this Government in the Congo-Katanga controversy. These come from traveling Americans and those whose businesses keep them in various parts of the world. I give you one only at this time because of its concise language. It reads:

S.O.S. Please send me some explanation of why the United States is fighting and backing the U.N. decision to fight Katanga. Everyone here believes it is only so U.S. financiers can get control of the copper mines. Opinion here unanimous that present U.N. policy means chaos and bloodshed. Tshombe considered the only one with any idea of civilization. Russia expected to

step in when chaos arrives and United States cast as the real villain in the drama. Difficult to stand up for one's country when everything one reads or hears is contrary to our State Department pronouncements.

Mr. Speaker, when are these matters going to be brought before this House?

## Virginia Poultry and the European Common Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, the unwarranted and discriminatory import duty and so-called gate-price restrictions which the nations of the European Economic Community have placed on our poultry is causing cruel damage to a domestic industry which, without price supports or other subsidies, has made a remarkable self-help record in developing a European market.

The effects are particularly serious in Virginia, a major poultry producer.

In a conference attended by representatives of virtually all segments of the economy of the Commonwealth, held in Richmond, Va., on January 11, 1963, Hon. Albertis S. Harrison, Jr., Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia, set forth the scope of the problem in a notable address.

Because of the importance of this problem to other poultry-producing States—and, indeed, to American agriculture generally—I include, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, a summary of Governor Harrison's remarks:

SUMMARY OF REMARKS BY GOV. ALBERTIS S. HARRISON, JR., POULTRY FEDERATION BREAKFAST, RICHMOND HOTEL, JANUARY 11, 1963

All of you who are in attendance here today—members of the poultry industry, bankers, manufacturers, businessmen from many fields—are aware of the purpose for which we gather. By your attendance here, you also indicate the urgency and the scope of the problem before us.

Our immediate concern is that the governing directorate of the European Common Market has more than doubled its tariff on importations of poultry. The obvious reason for this action is to protect the poultry industry in the member nations. The immediate effect has been to bar the door against more than 28 million pounds of Virginia poultry, representing a substantial portion of our total production and projecting a loss to our total economy of approximately $30 million.

This has been a unilateral action on the part of the Common Market. It amounts to a penalty for the superlative efficiency of the Virginia poultry industry, which is able to deliver an attractive, tasty, ready-to-cook bird to West Germany and other points at a price well below that offered for local, farm-grown chickens.

The broad impact of this action was presented to me in detail on Wednesday by representatives of the Virginia State Poultry Federation and the Virginia Department of Agriculture, and I commend both of these organizations for their prompt and detailed response to this challenge.

Obviously this is a problem which warrants the wholehearted support of the Governor, and that I freely and gladly give. I have urged the necessity for both immediate and permanent relief upon the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the members of Virginia's congressional delegation, and upon other southern Governors who will be similarly affected.

The economic aspects of this action present particular difficulties for an industry already beset with narrowing margins and intense competition, yet it has other implications.

This is a major preliminary move in the evolution of the Common Market and in the development of trade patterns which will form the basis of that agency's future relations with our entire Nation. The outcome has many implications for Virginia's future relationship with this growing economic entity.

Along with Great Britain, the 6 nations of the Common Market represent a market of 200 million people, many of them just beginning to acquire the beginnings of the infinite variety of consumer goods that make up our American standard of living.

Many of them have already been introduced to Virginia poultry, and have indicated they want more.

The large truth hovering in the background is that the Common Market has been fabulously successful, and that it has become a reality that our own economy must reckon with and with which we must establish a fair but firm basis of trade.

But our immediate and overriding concern is Virginia's poultry industry. A vigorous attempt to bring about adjustments in these tariffs is indicated, first, in order to allow our poultry industry to resume serving the market its products have created abroad, and second to demonstrate that Virginians and Americans mean business when they set out to do business.

I am delighted that the poultry industry has permitted me to take part in this session and to lend my personal support and the support of my office to this endeavor. I am confident that the caliber of the support assembled here lends assurance of eventual success.

## Judge Patrick T. Stone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, January 13, 1963, death brought an end to the career of one of our Nation's most eminent and able jurists. Patrick T. Stone succumbed to cancer at his home in Wausau, Wis. He was 73 years old. For 30 years he had served the people of Wisconsin as judge of the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin.

He served the people well. For him, the speedy and impartial administration of justice was not just an ideal to which our judicial system should aspire—it was the basic and necessary principle of his daily courtroom conduct.

Despite a schedule that would have staggered the most ambitious of men, Judge Stone was always up to date in his work. His court was a model of efficiency, impartiality and dignity.

At the same time, his deep compassion for people was well known and greatly appreciated by all who had the privilege of working with him.

Judge Stone was born in Ontario, Canada, but moved with his family to Tomahawk, Wis., when he was 2. He attended Tomahawk's public schools and received his law degree from Marquette University Law School. During World War I, Judge Stone served in the U.S. Navy. After practicing law and serving as Wausau city attorney for 8 years, Judge Stone was appointed to the Federal bench in 1933 by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. His was the first judicial appointment made by the new President.

Judge Stone presided over many important cases in his long career on the bench. In 1937 and 1938 he sat during the trial of 23 major oil companies charged with price fixing. He presided over the famous bankers trial in Detroit, the trial of two assistant U.S. attorneys in Chicago, and an historic counterfeiting case in New York. Just last year Judge Stone was one of three Federal judges named to hear the Wisconsin reapportionment suit.

His great respect for the traditions of our law did not keep Judge Stone from urging reform when he thought it necessary. He was a pioneer in the use of presentence investigations, which were instituted in his court in 1938.

Both on the bench and off Judge Stone had the respect and affection of lawyers and laymen alike. His firmness and businesslike conduct in his courtroom was matched by his warmth and affability during his rare leisure hours, when he enjoyed a good game of bridge with some of his many friends.

We of Wisconsin are proud of Judge Stone. His record of service to his community, the incisiveness and humanity of his judicial opinions will long be remembered. He has left an indelible mark on the law and on the lives of the people of the western district of Wisconsin. He will be missed, not only by those of us who knew him and felt the power and warmth of his personality, but by all who respected him as a judge among judges, as a man among men.

## Progress Is Not a Gift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, as we begin this new session of Congress with the certain knowledge that we will be pressured from all quarters for more and more Federal programs to solve all of mankind's ills, it may be well for us to ponder on the wisdom contained in the text of the advertisement of the Warner & Swasey Co., in U.S. News & World Report of December 31, 1962. Many of our

current problems will be solved if we return to the old-fashioned American idea for success—individual hustle and sweat. Only then can we earn the sweet rewards for tomorrow or as so aptly put in the following statement, "Tomorrow must be earned—not appropriated":

TOMORROW MUST BE EARNED—NOT APPROPRIATED

Voting more money for schools doesn't make this an educated Nation. It isn't billions for more veterans' hospitals that will make America healthy. It is honest production, not shorter hours, that protects jobs. It takes more than costly playgrounds to cure juvenile delinquency. Pouring our billions all over the world doesn't buy security nor peace.

Nothing worth having or worth being is ever reached except by honest hard work, but it is becoming the tragic fashion to think we can shortcut the work, and have everything we want if we only spend enough Federal dollars. And then we mistakenly feel "the Government has taken care of it," so we can sit back and relax.

Another once-great nation withered and died when its people were drugged with that same fatal poison. (Perhaps "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" should be required reading in many places today.)

Everything government offers free is obviously and always paid for by all of us in higher taxes or a worsening deficit—both of them deficits of dollars but, even more tragically, deficits in national character and self-respect. What would ever be worth that?

## Our Traditional Christian Christmas Must Forever Be Preserved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a Christmas message written by Mr. Charles Wilson, principal of Wakeham Elementary School in Orange County, Calif. This message was delivered to the 700 students of that school. Mr. Wilson is to be congratulated for having the courage to extend this message at a time in our national history when anything connected with religion is under attack.

The message follows:

OUR TRADITIONAL CHRISTIAN CHRISTMAS MUST FOREVER BE PRESERVED

(By Charles Wilson)

The world is in a state of confusion, turmoil and crisis upon crisis. It is divided a battleground between two ideologies striving to capture the mind, the heart, and the very soul of mankind. Country after country has disappeared behind the Iron Curtain, and these unfortunate people have been engulfed—swallowed up—by a political philosophy that is atheistic, denies the existence of a Divine Being and destroys by every means of dictatorial suppression and oppression the religious freedom of the subjugated citizens.

Change—change has become the modern panacea, the shot of penicillin, the magic cure-all for too many people in this land of Constitutional guarantees that actually had its founding in the Mayflower Compact of November 11, 1620. However, change for the sake of change itself is not necessarily good or constructive. Change is desirable only if it produces progress beneficial to mankind and the future of civilization.

Customs, traditions and mores have too often been considered obsolete, old-fashioned, and hence, discarded or minimized by a powerful faction of sincere but misguided Americans who have attempted to indoctrinate the American public through every possible media of communications and weapons of propaganda to the benefits of change and modernism without analyzing the ultimate consequences of these actions or the values of an appreciation and understanding of the basic foundations of our country.

There is one belief that has defied change. Time has not been able to erase it or tarnish its perfection. Numerous emperors, kings, and dictators, be they called Fuehrer, Il Duce, or premier, have not been able to eradicate by propaganda, physical and mental torture, or even death this faith. It has remained because it is an eternal truth, defying the powers of man to pervert or time to diminish its message.

"For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Savior, which is Christ the Lord." Nineteen hundred and sixty-two years later this is still the symbol, the significance, the very soul, the everlasting spirit of Christmas, and the message it joyously sings out for all peoples of the world of faith to hear can never be changed by mortal man although an attempt has been made in the past years in the United States for a changed celebration of Christmas.

Let us analyze, after scrutinizing carefully, the concepts of this changed version of Christmas we are asked to accept.

Christmas cards replete with galloping horses; ships in full sail upon a pastel sea; talking animals that deliver the holiday message; a martinied, jolly old Santa Claus that delivers a package of bottled cheer instead of a doll for Laura or a chemistry set for Charles are all an integral part of the changed new version of season's greetings.

Christmas songs that describe our children catching Santa Claus kissing mother with implications that are, at the best, questionable; the total commercialization with the only green being the color of money; music that has deliberately lost the true spirit of why we celebrate December 25 is repetitiously heard on radio and television before the Thanksgiving turkey has been eaten.

The changed colors of Christmas are exemplified in an abundance of yellows and pastels of various shades; turquoises, powder blues, pale pinks, fuschias, and avocado greens that dominate cards, the lights on the tree, wrapping paper, and ribbons on the gifts for those we love.

Christmas presents must be expensive, fancily wrapped in pastel colors and purchased at a store with a famous name that represents status and prestige. There must be a huge quantity of pastel wrapped presents under the pastel tree for each member of the family—including the dog and cat.

The basic belief of a Christian Christmas has been questioned, challenged, and threatened by a segment of our society. Christmas has become controversial. This is difficult to believe or understand because our country was, is, and must always be a God-centered nation. The Mayflower Compact, the Declaration of Independence, our Constitution, the pledge of allegiance to the flag of our country, the motto on our coins, and the oath of office of elected officials all give evidence that we are a land that does base our faith and trust in a divine being. Are these obsolete? Does the changed image of Christmas offer us more?

What is a traditional Christian Christmas?

Christmas cards must have the ancient and true symbols of Christmas—the Nativity scene, the star and the candle that shed light upon darkness, the wreath and the holly, the Three Wise Men, home scenes that portray abundant evidence of family love and loyalty with the warmth of the hearth permeating and adding to the blessings and joys of the yuletide season. These pictorial representations of Christmas must never vanish from our way of life but must continue to spread the deeper values of why we celebrate that 25th day in December each year.

Christmas songs must ring out in the voices of children at school, carolers in the streets, choirs in the churches carrying the hope of the world in the significance of the words of "Silent Night," "Away in the Manger," "O Come, All Ye Faithful," and the multitudinous hymns of Christmas that have come to stand for the richer thoughts of this season over hundreds of years.

Christmas colors have traditionally been red as the blood that Jesus Christ shed upon the cross for the forgiveness and salvation of all mankind; green as the everlasting life of nature as represented by the evergreen of the tree and the holly. Can we exchange these for pastels?

Christmas gifts stated so clearly by their intrinsic value that the "gift without the giver is bare," as children and adults made through perspiration and inspiration the presents for their loved ones—grandmother and grandfather, mother and father, sister and brother, friend and relative. Quality of present was the objective, not quantity. Time and effort, signifying love of the giver, was represented in each and every gift. The only brand name was the name of the giver.

And yet, we have missed the true and deeper implications of Christmas unless we devoutly and fondly remember the purpose of the home and the family at this season of the year. The family planned the presents together amidst great hustle and bustle and small huddles of secrecy and giggling; gifts were wrapped at home by hand and hidden with the greatest of care in every possible nook and cranny; cookies were baked in the shapes of stars, crosses, trees and plump Santa Clauses; taffy was pulled, fudge was boiled and fondant was made; popcorn was popped to be threaded and hung on the tree (all that was not eaten by the busy hands); gifts were so often made by hand—an embroidered apron or pillowcase; the button boxes or jewel boxes made out of coffee cans, cigar boxes and plenty of creative imagination. They represented love and unselfishness because they were the creations and efforts of the giver. Christmas carols rang throughout the home, and traditional songs were sung by the entire family on Christmas Eve before the cracking fireplace or gathered closely around the battered piano or organ. Fireplace, piano or organ, or just a home full of family love, Christmas carols were sung with an inner and spiritual feeling. The family that harmonized together these songs of devotion and hope of the world were united by a spiritual and intellectual bond that could never be broken.

Christmas belongs not only to the children of the free world but also to the adults. Childhood believes in the magical powers of Santa Claus and Frosty the Snowman. No gift, no wish is impossible as long as the child believes. No gift, no wish is impossible as long as the adult truly believes. We only have to witness the miracles performed by Jesus Christ as he made the lame to walk and the blind to see because they had faith, truly believed.

Childhood pathetically and tragically comes to an abrupt climax when the child discovers that Santa Claus is only a figment of the imagination and the magic powers of Frosty vanish with the sunlight, but for-

tunately the richer and deeper significance of Christmas replaces this loss if we as parents and adults have taught our children the religious connotation of Christmas. Santa Claus is replaced by the love and redemption of Jesus Christ.

Brotherly love seems to express itself in all the young at heart from 2 to 102 at this joyous season of the year. Miracles do still happen as in the days of Christ. People smile that have frowned and scowled for 11 months of the year and greet you with a warm, cheery and sincere "Merry Christmas." Hearts and purses that have been closed too long open generously to help those less fortunate. Even Scrooge found the joy of giving. Stockings will continue to be hung by the chimney with the greatest of care as long as the United States remains free. People who have forgotten to worship in God's house will return to his abode as long as Americans continue to have the guarantee of freedom of religion.

The world is a better place, people display their more noble emotions for a few short days as they consider unselfishly the welfare and happiness of others, rather than themselves. The Golden Rule prevails for an all too brief moment of the 365 days of the year. It seems so tragic, so futile that this spirit of love and unselfishness cannot shine throughout the world for the entire year, every year.

The church has not been overlooked in this homage, this tribute to Christmas, but each individual must honor his God as he believes. The school, the home, the Government must never usurp the privileges and right of each person to worship his God in his own manner. This right is guaranteed to us by the Bill of Rights, the first 10 amendments, to our Constitution. The makers of our Constitution were so firm in their belief of freedom of religion that they made this right a basic part of the law of our country.

The 25th of December is the day that Christians throughout the world honor the birth of Jesus Christ. But be we Christians or not, Christmas is a vital part of our American culture, our American way of life, and has been since the Pilgrims from the Mayflower landed at Cape Cod in 1620 and signed the Mayflower Compact, commencing with these words of faith, "In the Name of God."

Our American system of free enterprise that rewards initiative and risk has given us the greatest materialistic wealth of any nation since the creation of the earth. Our standard of living surpasses that of any people that have existed. And yet, we are not a materialistic people; we are a people that still believe in Santa Claus.

And what, then, is a Christian Christmas? It is the second chance for the people of the world. It is the eternal hope for peace on earth, good will to men.

"And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God, and saying, Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men."

## An Answer to Ole Miss Chaplain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ARTHUR WINSTEAD
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that public attention is presently focused on the high crime rate in the District of Columbia and the recent race riot at District of Columbia Stadium, I feel that the following newspaper article written by able columnist Tom Ethridge, of the Clarion Ledger, merits your reading and consideration. The Clarion Ledger is published at Jackson, Miss., and this article apeared in his column titled "Mississippi Notebook" on January 9, 1963. I find it to be most appropriate and timely:

MISSISSIPPI NOTEBOOK

(By Tom Ethridge)

AN ANSWER TO OLE MISS CHAPLAIN

Our text today is based on the following letter which appeared in this newspaper's "Voice of the People" yesterday, January 8:

"DEAR EDITOR: The people of Mississippi have been shamed by the presence of soldiers in our midst sent to keep the peace.

"Our politicians hope to win votes by loudly denouncing the Army's presence. Even Ole Miss officialdom has now joined in the popular hue and cry.

"Yet not a single one of these leaders has offered to guarantee that peace and order will be maintained if the troops are withdrawn.

"Sincerely,

"The Reverend WOFFORD K. SMITH,
*"Episcopal Chaplain,*
*"University of Mississippi."*

Well now, must a State or city be occupied by Federal troops simply because it cannot provide ironclad guarantees against violence or unpleasantness? If so, Federal troops should occupy every big city in America, including Washington.

Why should our State be expected to guarantee absolute protection for agitators and troublemakers, some seeking to provoke friction—when the President and Congress are not able to guarantee protection for citizens in our Nation's Capital?

Washington, as everyone knows, has become a jungle of violence and terror. Many of its streets are not safe, even in broad daylight.

The official bulletin of the U.S. Supreme Court recently warned women workers to take full advantage of the police escort service provided for them by police, due to numerous sex crimes on Washington streets—some within the very shadow of the Capitol and Supreme Court Building.

POLICE UNABLE TO STOP RACE RIOTS

If any place on earth is to be a model of law and order, it should be the Nation's capital city, but the opposite is true. Washington has one of the worst crime records of any metropolis in the world. By comparison, the African Congo is a safer place to work, visit, and live.

A race riot broke out in Washington this past Thanksgiving Day, after a white team defeated a colored team for the city high school championship. Of the 50,000 spectators, two-thirds were colored.

Negroes mobbed white men, women and children indiscriminately. This wild disorder was the fourth that has marked such championship games in the last 5 years.

As a result, the District of Columbia Board voted to deny use of the Muncipal Stadium for future city title games.

The Right Reverend John S. Spence, director of education for the archdiocese of Washington, has suspended participation of Catholic high school teams, not only in championship football games but also in championship basketball games with the city's public high schools whose student bodies are fast becoming all colored.

Even the city's "liberal" press has gone along with this unprecedented action.

Why? Simply because the Washington police and Federal Government cannot guarantee protection for players and spectators.

Over 200 policemen were on duty at the stadium but a police official said the rioting could not have been prevented if there had been 2,000 officers on hand.

NEW YORK CAN'T PROTECT ITS MAYOR

New York City is another notorious hotspot of crime and violence. Despite its large and efficient police force, protection cannot be guaranteed for the citizenry. In fact, vicious street gangs often mob officers on their beats. Students are robbed, raped, and beaten on the campus and even in the halls of Columbia University, the neighborhood of which is a criminal's paradise.

Many New York churches no longer hold night services, because the streets are unsafe for Christian people.

New York can't even protect its own mayor from roving gangs of human packwolves.

Not long ago, dedication ceremonies were scheduled at a new housing project on West 94th Street, Mayor Robert Wagner was slated to officiate.

The ceremony was canceled. Why? The reason, as given by the New York Times, was that police could not guarantee either the mayor's safety or the safety of other dignitaries invited to attend.

This, mind you, in broad daylight, in the middle of the biggest city of a nation which claims to be a world leader and a model for other nations to follow.

The Federal Government, taking cognizance of this ugly situation, has assigned 80 members of the Peace Corps to work among the Negroes and colored Puerto Rican imports causing the trouble in that crime-ridden neighborhood. The liberal New York Times ventured this angry comment:

"How many more such reminders does this city's administration need to develop a sense of outrage? Our parks are a no man's land after dusk; muggings throughout the city are common. Is it the hope of city hall that, if things get bad enough, we will eventually qualify for grants under the Alliance for Progress?"

Big cities of progressive States have become crime jungles but no such horrible conditions exist here in peaceful law-abiding Mississippi. The FBI's latest annual crime report showed Mississippi's crime rate was less than half the national average and the fourth lowest crime rate in the entire United States.

Thus, the Federal troops allegedly upholding law and order in Mississippi are needed more badly in America's metropolitan areas where vicious and pampered minorities wage a steadily worsening reign of terror. By comparison, Mississippi is a model of law and order.

## President Kennedy's First 2 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as everyone is interested in accertaining how knowledgeable journalists have evaluated the first 2 years of President Kennedy's administration, I wish to invite my colleagues' attention to an illuminating article written by Mr. Thomas O'Neill, a brilliant columnist of a regular feature of the Baltimore Sun, "Politics and People." This particular article, entitled "After 2 Years," appeared in that highly respected news-

paper on January 16, 1963, and contains this very significant sentence:

As the legislative rebuffs accumulated, the popularity polls disclosed Mr. Kennedy winning public support surpassing that given General Eisenhower, who is customarily described as the most popular of modern Presidents.

The entire article is as follows:

POLITICS AND PEOPLE

(By Thomas O'Neill)

AFTER 2 YEARS

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy arrives midway in his first elective White House tenancy high in the favor of his countrymen, with whom rests the question of an extension of his lease for a further 4 years, and encouraged by a wisp of congeniality in a previously stiff and indifferent Congress. Quite plainly, the Chief Executive has grown on the Nation since it entrusted him with a grudging and barely visible mandate 2 years ago.

The most persuasive explanation that appears is that the vigorous young President reflects in person and performance the mood of the times, concerned but confident.

In retrospect, the first 2 Kennedy years were a get-acquainted period during which the country learned a lot that had been largely unguessed about the all but total stranger to whom it turned in preference to a better known opponent on election day, 1960.

Surprises have been apparent at frequent intervals as the familiarization between public and President took its course. A Democratic President who is also an economic conservative, for example, was provided for in few of the abundant postelection scripts undertaking to predict the course of the new administration, especially in those sketched by romantics anticipating a return to the heady days of their youth in the early New Deal. Left similarly dismayed were those in the opposition who misread the Kennedy career to mean that he was a purely political animal and were undone when their bellicose shafts aroused no strenuous partisanship at the White House and the President, bent on leading a united nation in a difficult time, steadfastly abstained from what he himself calls highly charged political positions.

Mr. Kennedy adhered to his chosen course, which can now be recognized as innate, while a disdainful Congress, whose Members generally had run better at the polls than the President, denied him even the customary Presidential honeymoon. His proposals were scuttled mercilessly by a Congress more negative than any of those that had confronted his predecessor.

At this stage a revealing phenomenon appeared. As the legislative rebuffs accumulated, the popularity polls disclosed Mr. Kennedy winning public support surpassing that given General Eisenhower, who is customarily described as the most popular of modern Presidents.

Some degree of support in such soundings goes to any President simply because he is the President. Beyond that, the test is the popular appraisal of the Presidential manner and character. Here Mr. Kennedy scored high. Surely it was more than coincidence that concurrently the President was quietly demonstrating that he had no taste for repining or for self-excuses when things went wrong, either on Capitol Hill or at the Bay of Pigs. He neither sulks nor rants, and accepts that buckpassing ends at the President's desk.

Victories, when they occur, have been accepted with corresponding restraint.

Roger Blough learned last April that the President can be a dangerous adversary when aroused, but he was spared Presidential crowing when Big Steel pulled in its horns. The expected criticism was raised in the expected places at the time—Mr. Kennedy lost four points on Dr. Gallup's popularity thermometer—but the rest of the populace applauded, recognizing a doublecross when it saw one.

Nor was there any flamboyance when Mr. Kennedy brought off the premier triumph of the cold war, the facing down of Khrushchev over the Cuban missiles. Restraint and understatement are habitual to the urbane and patrician President. A smile of contentment playing about the Kennedy lips when the Russian retreat is the topic offers the only evidence that anything out of the ordinary has occurred.

Mr. Kennedy presents a knotty problem for his political opposition, principally by his firm preemption of the political center. It is plain in the awkward readjustment occupying his presumptive 1964 challenger, Governor Rockefeller, as the New Yorker studiously moves in a direction designed to please Senator GOLDWATER. The Rockefeller campaign for 1964 has begun—his pronouncements in New York are now conscientiously distributed in advance to the national political writers in the Washington press corps—and obviously he regards the Republican nomination as worth the effort.

Most opinion is that, in the absence of calamitous events in the remainder of his present term, Mr. Kennedy is assured of reelection. A dissenter from this view, along with Governor Rockefeller, is the President himself.

At his leaky Palm Beach background session with correspondents the President talked of second-term prospects and was pointedly bearish. Except for Franklin D. Roosevelt, he observed, Democratic Presidents since the Civil War have faced rough going as second-term candidates—Cleveland, defeated (he then ran a third time, and won); Wilson and Truman barely successful.

## President Kennedy's State of the Union Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, this was my first experience as a new Member of Congress to hear the President deliver in person his state of the Union message to the Congress and the people of the United States. It was not only a most exhilarating but also a most sobering experience.

I could not help but think, as I sat and listened to our Chief Executive, that here was a man who is very serious minded, who has deep understanding of our Nation's problems, and who possesses the leadership and the ability to cope with these problems in this very crucial period in world history.

The program he presented to Congress today is a sensible one. I am in agreement with most of the proposals contained in that program, because they are in the best interests of the American people. I am very much encouraged by the President's assurance that "we have every reason to believe that our tide's running strong."

I believe the President deserves the full support of the people. I shall do all I can to help in the enactment of his program.

## Forty-fourth Anniversary of the Republic of Latvia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter and statement received by me from Mr. Sigurds Rudzitis, president of the Latvian Association in Detroit, in observance of the 44th anniversary of the Republic of Latvia, which has, since its founding, to the sorrow of all freemen, lost its independence and liberty and been dragged behind the Iron Curtain.

The letter and statement follow:

LATVIAN ASSOCIATION IN DETROIT,
HIGHLAND PARK, MICH.,
*November 24, 1962.*

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SIR: Enclosed please find a copy of a statement issued by the Latvian-American of Metropolitan Detroit commemorating the 44th anniversary of the Independence of Latvia.

Any assistance that you can give to carry out the spirit of this statement will be deeply appreciated by the Latvians in the United States and Latvia.

Very truly yours,

SIGURDS RUDZITIS,
*President.*

STATEMENT

The Latvian-Americans of Metropolitan Detroit, assembled at the Detroit Institute of Arts, 5200 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich., on 18th day of November 1962, to commemorate the 44th anniversary of independence of the Republic of Latvia, unanimously agreed to issue the following statement:

"1. As we pause today to observe the 44th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Latvia, we again thank the U.S. Government for refusing to recognize the forcible seizure by the Soviet Union of the Baltic States of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania. We urge that this policy be continued.

"2. As Latvians, who witnessed the Communist brutality of Soviet occupation of our country, we know the true meaning of communism. With this thought in mind we heartily endorse President Kennedy's action in Cuba as a step toward what we hope is the eventual liberation of enslaved peoples. We hope for equal firmness in other threatened areas, such as Berlin and southeast Asia.

"3. We urge all Americans to stand behind the Government in a courageous reaffirmation of America's leadership in the struggle against tyranny. We urge that the leaders of the other free world powers recognize that the threat posed by international com-

munism is as dangerous to them as to the United States.

"4. Blinded by cries of 'colonialism' many neutral nations have failed to distinguish between Western traditions of freedom and Communist propaganda. The mistake in this attitude is demonstrated in Communist China's invasion of India. We hope this lesson will not be lost on the new African and Asian states.

"5. If there are to be any negotiations with the Soviet Union, the free world should constantly remind the Communists and neutral states of their opposition to the subjugation of the Baltic States and press for their liberation. There can be no peace in the world unless the principle of self-determination is applied universally for the small states as well as the large.

"6. We request the U.S. Government to bring the question of Latvia and other Baltic States to the attention of the United Nations and to take whatever other steps it may consider appropriate to reestablish freedom and independence of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania, which were destroyed by the criminal acts of the Soviet Union.

"7. Despite 22 years of Communist persecution, the continued deportations, attempted extinction of the church and the people's national heritage, the Latvians still proudly hold their head high and look to the day they will be free again. They see the United States their only hope. This country must not fail them.

"8. This statement is the expression of the entire Latvian-American community of Metropolitan Detroit and this assemblage directs that copies of this statement be sent to the President of the United States, Secretary of State, the U.S. delegation to the United Nations, Senators and Congressmen from Michigan, Governor of the State of Michigan and mayor of the city of Detroit."

Done in Detroit, Mich., this 18th day of November A.D. 1962.

## Castro Fooled Nearly Everyone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, Mr. William R. Mathews has written an editorial on the advent of Castroism in Cuba. Since Mr. Mathews is one of the few people who interviewed Castro before he assumed power, this editorial is one which will be of interest to all the Members.

The editorial follows:

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Nov. 16, 1962]

CASTRO FOOLED NEARLY EVERYONE

(By William R. Mathews)

When President Adolfo Lopez Mateos, of Mexico, told James Reston, of the New York Times, in a recent interview, that blunders made by the United States pushed Castro into the Communist camp, he spoke an alibi that is most popular in Latin America.

This is a subject on which I can speak in the first person, because I was one of a small group that interviewed Castro in a home near Havana on February 28, 1959, 2 months after he assumed power. None of us knew that Castro had a Communist background, and that he had participated as a rebel in the Bogota incident of 1948. Jules Du Bois, of the Chicago Tribune, insisted he was not a Communist.

My first alarm about Castro began when, after winning power, he instituted a program of terror and extermination that reflected pure Stalin Communist tactics. Stalinism might be defined as the maintenance of power by the deliberate extermination of all persons who can be suspected of opposition.

That program was just getting under way, when we interviewed Castro. He is a man of powerful physical and intellectual character. To us he was the soul of reason. All he wanted to do, he pleaded, was to establish an honest democratic government, and make many vested interests pay their back taxes. There would have to be agrarian reform, but that program would be worked out with respect to all who owned land. He wanted to break up only the big estates.

He was most plausible, except for one slip that he made, which did not impress any of us at the time. He spoke bitterly about how the United States had intervened needlessly in the freeing of Cuba in 1898. His hand should have been called by me and others right then, but we were gracious and sympathetic to his general program.

So were most of the Cubans. They saw him as the leader of a government that would restore full civil liberties and eliminate the corruption of the Batista regime. Castro won his most effective support from the middle class, which had been growing steadily in strength and influence. His revolt was not an agrarian or workers' rebellion. Cuba at that time had one of the highest standards of living in the whole Latin-American world. It was these people whom we saw about him as his assistants and public champions.

I wrote favorably about him, despite the increasing terror he instituted. My previous visit in Cuba was in 1955, when the country was thriving, and a high degree of freedom prevailed. We went all through the great Cabana fortress and prison, in which there was not a soul. When news came that it was being filled with prisoners by Castro, it sounded an alarm.

When Castro went to Washington and spoke before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, my question to him was the last one in a long session. It was, "What is your attitude toward the future and present investments of American capital?" Immediately he shot back, "We will treat American capital fairly; we need more captial to make our revolution a success."

On the other hand, the White House and Department of State remained aloof, because they knew of Castro's record, and the records of some of his new assistants. Washington could get no assurance from him that would justify either economic or political help. Washington acted wisely. The United States would have been a plain sucker to have given him aid which he would use promptly to transform and strengthen his obviously growing Communist society. The terror was intensified. Those fine men—and women—who had supported him soon found they had to flee for their lives, or suffer imprisonment and death.

Can this record by the United States be called one that pushed Castro into the Communist camp? Rather it represents an overly patient and correct attitude.

President Lopez Mateos blames the American press for the wide publicity Castro received before he won power. The New York Times did start the ball rolling with the interview and picture of its correspondent, Herbert Matthews, in Castro's hiding place in Cuba. Other papers, radio, TV and magazines chimed in. Castro seemed like a benevolent Robin Hood, while Batista was the cruel bad man. The Department of State continued its hands-off policy of noninterference in a Latin-American rebellion, which at that time was considered quite correct by the people of the country.

But the Mexican papers and radio chimed in, also. Throughout Latin America, Castro won initially warm sympathy. He was a modern David who had slain a modern Goliath. Not until Castro actually confessed his communism publicly, did these admirers change their tune.

Official Mexico didn't change until the October revelation of offensive missiles being installed and prepared to fire on the United States.

The irony of this whole matter is that if the United States had announced public support of Batista, Castro would have been squelched. He would not have won the support of the middle class, who saw in him the promise of a free, honest democratic government. But, if the Eisenhower administration had done that, it quickly would have been called upon by Congress to account for such an unpopular policy.

At that particular time, most Americans were living in the dreamland that confidently assumed that all people everywhere were capable of democratic—parliamentary—self-government. That the Kennedy administration, shortly after it came into power, tried to achieve that very thing in Africa, confirms how deep seated that belief was.

It will be many, many years before Cuba can develop among its people the ability and morality to accomplish that difficult task of restoring democratic, parliamentary government.

## The Origins of a Human Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the December 1962 edition of the National Jewish Monthly.

This article reminds us of the facts of this human tragedy: That the Arabs are refugees because their own leaders insisted that they leave their homes. The passage of years should not obscure this and it should not be ignored in attempting to reach an early solution to the problem.

The article follows:

THE ARAB REFUGEE PROBLEM: HOW IT ALL BEGAN

(By Edward E. Grusd)

The origin of the Arab refugee problem, which plays so large a part in the tension between Israel and the Arab States, has become obscured in recent years by both the passage of time and the intensification of the cold war in so many other parts of the world. But the problem itself remains; its solution has been blocked by the Arab States, which continue to use it to keep the pot boiling against Israel, while their victims languish in refugee camps. However, there is a growing disposition on the part of influential figures and governments to reach a just solution, and the subject is once more being debated on the floor of the United Nations.

It is now 15 years since the first of the refugees fled from Israel, and their original number—about a half million—has grown considerably in two ways: through births,

and the failure of the Arab host countries to report large numbers of deaths. Dr. John H. Davis, Commissioner-General of the U.N. Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees, in a recent report to the U.N. General Assembly, admitted there were at least 100,000 dead on the UNRWA relief rolls. Their ration cards are not turned in, as they should be, but are used unlawfully to enrich those Arab functionaries who control them. In addition, many Arabs from neighboring countries have infiltrated the camps, preferring public support there to unemployment at home.

During the past 15 years, Israel and its Arab neighbors have traded arguments and demands on the refugee issue. But the public memory is short, and the origins of the problem have become either forgotten or distorted. We feel it will be useful to refresh that memory with a summary of facts.

On November 29, 1947, the United Nations voted overwhelmingly to partition Palestine into two states—one Arab, one Jewish. But the Arab States rejected the vote and declared they would resist it with force. The Jews of Palestine, although disappointed at the area allotted to them, accepted the U.N. decision, and began to prepare for statehood.

Many people today, their memories dulled by time, may think that nothing further happened until May 14, 1948, when Israel officially proclaimed its independence, and that immediately thereafter the armies of five Arab States attacked Israel and the Palestine Arabs began to flee. It did not happen that way.

Egypt, Jordan, and other Arab States made armed incursions into Palestine and used internal subversion there long before May 14. At the same time, the Arab Higher Committee applied utmost pressure upon the Palestine Arabs to leave the country temporarily until Arab armies could conquer it. This pressure was not only in the form of persuasion and promises of loot, but also in the form of threats and violent terrorism: Arabs who remained in the Jewish State were called traitors to the Arab cause, and were warned they would be treated accordingly by the Arab Higher Committee, which was headed by the former Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, who had helped the Nazis during World War II.

On the other hand, immediately after the U.N. partition decision, the leaders of Israel-to-be strongly urged Palestine Arabs to remain as peaceful citizens, promising them protection and security in a Jewish state. This was done by Haganah in all Arab villages and by Histadrut in the cities where Arab workers lived.

But the first thing that happened after November 29, 1947, was the mass departure of some 30,000 wealthy Arabs, organized by the Arab higher committee. They can hardly be called refugees; they responded to organized pressure, took their property, and moved to neighboring Arab countries. Tens of thousands of propertyless Arabs then began to leave as the Arab higher committee flooded their press and radio with warnings that there was going to be a war, and that all Arabs who remained in Palestine would be considered traitors. Thus, even before Israel officially proclaimed its statehood, vast numbers of Arabs—estimated at close to 200,000—fled the country.

After Independence Day, May 14, 1948, this movement increased, because the armies of five Arab States actually crossed the borders into the new state and the war was on officially. Arab military commanders and political leaders again sternly warned Palestine's Arabs to leave so as not to be destroyed by the invading armies. They assured the refugees they could soon return, since the Arab armies would sweep the Jews into the Mediterranean and then the emigres could come back and divide all the Jewish property among themselves.

This is not "Israel propaganda." Al Hoda, a Lebanese newspaper in New York, 3 years later published an article quoting the secretary general of the Arab League as having assured Palestine's Arabs in 1948 that the Arab armies were "already on the frontiers and that all the millions the Jews had spent on land and economic development would be easy booty, for it would be a simple matter to throw the Jews into the Mediterranean." The newspaper added: "Brotherly advice was given to the Arabs of Palestine to leave their land, homes, and property and stay temporarily in neighboring, fraternal states, lest the guns of the invading Arab armies mow them down."

About the same time, the Beirut Moslem weekly, Kul-Shay, in an extraordinary confession, declared: "Who brought the Palestinians to Lebanon as refugees * * * in dire straits and penniless, after they lost their honor? The Arab States, and Lebanon amongst them, did it."

One of the refugees himself, Mahmoud Seif ed-Din Irani, writing in 1956, also confessed: "We left the country of our own free will, believing we were going on a short visit, a trip, and soon we would return as if nothing had happened." Nimer Al-Hawari, ex-commander of the Palestine Arab Youth Organization, wrote: "We shall smash the country with our guns. * * * The Arabs should conduct their wives and children to safety until the fighting has died down."

BRITISH CONFIRM THE FACTS

During the fighting, Haganah seized a number of British files. One of them, a British district police report in Haifa, dated April 26, 1948 (3 weeks before Israel independence) declared: "Every effort is being made by the Jews to persuade the Arab populace to stay and carry on with their normal lives, and to be assured that their lives and interests will be safe."

There are many documented expressions like these. Yet to this day the Arab contention is that it was the Jews who terrorized the Palestine Arabs and forced them to flee and who are therefore responsible for the tragedy. But in spite of all the Arab pressures, about 160,000 Palestine Arabs remained in the new Jewish state, and their number has now grown to 220,000 through natural increase and the reunion of separated families, which Israel has permitted. There are several Arab representatives in Israel's Parliament.

Altogether, 587,000 Arabs fled from Palestine, and became refugees, mostly in Lebanon, the Gaza strip and in the part of Jordan west of the Jordan River. During the same period, almost as many Jewish refugees (476,000) from Arab countries came into Israel, which welcomed them and integrated them, at a stunning economic cost, since practically all the newcomers had to leave their property behind. In effect, therefore, there was a kind of exchange of Jewish and Arab populations.

It is not the purpose of this brief survey to examine the fate and future of the Arab refugees, or to decribe their misery and despair (as well as their often gratifying U.N.-aided progress) or to go into the arguments and counter-arguments between Israel and the Arab nations on the subject. Its purpose is solely to set forth, as factually as documentary evidence permits, the origin of the problem.

However, the U.N. has wrestled with that problem for 15 years and has still not found a solution. The Arab States have done little to help their refugee brethren, who have been supported in the camps by a U.N. fund, with a large portion of the millions of dollars contributed by the United States. The Arab leaders demand that Israel take back all the refugees and restore their property to them. Israel answers that it is ready to discuss the refugee problem as part of a general peace settlement (it must be remembered that the Arab States still proclaim themselves formally at war with Israel).

Israel has already paid out a huge sum to individual refugees in compensation for deserted property, and has permitted many of them to return in the case of split families. But Israel has said it cannot permit hundreds of thousands of Arabs to pour into the country—especially after they have absorbed 15 years of the bitterest kind of anti-Israel indoctrination. Israel has also pointed out that it consists of 8,000 densely populated square miles as against nearly 3 million sparsely populated and underdeveloped square miles of Arab lands; that the refugees would be belwildered strangers in the new Israel of today whereas they share the language, religion, and customs of the Arab States; that the U.N. and many individual countries stand ready to appropriate large sums for big-scale rehabilitation and development projects in Arab nations which would not only make the refugees self-supporting but also enrich the host countries.

To all of which the present Arab rulers adamantly repeat the Israel drove the refugees out, and must take them all back.

And so the problem remains on the world's agenda.

## Effects of Imports of Zipper Tape on American Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a letter sent to me by Mr. J. K. Benfield, of the Sullivan-Southern, Inc., Narrow Fabrics Manufacturing Co., York, S.C., which will supplement my remarks of January 10. This is just another example of what is happening to the textile industry in this country:

SULLIVAN-SOUTHERN, INC.,
*York, S.C., January 9, 1963.*

Hon. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR BOB: You are familiar with the difficulties we have had and are having regarding the importation of zipper tape from Japan by U.S. companies. We in the zipper tape manufacturing of narrow fabrics became aware in 1960 that the Japanese were increasing shipments of this item into this country by a great percentage each year, starting in 1959.

In 1958, imports of Japanese zipper tape in this country were 171,000 pounds. In 1959, imports were 274,000 pounds, and in 1960, imports were 319,000 pounds. Since 319,000 pounds is approximately 10 percent of the total zipper tape sales in this country, we became alarmed, and in December 1960, we obtained samples of the Japanese tape to check for quality, thinking that it might be substandard. It was not.

During the early and middle part of 1961, we tracked down information regarding increased imports, which we felt must surely be increasing, since we were advised by some of our customers that our prices were out of line. Further customer resistance to our prices has increased to this present day. For instance, a standard construction in zipper tape is 42 ends 30/2 K.P. and 40 picks 20/2

K.P. Our cost to make this in natural is $8.18 per thousand yards. The Japanese price, delivered in New York, all customs and other costs paid, is $6.76 per thousand, or a difference of $1.42 per thousand. I have had people in Washington tell me that we would have to get more modern machinery, or adopt more economical methods of manufacturing. Let me say that we have the most modern machinery in the world, and our operation is very efficient. The difference in price lies in cotton at 8½ cents per pound cheaper than we can buy it, and in labor that is 25 cents per hour against our $1.50 per hour.

Since we did feel the increase in Japanese zipper tape imports, and since there was no way to compete pricewise with their cheap cotton and labor costs, we in this industry thought it would be the first line of approach to go to the U.S. Tariff Commission and ask them to raise the duty on zipper tapes to a point where our selling prices with the Japanese tape would be somewhat equal. After all, zipper tape is a component part of a zipper—the zipper cannot be made without the tape. It was at this time that we received a rude awakening about the intricacies of government.

We made an appointment with Mr. Donn H. Bent, Secretary, U.S. Tariff Commission for February 27, 1962. By this time, we knew that the Japanese were flooding the U.S. market with zipper tape. We later learned that in November and December 1961, alone, the Japanese shipped 282,564 pounds to this country. That was more than the entire year 1960.

We arrived for this appointment with Mr. Bent and found that he was away. However, he had made proper arrangements for us to have a conference with Mr. Roland L. Lee and other gentlemen of the Commission. These gentlemen were very nice but told us that they could do nothing. Although zipper tape is a component part of a zipper, it is also listed as "chief value cotton with fast edges not over 12 inches wide." This had a rate of duty of 17½ percent, whereas a component part would be 40 percent to 50 percent as interpreted. It seems that Tariff Commission chooses to call zipper tape the item calling for 17½ duty. This was amazing to me as a country boy being more familiar with an actuality rather than an interpretation of a section of the tariff regulation. At that time, our first thought was to ask Congress to correct this mistake, but felt that this would be a minor business to Congress, however major it was and is to us.

At the suggestion of Mr. Lee, we asked for and got an appointment at the Commerce Department with Mr. Jackson Spears, who had with him Mr. Thomas McMullen, of Commerce. Remember at this time, we were being flooded with Japanese tape and we could find no way to turn.

Arthur Hutchinson of J. Sullivan & Sons Manufacturing Corp., Philadelphia, Pa., and I talked with Mr. Spears on 27 February, 1962, and after what I consider a waste of time in a further discussion, Mr. Spears advised he would "look into the matter." I felt at that time exactly like an innocent man who was sentenced to die for murder, was sitting in the electric chair with the current ready to be applied, yelling for all he was worth that he didn't do it and nobody would believe him. Nobody believed us at this time and the hour of reckoning had passed, although we were not sure of it at that time.

We waited for Mr. Spears to look into the situation, but had no reply. On March, 1962, you replied that you contacted Mr. Spears, who told you that he would get the information. On April 5, 1962, having heard nothing, I again wrote to you asking what were the results from Mr. Spears. He still had given no information. On April 18, 1962, with the situation getting worse by the week, I again wrote to you asking what information Mr. Spears had given. Still no information from Mr. Spears.

It was then that we asked you to set up another appointment at Commerce Department and from your arrangements and those of Honorable Hugh Alexander, Arthur Hutchinson, Garner Bagnal from Statesville Narrow Fabrics, Statesville, N.C., a competitor, you two Congressmen and writer went to see Mr. Jefferson Davis of Commerce Department. This was on May 22, 1962. Mr. McMullen, previously mentioned, was also at this meeting.

This was another meeting that looked to me as if we had to start the entire procedure over, for we seemed to be getting nowhere. Mr. Davis and Mr. McMullen were very kind and courteous but did not seem to have proper power for what we needed—a restraint on Japanese tape under the then existing bilateral agreement with Japan. We couldn't find the proper party or parties to put into effect a restraint of a product that was ruining an industry.

It was then that you suggested going to Department of State and on May 22, we met with Mr. Michael Blumenthal and Mr. Stanley Nehmer of Department of State. It was then, as you recall, that Mr. Blumenthal advised that they would indeed consult with the Japanese Government regarding a restraint on zipper tape, and in a letter of June 2, 1962, Mr. Blumenthal advised you that consultation between the two Governments on the zipper tape question had begun on May 31, 1962. At this consultation, the Japanese Government was requested to hold exports during consultation at the level of, or 110 percent of, the exports of zipper tape during the period May 1961 to April 1962.

The results of this consultation would be a setting of a level for exports from Japan for 1962. To this date, I do not know what has been agreed, however, we are now under the long-term cotton textile agreement. The Japanese shipped to us 822,727 pounds of tape during the period mentioned above, i.e., May 1961 to April 1962. This meant that 110 percent of this would be 905,000 pounds that could be shipped to this country by the Japanese in 1962 calendar year. I wrote to you on July 31, 1962, that this amount was ridiculous and would hurt us badly in the industry in this country. It has. We have been on slow time for some 4 months and other manufacturers have been on slow time and/or sold part of their production to other types of tape users. I also advised you then that the quota was approximately 30 percent of all the sales zipper tape used in this country and asked if there were not some way to reduce the amount coming in to 10 percent of usage, or 300,000 pounds per year, which would be fair to the Japanese and we could live with, even with the difficulty with their cheap prices. I don't know what can be done about this, but there is somebody somewhere who can make this right. I obviously haven't been in contact with that person. I still believe that a country as great and as good as ours is, will not let an industry die needlessly. Some way, and it must be soon, we must correct this situation.

You see, all the time we told these people what was happening, nothing happened until too late, as far as zipper tape is concerned.

Now something else has happened and this must be corrected at once. When the Japanese were restrained at the too-high export quota, they were not satisfied and more and more tape is now coming into this country from Japan as zipper chain. To make zipper chain, one takes tape, sews a cord on either side of one edge, then by a special machine, metal elements are attached to the cord and tape, and this is called a zipper stringer. Two stringers joined together make zipper chain. A zipper, as we know it, can be made by taking this chain, cutting it to length desired and attaching to this length a bottom stop, slider, and top stop. You see, then, this chain coming in is a way to bypass the tape quota, for chain is not restrained as of this date and the duty is only 19 percent, whereas a component part of a zipper is 50-percent of duty.

Chain is the most valuable component part of a zipper, but by someone's interpretation, zipper chain is classed as a metal product, but with chief value not being metal. The Japanese have been smart on this, for if chief value were metal, it would be 50-percent duty. This takes us back to the point where Tariff Commission does not classify zipper tape as a component part of a zipper; however, it is and a zipper cannot be made without it.

With our industry seriously damaged by the high tape quota, which is approximately 30 percent of U.S. sales zipper tape, the Japanese are now sending in zipper chain. We first noted this as a sample lot of 280,000 yards of chain in May 1962; 280,000 yards of chain contains 560,000 yards of zipper tape or approximately 3,500 pounds of tape. This sample must have proven satisfactory, for in August 1962 it started on the same course that tape had followed 4 years earlier, only with the chain they will build it up faster so that if and when a quota is put on, the quota will be very high, as in tape. Let me reemphasize that the chain coming in that contains tape is just adding insult to injury up and above the extremely high tape quota.

From August 1962 to December 31, 1962, we have records of one company in the United States receiving 102,900 pounds of chain, as against nothing in prior years and only a small amount in May 1962.

This 102,900 pounds of chain, most of it in late 1962, is 3,430,000 yards and it contains 6,860,000 yards of tape. This tape would weigh 42,867 pounds, plus 13,720 pounds of cotton cord. This, you see, is in addition to the quota on tape and if chain would continue to come in at this rate that it is now coming, it would include 195,000 pounds of tape, plus 62,400 pounds of cotton cord. This item does not even have a quota and in addition to pushing our zipper tape industry further in the grave, it also hurts the man in this country who makes metal for teeth on the zipper, the man who makes the yarn for the cord, the man who makes the cord, the man who puts the metal teeth on the cord and tape, the dye house that would dye the tape, and other auxiliary industries.

This is bad enough. But again, let me remind you that we are on the same path as on zipper tape. I have learned from reliable sources that just one U.S. customer expects to import this chain at the rate of 2 million yards per month beginning July 1963 and 4 million yards per month beginning January 1964; 2 million yards of chain per month is 4 million yards or 25,000 pounds per month of tape as well as 8,000 pounds of cord. This is at the rate of 300,000 pounds of tape per year. This again would be in addition to the zipper tape quota. If the imports rise to 4 million yards of chain per month as expected, this would be 8 million yards or 50,000 pounds of tape per month plus 16,000 pounds of cord per month. In tape per year on the chain, this woud be 60,000 pounds. Add any of these figures of tape on chain to the tape quota and you can readily see that within 12 months the Japanese will have 50 percent of the U.S. sales tape. Of course, we in the zipper tape industry will be bankrupt or have to go out of business before then, as well as cord manufacturers and zipper tape dyers.

The zipper tape division of the narrow fabric industry is not expendable. Now we

are making the tapes for zippers for all military and Government uniforms, as well as all the special tapes for special zippers for the space agencies. In times of national emergency, we make all types of necessary webbings and tapes for our Government, as we did in World Wars I and II, and in the Korean war. In World War II, our company was 100 percent on webbings and tapes for our Government. Should this import situation with the Japanese continue, you know that we will not be available if needed again because the industry will not exist.

Please understand that this matter is of utmost urgency and time is very, very limited. If we have to go through the same procedure on chain as we did on tape, we will be out of business before the end of this year.

I recommend as an immediate measure to restrain the Japanese at once on zipper chain exports under the long-term cotton agreement since zipper chain is in chief weight cotton and this can be done at once under the long-term agreement. This must be immediate and no evasion of the question as last time. By immediate, I mean within 10 days at the latest.

After that, we must do two things:

1. Classify zipper chain as a component part of a zipper at 50-perecnt duty, where it should be in the first place.

2. Reduce the Japanese quota on zipper tape from the present approximately 900,000 pounds per year to a reasonable 300,000 pounds per year (10 percent of U.S. sales zipper tape), and if this is not possible due to law or agreement, then we must have zipper tape properly classified as a component part of a zipper at a higher tariff to protect our zipper tape industry in the United States.

I hope that I have made it clear what has gone on, what is going on, and what must happen if we wish to save this U.S. industry. I shall expect you to make appointments for representatives of our industry to meet with the proper parties in Washington in the immediate future. I shall anxiously await your advice.

Kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

JOHN K. BENFIELD, Jr.

## Resolution, Charles Trumbull Hayden Chapter, DAR

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Charles Trumbull Hayden chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, of Tempe, Ariz. The resolution follows:

Whereas the U.S. State Department has been and is continuing to support in every manner, including financially the unmerciful, unwarranted action of the United Nations against the anti-Communist, freedom-loving government of Moise Tshombe, of Katanga.

Therefore, by resolution, passed unanimously, on January 7, 1963, the members of the Charles Trumbull Hayden chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, of Tempe, Ariz., request that a complete investigation of this action be demanded by the U.S. Congress, and those persons in our Government responsible for this action, regardless of their status or high position, be removed from their positions of influence. This wanton action is in complete violation of that which all true Americans hold inviolate, Freedom for all, and in addition is illegal under the terms of the United Nations Charter; be it further

*Resolved*, That because of this illegal action of the United Nations, the United States is justified in withdrawing its membership and support from the United Nations, which since its inception has become a tool of the Communists and not the best hope of peace for the world as it was originally represented to be.

(Mrs. E. J.) FLORENCE ROTH,
*Regent, Charles Trumbull Hayden Chapter, DAR.*

## Cuban Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following speech delivered by Mrs. Harold B. Chait, president of the Baltimore Woman's Committee for Cuban Freedom, on October 18, 1962:

SPEECH BY MRS. HAROLD B. CHAIT, PRESIDENT OF BALTIMORE WOMAN'S COMMITTEE FOR CUBAN FREEDOM, MONTHLY LUNCHEON MEETING OF THE TOWSON INNER WHEEL, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1962

Thomas Jefferson once said that an informed, alert American people were vital if our liberties and our Nation itself were to survive. That is why it is so desperately important that women like you, community leaders, thoughtful citizens, keep constantly aware of developments affecting our security. Our very survival hinges upon it. To paraphrase Clemenceau, America is much too important to be trusted blindly to bureaucrats.

Cuba is the most dramatic example of that danger—and I mean the Cuba of 4 years ago as well as the Cuba of today. Cuba is now a Soviet stronghold because in 1957 and 1958 there was a systematic campaign by powerful groups in and out of our Government to whitewash Fidel Castro from flaming Red to pale pink.

Ladies, I have seen documentation prepared as far back as 1948 citing Castro's Communist affiliations and citing specific acts he had performed in the services of communism. Long before Castro launched his revolution from Mexico, Robert C. Hill, our Ambassador to that country warned, bluntly, that Castro had surrounded himself with Communists and that Communist aid and direction was paramount in his movement.

Despite massive evidence compiled to prove unmistakably that Castro's revolution was a monstrous Red hoax, a combination of official policy and unofficial propaganda permitted the Marxist-Leninists to conquer Cuba. Few people realize the extent to which Florida was privileged sanctuary for Castro's forces during his revolution. I have heard former Castro gunrunners laughingly describe how they were sometimes given official escorts when they wheeled Castro's munitions through the streets of Miami. The FBI was forbidden to intervene against the swarms of illegal Castro agents openly operating throughout the United States.

Today, I might add, some of those same erstwhile agents complain that it is more difficult to slip arms out of the United States—arms destined for Cuban freedom fighters—than it is to slip them in Red Cuba itself.

The question of how Castro came to power might seem ancient history—but for one strange fact. History seems to have an odd way of repeating itself regarding Cuba these past few years. We make the same mistakes again and again. The same people are trying to impose the mantle of silence and acquiescence which imposed communsim on Cuba in the first place.

Did you realize, for instance, that the massive Soviet buildup in Cuba—now getting so much publicity—actually began many months ago? And for many months it was systematically swathed in silence by the people charged with guiding our struggle for survival. Do you realize that the arrival of those shiploads of munitions and troops was common knowledge in Cuban exile circles in Miami long before they were known to the American people? Do you realize that exile spokesmen who attempted to alert the American people were threatened by U.S. agents? They were told to keep silence or else. And do you realize that it was those same exile spokesmen who, refusing to bow to threats, finally succeeded in piercing that curtain of silence and alerting the American people to what was going on 90 miles from their country? It would appear that we are dependent on those Cuban exiles for knowledge of what is happening along our southern flank. It is significant that as late as August 30 the State Department was still dogedly insisting that it had no knowledge of Russian troops in Cuba—and that the new arrivals were merely agricultural and industrial technicians.

From these repeatedly compounded errors have sprung new fallacies. The most misleading is that Cuba confronts us with only two alternatives: Do nothing or face nuclear war. Cuban freedom fighters are said to be too disunited to accomplish anything. To fill the gap between the two main poles a third view is now being leaked in Washington: That is that our intelligence services have the capacity to vastly increase secret anti-Castro operations inside Cuba. Let us examine this situation more closely.

The great weakness of both the U.S. services and the Cuban liberation movement is the Bay of Pigs debacle in April 1961. Not only was it a crushing defeat for the cause of Cuban freedom—it was also the beginning of a disastrous new policy orientation toward Cuba. Responsible officials panicked and began to act along lines unrelated to reality. The end result was that Washington in practice reversed its sponsorship of Cuban liberation and systematically torpedoed exile-underground operations against Castro.

One of the more fascinating aspects of CIA operations in Cuba is its method of supplying arms and ammunition to Cuban liberation groups. Time and again, CIA cutters make their dash to Cuba and deliver such items as .45-caliber Thompson submachineguns and .30-caliber ammunition. On other occasions, CIA provides the patriots with .57-millimeter recoilless rifles and .75-millimeter rounds. One boat will run to Oriente Province with C–4 explosives; the needed detonators will be landed 700 miles to the west in Pinar del Rio Province.

This sort of thing, done consistently, used to baffle the anti-Castro freedom fighters to the point of hysteria. But eventually, CIA's reasoning became clear. The policy of deliberately separating weapons from ammunition and explosives from their fuses serves two purposes: (1) The munition will be stockpiled until a given signal, at which time

the underground will unite and wed bomb to fuse, rifle to bullet, and (2) until then, the munitions can't be used.

Trouble is, the shattered Cuban underground is in no shape to coordinate with anything or anybody. Where the clandestine fighters survive at all it is as a tiny, isolated fragment. It was, in fact, this insistence on coordination that really destroyed the Cuban underground. Maintaining secret liaison between a swarm of underground groups and between those groups and abroad is always a desperately risky business. In Cuba, it proved fatal.

From my own limited contact with the CIA, I would say that the Florida agents are perfectly well aware that the present system of arms delivery is nonsensical. However, it is also plain that this policy is primarily political. The agency is under orders to restrain Cuban freedom fighters at any cost—hence all the deactivated munitions. On the other hand, the CIA is charged with gathering intelligence, keeping underground groups alive—barely—and be in a position to renew major operations should the word ever be passed.

But by so doing, the CIA is bankrupting its potential for the future. Some Cuban commandos, who man the boats, wonder out loud if their bosses aren't slightly mad. Other crewmen are resigning, claiming that they are being asked to risk their lives in order to keep up a pretence that something is being done. They suspect, as one exile leader said, that all the CIA activity is designed to keep the exiles occupied and entertained.

"I made more than 20 trips," a former commando told me, "but it finally got to the point that we were delivering fuseless bombs to people we didn't know, who didn't know us, and didn't know what to do with what we gave them. I decided it was time to quit."

The fact is the 400,000 Cuban exiles and their underground supporters are quite capable of freeing their island on their own. They need only a minimum of moral and material encouragement from Washington—plus protection from interference by certain U.S. officials and agencies. If anything, the arrival of foreign Communist troops—hated by even pro-Castro Cubans—has served to actually increase chances of triggering a mass upheaval. Cuban freedom fighters are aware of this. They are determined that neither Washington nor Moscow shall have the last word in deciding Cuba's fate. They are shifting their bases from Florida to a number of points in the Caribbean. Certain Caribbean governments are now quietly extending aid and facilities to those freedom fighters—despite the opposition of the State Department. Attacks against Cuba and against ships supplying Red Cuba can be expected not only to continue but to actually expand in scope and intensity. Nor can the United States be held responsible for those acts. Who can declare war on underground freedom fighters and exiles scattered through 20 nations?

Now for the question of Cuban disunity, so often advanced as an argument for shrugging off the potential power of the Cuban liberation movement. Ladies, I can tell you that much of what has been said about Cuban disunity is mostly nonsense. Superficially, yes, there is disunity. There is squabbling between so-called exile leaders. But the vast majority of Cuban freedom fighters are fed up with the powerless exile politicians and their bickering. The issue of "batistiano" and "ex-fidelista" means far less to them than it apparently does to American reporters and officials. I have visited guerrilla training camps in Florida. I have seen young men who had lost relatives and friends to Castro firing squads. I have seen those young men training alongside other youths who had served on those same firing squads. Neither of the two now care about past issues or allegiances. They scorn those who talk of postwar plans and shadow cabinets. These men have one purpose, one burning desire: they want to fight. They want to free Cuba.

Ladies, I suggest to you that there is great power which could be unleashed against Soviet Cuba. I also suggest that unless that power is freed from its shackles that Communist power radiating from Cuba will eventually crumble the weak and trembling governments of other Caribbean states. The future of Central America now hangs in the balance. Haiti and the Dominican Republic are in mortal danger. Venezuela is convulsed by Castro Communist subversion. Even great Brazil is being shaken to its foundations by Cuba-based subversion.

The facts bear out the contention of many thoughtful Latins that the Alliance for Progress program is no answer to this massive subversive offensive. Do you realize, for instance, that more capital has already fled Venezuela for New York and Switzerland than all the Alliance for Progress aid that is to be allocated to that country for the next 10 years? In far less than 10 years, at the present rate of deterioration, there will be no Alliance and no free Venezuela.

But the implications of Cuban liberation extend far beyond this hemisphere. It has been said, for instance, that the day the West initiates successful political warfare operations in a Communist-captured land is the day the cold war will shift in our favor. To put it another way, if and when the West successfully implements a strategy of victory which does not require nuclear weapons, it is then that the global balance of power will tip to the West.

We now have that opportunity in Cuba. Remote from the Eurasian land mass, Cuba is the Achilles' heel of communism. Victory in Cuba might well trigger a chain reaction of liberation throughout the Communist world. The power potential to free Cuba by political warfare exists. It remains for us to resolve that freemen have the right to fight against alien imperialism and oppression. Their fight is ours. With all my heart, I urge you to support the Cuban freedom fighters in their great struggle. Thank you.

## More Than a Doorkeeper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, a new Member of this House is awed and humble and grateful for the friendly word of counsel and the helping hand. He learns early to appreciate the generous guidance of the Doorkeeper.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an informal sketch of this valued aid and Mississippi gentleman, William M. Miller, as seen by The Rambler of the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star in its issue of January 7, 1963, as follows:

THE RAMBLER FINDS FISHBAIT

(By John McKelway)

One of the great characters in the world today is a man named William M. Miller.

He is 53, a skilled politician, a round man who weighs about 200 pounds. He is the superintendent of a Sunday school at a Baptist church in Arlington, a successful trashman, a Democrat, the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, and a native of a place called Pascagoula, Miss.

He can move fast, in spurts, at speeds approaching 10 miles an hour. His legs appear to be rather rubbery but the upper part of his body remains steady in flight. He always knows exactly where he is going.

His hair is coal black and parted in the middle. His face is moon shaped and friendly.

One of his chores is to announce the arrival of distinguished visitors in the Chamber of the House such as the President of the United States or the President of Pakistan. He does this magnificently after a struggle to pull in his stomach and puff out his chest. In a ringing cry, from the Deep South, he says, "Mistah Speakaaah, the President of——"

Yet he has never been known by any name other than "Fishbait."

This started in 1933 when he arrived on the Hill with Representative COLMER, Democrat, of Mississippi. Mr. COLMER introduced Fishbait as "Fishbait" to the young man's boss in the House Post Office.

Before that, in Pascagoula, he had been called a variety of other names because at the age of 15 he weighed only 75 pounds, having been smitten in childhood by a collection of illnesses (which probably toughened him up for the rough-and-tumble of the House). In those days, he was called "Alligatorbait," "Shrimpbait," "Garbait," and "Crabbait."

Fishbait once received a letter from Pascagoula from a constituent of Mr. COLMER's. It was addressed only to "Fishbait, Washington, D.C." The letterwriter could not think of his Representative's name. He remembered Fishbait and so did the local post office.

As Doorkeeper, Fishbait commands around 300 employees on a payroll of $1.3 million. His domain includes all the other doormen, the pages while on the floor, the Document Room, the Folding Room, two cloakroom snackbars, three barbershops, and, in his words, "six ladies' retiring rooms."

It is also his responsibility to station a man outside the Prayer Room of the Capitol to prevent any interruption if it is occupied by a Member of Congress.

He also runs a trash collection service. Under his supervision, since 1956, 13 million pounds of wastepaper on the House side of the Capitol has been picked up and baled and sold. A total of $92,000 has been returned to the Treasury and President Kennedy recently told Fishbait it was the sort of thing he liked to see.

Ol' Fishbait, he sharp. His is an elected office. Within a week, a newly elected Congressman gets a letter from Fishbait. Fishbait announces he is ready to serve him in any way. He signs his letters, "Yours for Service."

Since the election, he has been memorizing the names of the 67 new Congressmen. He has a picture of each pasted in a notebook. Within 2 or 3 hours after the start of the first session on Wednesday, he says he will have every name and face cold.

He tells new Members where to sit, how to get the floor, how to get something printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He knows everything that's going on.

He was first elected Doorkeeper in the 81st Congress by the Democratic majority. He was minority Doorkeeper in the first 2 years of the Eisenhower administration, and then got his old job back which he's held ever since. He's up for reelection tomorrow, by the Democratic caucus. Fishbait is unopposed.

"A good Congressman," says Fishbait, "has got to work at his mail, be on time, do his committee work, get to the floor in time for the opening prayer.

"You find out about people in the House. And they don't fool the people back home."

Or Fishbait.

## Philosophy of Democrats Lights Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Detroit (Mich.) News of November 24, 1962, which speaks for itself.

The article by Mr. Ralph McGill is perhaps one of the clearest and most concise statements of why the people of this country return again and again to support the Democratic Party.

The article follows:

PHILOSOPHY OF DEMOCRATS LIGHTS WAY
(By Ralph McGill)

Driving up from Alabama, and cutting across to Warm Springs, Ga., one sees the relics of a South that was—the one which stirred Franklin D. Roosevelt to anger and to action in behalf of a depressed people, whose cotton economy was ended.

There are the lonely chimneys in the fields. Once a tenant or sharecropper house was there. There are still old shacks, cabins and barns, dilapidated, vine-grown, windowless, weather-stained, and broken.

The faded men and women in faded denim, the children who played in the swept yard or picked cotton and chopped weeds, are a part of a past unknown to today's generation.

There was no tenure. There was a surplus of croppers and tenants. They were, with few exceptions, ruthlessly exploited by landlords and stores.

In the Cotton South's depression years that began with the boll weevil in the 1920's, these persons were a cloud of witnesses testifying that for many thousands of Americans the misery, squalor, and hopelessness of the human condition was as bad in the rural slums as in the cities.

They witnessed, too, another fact. The country was so lost in fear and grief, so bedeviled was it with unemployment and the tears of the thousands whose farms and homes were sold because mortgages went unpaid, that there was no mechanism by which the Nation could help human beings in trouble. And to many it seemed no one cared.

They walked the roads—husband, wife, children. They piled their pitiful goods on a mule-drawn wagon—a stained and dirty mattress, sagging springs, a few old quilts, a pot-bellied stove, a straight chair or so and moved on, hungry, holloweyed and defeated. (John Steinbeck wrote about their midwestern counterparts in "The Grapes of Wrath.")

Today, as one drives the roads one sees the remaining evidences of a time that was—the shacks, barns, chimneys—and the new, prefab houses dotting the edges of fields where once cotton grew and the mules and croppers moved.

One notes, too, the electric wires that run to the farmhouses and the bright new prefabs of those who work in town, but have enough land for a pig, some chickens, a garden.

There is always the electric wiring, the TV aerials, the washing machines on the front porch, the pump in the well. (To the young generation "the ole days" are those that existed before TV.) To young executives in their late twenties and thirties, the depression years are something that dad or granddad talks about.

It was in the simple, plainly beautiful cottage at Warm Springs that Franklin D. Roosevelt signed the REA bill—the Rural Eelectrification Act. The signing took place in the cheerful little combination living room. The date was May 11, 1935.

Roosevelt had become interested in electric power when he paid the cottage bills. They were about four times the rates charged in New York. He saw that none of the farms on the roads he drove had electric power.

He thought of installing a small generator at a suitable place on a nearby stream. The site was under lease—but unused. A sort of rage grew in his mind. When it cooled he set into motion the forces which drew the REA Act and made it law.

In that year 1 farm in 10 in the United States had electric power. And in the South there were large areas where no farm at all had lights. The ratio was roughly one in a hundred.

There are men today who are Democrats because they remember the day "the lights were turned on."

There are older men and women who, when the city demagogs rant and rave about the Kennedys, the Trumans, the Roosevelts, quietly and patiently vote the Democratic ticket because they recall when the pump went in a well, when running water came to the kitchen, when a man could sit at night before his fire and read his Bible or his newspaper.

There are those today who say, glibly, that there really is very little difference between the two parties. Superficially this is true.

But there is a constant thread of philosophy that pushed through REA—and the forces of greed were not easily displaced.

It is the philosophy which brought about the Soil Conservation Act, the conservation legislation, the TVA, which established a power yardstick, made fertilizer available, and provided progress in a long valley dying of floods and erosion.

It is the philosophy which guaranteed savings accounts, made farm- and home-owning credit plentiful—the story runs on.

One thinks of this—remembering the depression years—riding through REA-F.D.R country.

## Bulwark of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial from the Ontario, Calif., Daily Report of January 3, 1963, commenting on a recent statement by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover in the FBI bulletin with regard to the role of law enforcement today and containing the always timely warning of the threat of communism to the security of the United States:

BULWARK OF FREEDOM

"Communism remains a constant threat to world peace and a threat to the priceless heritage of freedom."

These observations are made by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in the January issue of the FBI Bulletin. And observations by Director Hoover merit the close attention of every citizen of the United States.

Most of Mr. Hoover's statement in the Bulletin is in regard to the role of law enforcement in times of crises.

"The year 1963 dawns on a deeply troubled world," Mr. Hoover writes. Communism jeopardizes world peace and the posterity of mankind. Communists continue to push forward aggressively in many areas seeking new lands to rule and additional people to regiment.

Man—the fallible being that he is—now holds in his hands a destructive force of such great potential that its very existence poses the question of whether or not mankind is to have a future. It is no wonder that people everywhere fear the worst, knowing as they do that a militant force dedicated to world rule possesses such destructive power.

In this country, Americans are justifiably alarmed at the ever-present threat of communism to the priceless heritage of our great land. They view with grave concern the tactics of the Communist Party, U.S.A., to undermine our system of justice. They recognize the imminent danger of communism's encroachment, and they deplore the dogma of Communist dictators to rule all men and all nations.

In times of peril, the rallying strength of our country stems from its democratic safeguards. Our faith and trust are anchored in the God-inspired hallmarks of Americanism—truth, liberty, and justice. From these ideals springs the determination to protect and preserve our way of life from tyrants near and far. From these ideals comes the will of a united, free, and righteous people to stand firm against godless despotism.

Law and order are bulwarks of freedom. Law enforcement must relentlessly promote the perpetual existence of this honored axiom. In this new year, we must labor with unswerving devotion and we must be firm and resolute in the face of adversity. Let us keep fully appraised of our country's needs and fully informed as to our individual and collective responsibilities.

International tension should not for a moment divert our attention from vigorous and effective law enforcement. Not only must we shoulder additional burdens or hardships, but we must also be sure the operations of criminals and lawbreakers are detected and the perpetrators apprehended. There can be no breakdown in the respect for law.

In the past, law enforcement has repeatedly demonstrated its ability to serve our Nation above and beyond the call of duty. In the fight against crime and subversion, we cannot afford to do less.

Let all officers resolve to make this a distinctive year in the annals of law enforcement. Let no community of our land become a haven for enemies of society. Rather, let 1963 come to be known as the year in which this Nation made marked progress toward its goals of freedom, abundance, and equal justice for all.

## No-Show Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, in March of 1962 the Civil Aeronautics Board put into effect a program penalizing passengers who missed their plane connections. Under the no-show plan, passengers who failed to fulfill their reservations were fined from $5 to $40. As I have stated on several occasions,

this plan is loaded in favor of the airlines and is unfair to the traveling public.

I am happy to inform my colleagues that the no-show plan will expire on February 1 of this year. Although I commend the dropping of the passenger penalties by the airlines, it is indeed regrettable that the Civil Aeronautics Board did not end the fines at the end of the original 6-month experimental period. It is significant to note that most airlines found the passenger ill will with the plan worse than the no-show problem itself.

The sole benefit to come out of this notable experiment was the fact that much of the reservation problems of the airlines were found to stem from the internal practices of the airlines themselves. A recent Wall Street Journal account estimated that 90 percent of the no-show problem was caused by the airlines, not the passengers. I urge the Civil Aeronautics Board to continue to investigate this problem.

It is a warning signal that this plan which hurt the individual passenger was dropped only after pressures exerted on the Civil Aeronautics Board, which is charged with protecting the public interest, by the airlines who understandably are interested in the private interests of their owners and shareholders.

## The Futility of a Third Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a letter to the editor appearing in the Santa Ana (Calif.) Register, which was written by Mr. Robert A. Geier, my former administrative assistant.

At a time when there is a great deal of talk about forming a third party, I believe this letter analyzes the futility of such a move:

DEAR MR. EDITOR: Anyone who heard me speak during the recent campaign knows that I believe in the conservative principles espoused by the proposed conservative party in California. Those who call these principles extreme are either seeking votes or other evidence of public approbation, or are ignorant of what made the United States the greatest nation on earth. And yet there are some who believe in America who are extreme, not in what they espouse but in the manner in which they defend it.

One may present facts and do it accurately, but if the conclusions reached on the basis of those facts are not logical, then the charge of extremism might be well justified and this then becomes harmful to the cause for which we fight.

It is true that both parties have promoted the welfare state, and without thinking in practical terms one might feel that the only solution is to form a third party. The argument is made that both the Republican and Democrat Parties were once third parties. However, the first and second parties at that time were not as well organized and as strong as they are today, and communications were extremely slow.

There is a difference between the parties' members. Republican Members of Congress, when they controlled the Congress in 1948, produced the largest budgetary surplus in U.S. history, $8.4 billion. Democrats, when they controlled Congress, ran up 93.4 percent of the national debt. Democrat Congresses approved deficit spending budgets or deficiency appropriations which resulted in deficits during 20 of the last 27 years.

There were of course some Republicans who voted for some of these spending sprees, just as there were some Democrats who voted against them, but the majority of Democrats by far voted for them and the great majority of Republicans voted against them.

The ratings given by the Americans for Constitutional Action prove without any doubt that Republicans in Congress are much more conservative than the Democrats.

To me this proves that there is a chance of conservatives taking over the Republican Party but only if we use our heads and quit fighting among ourselves.

The best way to win is to form a conservative group as is being done, but stay registered in the Republican Party and get the conservative Democrats to register in the Republican Party. And before anyone gets his mind closed, let me explain.

In the primary in 1962, liberal Republicans were nominated for some offices and then in the general election there was no choice for the voters. These liberal Republicans were nominated because too many conservative Democrats could not vote for a conservative in the primary and neither could conservative independents. In the congressional race, conservative Democrats had the chance to vote for Sam Campbell but the independent's didn't. And too few conservatives like Sam run for office on the Democrat ticket.

Now if all the conservatives join the third party and register therein, they will not be able to vote for either a conservative Democrat or a conservative Republican, and this will assure that a liberal will be nominated on both tickets.

Sure, I know that the conservatives can then nominate one of their own—but they can't elect him. So what's going to happen to Jimmy Utt, H. Allen Smith, Glen Lipscomb, and, if they run, Johnny Rousselot and Eck Hiestand? They will be defeated in the primary by liberals.

One might say that these conservative office holders should join the conservative party so that they can get the conservative votes in the primary. Now that would be rather foolish, wouldn't it? It would be a noble gesture but ineffective as far as having conservatives in office because in the general the liberals on the Democrat ticket would be opposed by a Republican and a conservative which would split the vote and enable the liberal Democrat to be elected.

On the other hand, the formation of a conservative group, all registered in the Republican Party, will give that group a tremendous amount of power—a real balance of power—to assure that conservatives are candidates and get nominated. Then they can all really get together and work to make them win in the general election.

It is only the primary that makes any difference as to registration. In the general any registered voter can vote for any candidate, but if the conservative isn't nominated, he surely can't win the general.

## Freeman Forges Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the international thunderheads seem to be hiding the glow of the New Frontier dawn over agricultural trade with the Common Market.

A year ago today, the New Frontier cowboys were riding around the Nation telling the American people that if an unwilling Congress were only forced to turn the tariffmaking power over to the President, he would increase our exports many times over.

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman was telling the farmers that the Trade Expansion Act was necessary if the American farmer expected to increase his sales to the Common Market countries.

The New Frontiersmen, who have been able to sell their program of centralization of all legislative, executive, and judicial power in the hands of the President, sold this nefarious plan to the Nation and to the Congress. Now, less than 6 months later, we find them talking out of the other side of their mouths.

In his testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee last year, the Secretary of Agriculture, on page 840 of the committee report, testified:

The potential for expanding foreign trade is of vital importance in the years ahead. It is especially apparent in Western Europe, particularly in the six countries of the Common Market. We have had a taste of what prosperity can do to our export sales in that area, and would like more of it. During the past 5 years, our sales of farm products to EEC countries have expanded 29 percent. In fiscal year, 1961, our agricultural exports to EEC came to $1.1 billion, which was about one-third of our total dollar exports.

Again, on page 842, the Secretary is reported as having testified, "From most of these commodities, which account for about 70 percent of our agricultural export trade to the community, we can expect our exports to expand in the years ahead."

On page 843, the Secretary, still attempting to sell the so-called Trade Expansion Act to the Congress, testified as follows:

The legislation before this committee would give us a splendid opportunity to do some swapping of concessions. But we must try to make certain that any swap with them includes assurance that reasonable terms of access will be provided for our agricultural products.

Later, he said:

Our ability to support these forces and to help direct the path of the Common Market trade policies in the liberal direction will depend to a large extent on the new authority of the proposed Trade Expansion Act.

Later, he said:

Furthermore, we have ample evidence that a liberal trade policy helps American farmers

to capitalize on their export market potential.

That, Mr. Speaker, was before the passage of the Trade Expansion Act, when they were putting the heat on Congress to pass the bill. Now, less than 6 months later, when they have their so-called liberal trade policy to help the American farmer to capitalize on his export market potential, what is this great exponent of freewheeling and free trade saying? I would like to quote to you from a speech he made at the annual meeting of Farm Cooperatives in Miami Beach, on January 8, 1963.

In that speech, he said:

The vital nature of our export trade in farm products causes us to be deeply concerned that protectionist tendencies are appearing today in the common agricultural policy of the European Common Market.

He said further:

Protective devices, adopted or proposed by the Common Market center, around the use of a varying levy fee are a serious threat to as much as $600 million in our annual agricultural exports to present and prospective members of the Common Market.

It must be just a little embarrassing to the great and wise planners of all political and economic programs, both nationally and internationally, to find that in less than 6 months, the bubble they painted as a gold nugget has blown up in their face. Instead of doubling our agricultural exports, as Mr. Freeman predicted 9 months ago, these exports for cash to the Common Market countries are actually being slashed in half, while the farmers of America are paying the price for another New Frontier experiment.

The thing the planners downtown cannot understand is that whenever a country wants to protect their industries or farmers they will do so without asking us. After it is too late our planners will probably discover that the people of these countries are not a bunch of Boy Scouts.

## Order Out of Chaos in the Congo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. MORRIS K. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, at a time when Americans are seeking an understanding of events taking place in the Congo, the editor and publisher of the Arizona Daily Star has written a profound editorial, based on his personal observations in the Congo, worthy of the attention of all of us. The editorial follows:

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., Jan. 6, 1963]

AMERICA, THE CONGO, AND KATANGA

(By William R. Mathews)

Recently the Arizona Republic of Phoenix published an editorial headed, "America's Day of Infamy," in which it took to task our Washington administration for its official conduct in the Congo and Katanga.

It makes almost hysterical charges when it writes, "For the first time in our history the United States has deliberately set out to destroy the liberty and independence of another people.

"Without U.S. support and direction, this brutal destruction of the rights of the people of Katanga could never have occurred. We have abandoned our traditions and our principles. We have copied the Soviet Union's bloody action in Hungary by mounting and directing the same sort of a mercenary attack against the freely chosen Government of Katanga. This is the final abandonment of the ideals of our country to the expediency of the conscienceless United Nations."

These heated charges bring back memories of my brief stay in the Congo, including at Leopoldville and Elisabethville, in 1961. When our group of editors was there, the astoundingly beautiful and modern city of Leopoldville was policed by United Nations troops. At that time the Katanga issue was getting hotter, but the biggest danger came from Stanleyville, where a Communist sympathizer by the name of Gizenga held forth. It was impossible to go outside of Leopoldville save by plane. The American Embassy was trying its best to bring the warring factions together. We talked for an hour with President Kasavubu, and took a military briefing from General Motuba.

When we flew south we stopped at Elisabethville, where Tshombe maintained order. While we were there we saw Pan-American planes come in with troops from India to add to the U.N. forces.

It was quite evident that the former Belgian Congo was in chaos, and that the only force capable of maintaining order outside of Katanga was the United Nations force. It was also quite evident much of the prosperity of this former Belgian colony has its roots in the mineral wealth of Katanga. Unless the Congo included Katanga, with its superior leadership of whites and blacks, as well as its mineral revenue, the Congo would collapse into a state of anarchy, which would require the authority and funds of a great power to restore law and order.

The success of Katanga in maintaining law and order has been made possible not merely by its wealth, but by the good relations that always have existed there between the whites and the blacks. Tshombe could not be a success without the excellent advice he has received from the whites, who, in turn, have kept the mines operating.

Leopoldville, on the other hand, had endured a reign of terror deliberately precipitated by a tiny group of Belgian Communists, three of whom belonged to the Belgian Parliament. Most of the whites had fled from it and from other cities in the interior. It was quite evident that the blacks lacked the ability, prestige, and knowledge to run their government alone. The American Embassy was trying to fill the gap, while United Nations troops maintained order.

All of this American effort was indispensable, if the Congo was to be kept from going Communist. If it were not for the presence of American authority, supported by United Nations troops, some other great power would have had to step in the breach. The Soviet Union was ready and anxious to do the job. We broke the power of their stooge, Gizenga of Stanleyville. We furnished the money to pay the expenses of the United Nations troops, which have acted as an instrument of American power.

Evidently progress has been made. We Americans have been paying the bill. We have found out that we will have to continue to pay the bill, unless Katanga remains under the authority of the Leopoldville government, as it was before when Belgian authority was in power.

Katanga has no more right to secede from the Congo than Mississippi has from the United States of America; no more right than the South had the right to secede from the Union in 1861. The Leopoldville government has the right, indeed the duty, to see that Katanga does not secede. That cannot help involving the United States and the United Nations.

Unless a viable self-supporting nation is developed out of this Congo mess, the United States is the party that will have to pay the bill for its deficits and its chaos. If United Nations troops are not used, then American troops must be used. The minute we flunk out, the Communists will take over, because they will be the only authority to whom the black people of the Congo can look for help.

This is a matter of American self-interest. Things will not be changed by pulling out the crying towel and shedding tears over our mistaken policy of wrecking the empires of our allies. A situation, not a theory, confronts us. We have to make the best out of what has been a tragic mistake.

As to the shocking charges the Republic makes, the only thing true in them is that, after exhausting all peaceful means, we have, and should have, taken what measures are necessary to bring Katanga under the authority of the Léopoldville government. We have not abandoned the ideals of our country; we have not sought this brutal destruction of the rights of the people of Katanga. I repeat, if we had not used U.N. troops, we would have had to use American troops. The fact that President Kennedy has sent an American military mission there within the past 10 days gives some indication of that.

The casualties have been trival. No American principles have been violated. We might remember that when we took over the Philippines, we had to wage a long guerrilla war, before we could restore law and order, and finally make possible an independent government of the Phillipines. That is all we are trying to do in the former Belgian Congo. If we do not do it, someone else will; and that power will do as we are trying to do—keep rich Katanga within whatever government is established in Léopoldville.

## U.S.S. "Maryland": Diplomatic Cruises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 29, 1962, I quoted a most interesting article by Harry W. Frantz of the United Press International, which described the 1922 centennial mission to Brazil headed by Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes. The naval unit accompanying Secretary Hughes during his historic visit at Rio de Janeiro consisted of the U.S.S. *Maryland*, flagship, and the U.S.S. *Nevada*.

In a sequel to the story mentioned above, Mr. Frantz at Christmas 1962 tells of some of the subsequent cruises of the *Maryland*.

The news story follows:

U.S.S. "MARYLAND": DIPLOMATIC CRUISES

(By Harry W. Frantz)

In the 1920's, the battleship *Maryland*, flagship of the U.S. Fleet, made goodwill cruises

to South America which gave it a memorable importance in the evolution of inter-American relations.

The *Maryland* did the honors for the United States at the international naval review in Rio de Janeiro harbor in September 1922, on the occasion of the Brazilian centennial celebration.

A week later it carried Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes from Rio to New York, simultaneously making record speed tests of new electric turbine engines. A United States-Brazil naval agreement soon followed.

In December 1928 the *Maryland* took President-elect Herbert Hoover from San Pedro, Calif., to Valparaiso, Chile, on the Pacific leg of Hoover's goodwill tour of Central and South America.

During that voyage Lt. Comdr. Harry W. Hill, a gunnery officer, served as liaison to the 20 newsmen and 7 cameramen aboard. He edited a book logging the cruise to which each of the press party contributed chapters or photos.

This Christmas Adm. Harry W. Hill, now retired, has sent to his shipmates of 1928 an illustrated booklet about the battleship *Maryland* which revives memories of those long past events.

Although the booklet does not say so, Hill after the 1928 cruise gradually became one of the Navy's greatest experts in the evolution of amphibian warfare, and he was in the top echelon of naval commanders in decisive engagements at Tarawa, Iwo Jima, and other Pacific islands which wrested control of the Western Pacific from Japan.

He also served for a time as Superintendent of the U.S. Naval Academy, and was host to many Latin American naval visitors.

Hill recounts that an armored cruiser named for the State of Maryland was commissioned in 1905, renamed the *Frederick* (a Maryland city) in 1916, and served with the cruiser and transport service during World War I.

The battleship *Maryland*, which was to become well known in South American ports, was commissioned on July 21, 1921, served with outstanding distinction in the Pacific during World War II; was decommissioned in 1946, and scrapped in 1959.

The *Maryland's* length was 624 feet, beam 97½ feet, displacement 31,500 tons, speed 21 knots. Its armament was eight 16-inch, twelve 5-inch, and eight 5-inch antiaircraft guns.

Considered a masterpiece of advanced naval construction in its day, battleships of the *Maryland* type have become entirely obsolete since World War II.

Among the 20 newsmen who were shipmates of Hill and President-elect Hoover on the 1928 cruise to Valparaiso were some of the most distinguished writers in North American journalistic annals.

Preeminent, perhaps, were Edward Price Bell, of the Chicago Daily News, Will Irwin, of the North American Newspaper Alliance, William Phillip Simms, of the Scripps-Howard newspaper chain, L. C. Speers, of the New York Times, and Mark Sullivan, of the New York Herald Tribune service.

Bell had probably interviewed more chiefs of state than any other newsman in the world, and had recently published "World Chancellories."

Will Irwin was the star reporter, second to none, of World War I. He contributed to Hill's *Maryland* cruise book a story about the Neptune ceremonies at the equator which is probably the best documented account of King Neptune's court ever written.

Speers had already worked 18 years for the New York Times, and was famed for his coverage of the Teapot Dome and other oil scandals of the early twenties, and his reviews of United States-Mexican relations.

Simms had been the first U.S. correspondent accredited to British Army headquarters during World War I, manager of the United Press office in Paris, and a worldwide traveler on special news assignments.

Mark Sullivan is still remembered as the ablest political analyst of his time, and a writer of brilliant books on the political and social history of the United States.

Meri Lavoy of Pathe News, dean of the cameramen, had covered every European front in World War I, and before his disappearance in Africa a few years ago filmed innumerable scenic spots from Aconcagua to Mount McKinley, the Yangtze Gorge to the South African national parks.

---

## Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

# HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of January 12, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

EIGHTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS OPENS

In one of the most critical periods in the history of mankind the 88th Congress convened on Wednesday. Once again 435 elected Representatives of the people to the House of Representatives swore to "support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same." Within minutes of taking this oath the Members engaged in the first debate and vote testing our allegiance to the Constitution in letter and spirit—the administration-backed proposal to pack the Rules Committee. The resolution passed 235 for (207 Democrats, 28 Republicans) to 196 against (148 Republicans, 48 Democrats). I voted against the proposal because it violates the constitutional conception of the separation of powers. The President, in my opinion, exerted undue influence on Congress to get his way and he will now control the Rules Committee whose primary function is to determine the rules under which legislation is brought to the floor. Past history shows us that when the radical-liberals have had such control all the welfare state and social legislation is sent to the House under gag rules with debate strictly limited and all amendments prohibited. The Rules Committee cannot block legislation. House rules contain adequate provisions for bringing to the floor any measure the leadership wants to bring out.

Preceding the rules votes the House was organized and every Democratic Member voted for liberal leadership which insures that all important House committees will again be headed by the most liberal Members in Congress. Just to remind you what Democratic organization of the House means and for which every Democrat votes on this first vote, the key committees of Education and Labor, Judiciary, Government Operations, and Public Works, among others, will again be headed by chairmen who have 100-percent Americans for Democratic Action voting records.

Big battles ahead will concern tax legislation, medical aid under social security, raising the debt limit, Federal aid to education, and expanded Federal programs and control. The President will begin a series of messages on Monday with his state of the Union message. Most of the bills embracing the President's program will come before my Committee on Ways and Means, emphasizing again the importance of this powerful committee on which I represent the people of Dallas County.

TEXAS REPUBLICAN DELEGATION

The Texas Republican delegation in Congress, consisting of Senator JOHN TOWER, Congressman ED FOREMAN, and me, held our first meeting, luncheon with the press representatives of Texas newspapers and wire service. ED FOREMAN is going to be a great Congressman and I appreciate the honor and privilege of serving with him in the House. He was my first guest on my 1963 television series, the first of which will be telecast on WFAA, Sunday, January 20 at 1:15 p.m. Congressman FOREMAN and I divided the two Republican Committee appointments with ED serving on the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee and giving me the responsibility of continuing service on the Committee on Committees. At the moment I am doing my level best to get Congressman FOREMAN appointed to the Armed Services Committee, the committee of his choice.

ALGER LEGISLATION

The Alger yardstick, "Is it a function of the Federal Government—can we afford it?" formed the basis of the 11 bills and resolutions I introduced on the first day of the session. This is my way of doing my part as your Representative to preserve your freedoms and the free enterprise system. My bills are: H.R. 263, to rescind and revoke membership in the United Nations; H.R. 264, to make labor unions subject to antitrust laws; H.R. 737, to provide for a flat percentage tax instead of present income tax rates; H.R. 738, tax reduction and reform (Alger-Baker-Herlong bill); H.R. 739, to eliminate withholding of income tax from wages and salaries; House Joint Resolution 5, to prevent treaties and international agreements from superceding the Constitution (Bricker amendment); House Joint Resolution 6, to prohibit the Federal Government from engaging in business in competition with its citizens; House Joint Resolution 7, enforced balanced budget; House Joint Resolution 8, expressing the will of the American people and their Government in winning complete victory over the worldwide Communist conspiracy (the victory resolution); House Concurrent Resolution 4, emphasizing the sovereignty of the United States by protecting American lives and property anywhere in the world; House Resolution 26 to establish proper representation for the minority party in House committee staff appointments.

Legislation in these fields is basic to reestablish responsible, constitutional limited Government of, by, and for the people. My bills may not be the complete answer, but they form the groundwork for discussion. If the committees will schedule hearings the best brains in the Nation within and without Congress, could use my proposals as a basis for discussion. I hope these proposals will receive widespread publicity across the Nation so the people will express themselves on the importance of action on these matters. My conservative creed: the Government cannot successfully nor constitutionally, feed, clothe, house, provide jobs, medical care and basic necessities for the people.

CURRENT EVENTS

Why? Why? Why? The world was horrified at news stories of innocent women shot down by U.N. troops in Jadotville in the Congo. The pitiful picture of a husband of one of the murdered women asking "Why?" aroused in all of us deepest sympathy and stirred in our minds the same question. Why are U.N. troops, an organization dedi-

cated to peace, forcing war on Katanga? Why does U.S. policy permit us to support such action? Adequate answers have not been given by the U.N. or the Kennedy administration. U.S. foreign policy is being tailored to meet U.N. approval and the U.N. is packed against us with the Communist nations and the so-called neutrals who invariably vote with the Communists, in the majority. While we, the American taxpayers, almost alone finance the U.N., it is being used as a propaganda forum for the Soviet Union and its stooge nations, and millions of dollars of our tax money is actually being channeled to Cuba whose Government is doing its level best to involve us in a war with the rest of the world. The U.N. influence has never been used in the interest of self-determination of people, a must in the cause of freedom. The U.N., as it is presently constituted, does not serve the self-interest of the United States, is a threat to our sovereignty, and its heavy financial demands upon us endanger our solvency and could be a contributing factor to bankrupting the United States. For these reasons, I introduced H.R. 263 to withdraw from the U.N. and to strengthen our alliances with those nations determined to stand with us in the cause of freedom.

God-fearing Americans were heartsick at the news of 30 Christian peasants in Russia being refused asylum by our Embassy in Moscow. Unfortunately, there was nothing we could do to help these unfortunate people who are being denied the right to worship God by the anti-God Government of the Soviet Union. We cannot dictate to that Government how it shall operate in Russia. We can, as I have suggested, encourage and assist satellite nations which have been enslaved by the Soviet to revolt which, in turn may inspire the Russian people themselves to throw off the yoke of Communist slavery. We can, as I have advocated, break off diplomatic relations with a nation which denies its people the right to worship freely and which is attempting to spread its antireligious doctrine to the whole world. If we refused to recognize the Communist Soviet Union, we would take away from that ruthless dictatorship the respectability we have given it through recognition and its acts of violence, murder, and suppression of the rights of man, would be exposed in all clarity.

"The spirit of truth and the spirit of freedom—they are the pillars of society"—from "Pillars of Society" by Henrik Ibsen.

## Equal Pay for Equal Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DAVE MARTIN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today which will go far toward insuring that the women of America will receive equal pay when they are doing work which is equal to that which is performed by male employees. The concept of lower wages for female employees is both antiquated and ridiculous in this day and age. Today, the women of America, thanks to our splendid educational system and the increasing trend toward automation and laborsaving devices, are just as capable of performing the bulk of the office and industrial tasks as are the men. Thus, many of the logical reasons for a differential in pay have been narrowed and in many cases they have even disappeared.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, an equal pay bill, H.R. 11677, was passed by the House of Representatives on July 25 of last year. Thanks to a number of amendments which were offered by my Republican colleagues and accepted by the House, the bill as enacted was basically a good bill. It was then considered by the Senate on October 3, 1962. Unfortunately, it was considered and passed as an amendment to an embassy construction bill, H.R. 11880. As a result, it could not go to the appropriate conference so that the differences between the House and Senate version could be ironed out.

The bill which I have introduced today is basically the same bill which was passed by the House last year. It contains the safeguards with respect to the investigative authority of the Secretary of Labor. It also provides for the trial of all violations in a U.S. District Court rather than before an administrative tribunal. Finally, the provision that there shall be equal pay for equal work is retained.

I believe that the modifications which I have made in the bill, although minor in nature, will both strengthen it and help it to receive favorable consideration.

For example, I have substituted the word "establishment" for the term "place of employment." This change nails down once and for all the often-expressed congressional intent that the provisions of this bill will apply only within and on an individual plant or store basis. Jobs in one plant or store will not be compared to jobs in another store or plant.

In section 4 I have also added the phrase, "or where such payment is attributable to other reasonable differentiation based on a factor or factors other than sex." This phrase appears in a number of State equal-pay statutes. By adding this phrase it is then no longer necessary to list in detail each and every valid reason that would justify a disparity in wage payments. For whenever an attempt is made to list exceptions, there is also the danger that subsequent statutory interpretation will construe the partial listing to mean that those exceptions and only those exceptions that are listed will be considered valid.

Section 5(b) has also been reworked so that it is absolutely clear that the Secretary's investigative authority is limited to those facts, conditions, practices, and matters that are specified in and directly relate to the charge. I am sure that no one wants to arm the Secretary of Labor with a wandering-ministrel type of investigative authority. One of the touchstones of our present legal system is that the accused is advised in advance of the charge that has been made against him. We do not permit the police or the FBI to move in on a citizen, or to invade his place of residence or business; there to stay until such time as an exhaustive and never-ending investigation discloses some type of violation. This smacks far too much of the police state. Certainly this concept should not be applied in the name of equal pay for women.

I have also established a 6-month statute of limitations. This corresponds with the statute of limitations in the Taft-Hartley Act. The National Labor Relations Board has not experienced any difficulty in operating under this rule. In fact, it has proven to be a blessing for it automatically weeds out all stale claims.

In section 6(d) I have eliminated the reference to double pay and have substituted a provision which calls for the payment of back wages plus 6 percent interest. Assessing double pay can be only construed as a penalty or a fine whereas the concept of backpay is instituted in an effort to make the employee whole for any loss that she may have suffered. The addition of a reasonable amount of interest along with the award of backpay further implements this policy of complete restitution without moving into the field of a penalty or a fine.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I have completely eliminated section 8 from the bill. This section provided special blacklisting penalties for any employer who does business with the Government. I am sure that we have all been troubled by the recent trend which some have characterized as an antibusiness trend. All too often a concept of special and exceedingly harsh penalties has been applied to business. Business has been treated as if it is some type of "Peck's Bad Boy." It is unnecessary and unwise to permit this special-treatment concept to creep into this bill. Moreover, it is an exercise in forensic vindictiveness for under the related provisions of this bill, an employer cannot be penalized in this fashion unless he has been found guilty of a violation by a U.S. court and then refused to comply with an appropriate court order. In other words, he would have to be in contempt of court. We all know that the courts can take care of themselves if and when an individual or a company has the poor judgment to become contemptuous.

It is my sincere hope that the bill that I have introduced will be speedily considered by the Education and Labor Committee. As a member of that committee I will do everything that I can to see that this is done. I urge my colleagues to vote in the affirmative when it is brought before the House for approval.

## Transmission of Electricity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN E. MOSS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to allow transmission

of electrical energy in interstate commerce at normal voltages in excess of 230,000 volts. A similar bill has been introduced today also by my good friend, the distinguished Senator from California, Hon. CLAIR ENGLE.

The new bill, similar to one offered in the 2d session, 87th Congress, would amend the Federal Power Act so as to require Federal Power Commission authority for the construction, extension, or operation of certain facilities for electrical energy transmission in interstate commerce.

The old bill, H.R. 12181, was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, but was not taken up before the end of the session.

In recent years, there have been great advances in the techniques of transmitting electric power. Until recently, the longest economical transmission distance ranged from 200 to 400 miles at maximum voltages of 230,000. For several years, there have been lines operating in Europe and Russia at greater distances and higher voltages. An Interior Department task force which recently studied the posibility of an intertie between the Pacific Northwest, where power can be produced economically in hydroelectric plants, and the Pacific Southwest, where the need for more electric energy at low cost is acute. The Interior Department study points out that electricity now can be transmitted for more than 1,000 miles at 750,000 volts.

Construction of such lines would have a tremendous impact upon the power utilization and economic growth of our country. Experiments have been conducted in the United States on transmission of extra-high-voltage power. Recently it was announced that such a line will be built in northern California and southern Oregon to interconnect the systems of Pacific Power & Light Co. and Pacific Gas & Electric Co. The Federal Power Commission has ruled by split vote that the terms of the Federal Power Act do not authorize the Commission to determine whether such extra-high-voltage lines are compatible with the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

The tremendous effect of such extra-high-voltage lines demands regulation by the Federal Power Commission. The bill provides that a certificate of convenience and necessity must be obtained from the Federal Power Comission before any person or company may construct, extend, operate or maintain any facilities for transmission of electricity at normal voltages in excess of 230,000 volts. Anyone who, at the time this bill is enacted, is already then engaged in the transmission of electricity at a normal voltage in excess of 230,000 volts will automatically receive such a certificate if he files for it within 90 days. Our proposal will require all applicants, except those who already have existing extra-high-voltage lines in operation at the time this bill is enacted, to show that their operations are required by present or future public convenience and necessity, and to observe such reasonable terms and conditions as the Federal Power Commission requires for the public convenience and necessity. In addition, no public utility would be permitted to abandon or curtail such extra-high-voltage transmission lines unless the Commission finds that such abandonment or curtailment would be consistent with the public interest and then grants permission for such abandonment or curtailment. The abandonment provision in our bill is identical with the provision in S. 1607 which was approved by the Senate August 14, 1961.

This bill also provides that any such extra-high-voltage transmission facilities authorized, but not required for the applicant's own use in power transmission, shall be made available on a common carrier basis for other electric energy. The Federal Power Commission will have authority to attach other reasonable conditions to granting permission for extra-high-voltage transmission facilities.

## Governor Hollings' Farewell Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ALBERT W. WATSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, the great Palmetto State has just inaugurated as Governor an intelligent, articulate, and extremely capable gentleman, Donald S. Russell. Under his leadership, South Carolina will continue to ascend the ladder of State superiority.

Today it is my privilege to present for the RECORD the outstanding farewell address of our esteemed former Governor, Ernest F. Hollings, which in itself exemplifies a man mature, intelligent, and progressive thinking. Although only 37 years of age when he assumed the governorship we are proud of his 4-year record as our chief executive.

As he so eloquently pointed out, 100 years ago our State lay bleeding under the heel of a punitive Reconstruction era but today South Carolina is America's No. 1 opportunity State.

Mr. Speaker, it is a long, hard, and expensive road from poverty to prosperity, from ruin to recovery, but the Palmetto State has both the people and the will to travel that road successfully. Governor Hollings' complete address follows:

GOVERNOR HOLLINGS' FAREWELL ADDRESS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the complete text of the farewell address of Gov. Ernest F. Hollings, delivered to the general assembly on Wednesday, January 9.)

I'm very much at home here—and regret leaving you. This ends 16 years in these halls as page, house member, speaker pro tempore, Lieutenant Governor, and Governor. The friendships, the experiences make me an oldtimer. The wonderful advice, cooperation, and assistance you have given me will again and again give me new inspiration. Pat and I are genuinely grateful.

I wish the best for Governor Russell. In short time, he will make important decisions for our State. I have tried to prepare our people for these times. The State's institutions and all law enforcement agencies have been charged with their responsibilities. I know you will give Governor Russell the same fine cooperation you gave me. I gladly offer him my support.

CONTROVERSY

The general assembly, unfortunately, leads a life similar to a football referee. You are seldom noticed until you make a controversial decision. I have never served with men of more courage and resolve. You took a $23 million deficit, and in 4 years turned it into a $19 million surplus. Meanwhile, the counties have received $18 million added assistance. For the first time in decades the incoming Governor begins operating in the black.

You took an insurance mess and created a strong department. A penitentiary with inadequate provisions is now being turned into a modern penal system. We have a securities law. The Attorney General of the United States says there is no organized crime in South Carolina. The law-enforcement officers now have a reliable retirement fund. Long needed State office building facilities are being built. We lead the Nation in TV education. A nuclear space commission points forward.

A commission on higher education tells how. A magnificent technical training program prepares the people for jobs. And the country's best development program brings jobs for our people. Thousands, tens of thousands of jobs. Over a billion dollars in new and expanded industry in 4 years. This is at the rate of over a half million dollars a day each and every day for 4 years.

The Advisory Council for Agriculture is working. The "50 to first" education program has been launched. Teachers' pay is up 34 percent, and personal income is up 25 percent. Tax seminars, insurance seminars, safety conferences, conferences on business, industry agriculture and education—people from the different sections of our State have joined hands for the common good. We are working together. You have every reason to be proud.

TRAVEL

I am honored to have worked with you on these projects. But there must be more than a rollcall of accomplishments. You have given me more. You have traveled me over 200,000 miles—to four countries in Latin America, seven countries in Europe, to Hawaii, Canada, Puerto Rico, and up and down, crisscrossing this Nation. I've met with the industrial giants, the labor leaders, talked with the university presidents, served in Washington at the appointment of President Eisenhower and President Kennedy, headed up the nuclear-space effort of our Governors' conference, talked constantly to fellow Governors and public leaders, both Republican and Democratic. And today, you who have supported me so loyally, you who have given me this vast experience, want to know about South Carolina. Have we a chance? Where are we headed?

As I visited in these foreign lands and talked with their people; as I traveled over this great country of ours, I began to realize that South Carolina really has a chance—an opportunity to succeed, to pull away from the hangover of 100 years of poverty, to climb to the top of the ladder of States.

This is my valedictory. In short time, South Carolina can reach the top and stay there.

Some foreign languages have no words for English words. Some have words with plural or different meanings. The Chinese language has the word "chuangi-chi" which possesses the plural meaning of "crisis," or "opportunity," depending on its use.

South Carolina, this year, has much the same characteristic. We are in chuangi-chi, crisis and opportunity. We need, must have, a time machine to compress 100 years into

1 year to speed with precision South Carolina into the age of space.

AT BOTTOM

This region, nearing 100 years ago, lay bleeding under the heel of a punitive Reconstruction era. Seventy-five years later the South was still the Nation's No. 1 economic problem. Even now, we have not recovered. This very day, any ranking of regions or States, for any purpose, finds the South and her States wearily clinging to the bottom rungs.

Why? Because the Northeast section of the Nation experienced an industrial revolution, prospered from it, and went on to enjoy its riches, while we struggled to feed our hungry children, and broke the spirit of our men and women who grew the fields of cotton that suddenly no one wanted.

Why? Because the Nation pushed West. The manifest destiny of exploitation drew the daring and the brave to draw from the land in the West the gold and the oil, the wheat and the corn, and to raise the great cattle herds that filled their wallets with money and their people with plenty.

And of us? We built our textile mills and gave our people jobs and hope. But again we were 50 years too late. International considerations had risen in America's mind and the textile industry is now expendable—and the jobs of our people with it.

Always too late with too little—that was the demon that plagued the South. Well, my friends, we still have too little, but this time we don't have to be too late. History has given us one more chance.

Just as the frontier's marksman with his single-shot muzzle loader had to hit the target with his first shot because he couldn't reload in time if he missed, we have to be accurate now. We have one shot. We must not miss.

LIMITED

With limited ammunition, we should understand and appreciate the forest in which we're hunting. This is the space age forest. It's deceiving. Many think this is just Buck Rogers fantasy. But this is real. This is not reaching to the moon or some particular planet. What creates the forest are the things we learn on the way. The study of extreme temperatures has given the housewife a coffee pot she can take out of an icebox and put on an open flame. The telemetry system of satellites is now being used in surgery to track blood temperature and blood flow, cutting a 90-minute operation down to 10 minutes. From a rocket propellant, we have developed a drug to treat mental illness. The satellite itself has brought international TV. And on and on it goes. With this age's dynamic technology, we wander into a wonderland of near magic. Science fiction is now scientific fact. Devices scoffed at 10 years ago, even 5 years ago, are exciting the research men of America today.

Scientifically, then, the space age means the reaching for outer space, and all the new scientific knowledge that is gained therefrom. Militarily, the space age means the determination of who shall control the space above us. But for the 95th general assembly, the space age means turning this crisis into opportunity. It means equipping our people for this new era. It means preparing our State so that she can compete with other States for space-age facilities. It means taking a tremendous leap forward now to prevent forever being relegated to the 50th of States.

YEAR 1970 TOO LATE

To prepare, some will think of a 3-year program, a 5-year program, or a goal to be attained by 1970—1970 will be too late. Knowledge of man recently has been calibrated to determine its rapidity of growth. From 4000 B.C. to the 16th century, man's knowledge was constant. With the invention of the printing press, the communication curtain was broken and by the 18th century the knowledge of man was doubling every 50 years. In the 20th century the doubling time dropped to every 20 years, with the space age now man's knowledge doubles every 10 years. In the next 10 years then, there will be twice as much to be taught in our universities than there is today. Veritably, we are in the midst of an education explosion.

This space-age forest is growing like wildfire and this general assembly must understand this problem; it must appreciate this problem; and it must legislate for it—now.

The question before South Carolina is not whether this explosion is good or bad, necessary or not. The question is simply, can we equip ourselves to utilize it before the rest of the Nation leaves us behind. The current of history is more swift than ever. Those who float will shortly be left in the eddies of the stream.

HOW TO AIM

In an age where bullets to shoot down bullets are being designed, how do we aim so that the target is not out of date when we hit it? This sounds impossible—but is it? Space's dynamic technology allows us to accomplish something never before possible by a State or area. We can catch up. We can condense time and leap from today all the way over to the day after tomorrow, without pausing, even for an instant—in tomorrow. This is no pipedream or wild theory.

Nor will it be for a first time in history. For it has just been done by another people in another land. In 1917, Russia was distraught. There was no industry, no education, no science, no arts or culture. There were only 47,000 Communists, and as a nation the Soviet was only to be found in the geography book. But they took good aim. They didn't frustrate over trivia—over what was nice and who had to be kept happy. They were determined to pack 100 years into a few short years. And while we disagree with the bullet they used, they hit the target.

They skipped the 100 years of the industrial age and went from oxcart to space vehicle. They caught up and passed the United States, Britain, and other great powers. Instead of 47,000—today there are over a billion people in the world now controlled by Communists—the fastest growing political development in the history of man. With no culture and arts—the Bolshoi ballet. Of many sports they never knew, but they have just won the olympics. With no power, today a world power. Russia and the United States are the only ones in space, and admittedly, today, the Soviet is 2 years ahead. And 5 years ahead in oceanography.

The Soviet saw the way the world was headed and they took a shortcut. They saw what day after tomorrow would be and they went straight for it. They ignored the middle ground—they avoided trivia. The Russian science, culture, and technology hurdled from American Civil War levels to the level of the day after tomorrow. They didn't have much to work with, but they used it all for one purpose. And it worked. This is the type aim South Carolina must take. We must unflinchingly avoid the temptation to restrict our goal—to aim merely at catching up. Our ultimate goal has to be nothing less than to forge ahead—and stay ahead.

NOISES

In taking aim let's become accustomed to the noises of the forest. We must not be distracted. These noises are trivia. The problem of South Carolina—the problem of this general assembly, is trivia. Trivia means cussing and knocking each other out all year long about two parties, when the choice is Kennedy or Rockefeller. Trivia means holding alerts all over the place when there are by last count two Communists in the State. We all know that teachers' pay should be increased, but trivia means the long palavering each year in this hall whether to give the teachers 10, 12, or 15 percent when any one would be inadequate, and all together would not give us quality education. Trivia means trying to legislate loyalty—or trying to regulate politics by law. These noises of the legislative forest must be recognized and given their position of unimportance if our one shot is to score.

Now we are set. We know the forest. We know the noises of the forest. We know how to aim. We know the target. But what is this one shot we are to use? A college professor. You say we have lots of those, and we do have many good ones. But we don't have one with a National Aeronautics Space Agency grant. We don't have one with a space science grant. We don't have one internationally famous who will attract leading scholars and professors. You say that's Harvard thinking. South Carolina can't afford it. Any money available should go to the teachers, and not these ivory tower professors. But I disagree. We can't afford not to do it.

Let's talk money. Suppose we had a faculty budget of $60,000 for 5 professors. The ordinary way, the South Carolina way, is to hire 5 good professors at $12,000 each. But the space age approach is to retain an outstanding one at $20,000 and hire the other 4 at $10,000 apiece.

ATTRACTION

The $10,000 ones are just as good, perhaps better than the original $12,000 professors, for this type will sacrifice to associate with the outstanding. And you haven't spent any more money. In fact, you've made money. For the grants and contracts that the outstanding professor can attract will bring a fortune to the campus. You see, the national effort in space has released from the Ivy League campuses the brains of the country. For those that can qualify, money for research is available anywhere—on every campus. Last year our country devoted $18 billion to various research and development projects. In this one year, we spent more for research than was expended by this country for research from the Revolution up to and including World War II.

In 1957, internationally famous Prof. John Gibson came to Purdue, a State university. After a year, he finally secured $300 to start on a program with a few German scientists and students. Today, his research team consists of 7 other professors and 60 graduate students—all involved in teaching of research. Funded by grants and contracts John Gibson works on a budget of $300,000 a year. None of this money comes from Purdue.

Recently, his team's work on computers has received national fame—and further grants. Purdue and Indiana have taken a position of leadership because of the seed corn planted by John Gibson. This one shot—the outstanding professor—has a snowballing effect. First, you have the professor, then his associates, then talented students, then contracts, then grants, then quality education, then leadership. Multiply this by 5 or 10 professors and it's easy to see the effect.

PALO ALTO

And it's not all Government money. The great percentage by far is private capital under the free enterprise system. Recently, I saw this in Palo Alto, Calif., on the campus of Stanford University. Over 35 great names in American industry, with million dollar research centers. Think of the investment, the brains, the talent, the leadership—and new industry. In 1955, Lockheed had its 1 division of space in Palo Alto with 450 em-

ployees. Today, this same division has over 30,000 employees. And the talented become more talented. Lookheed has a program that pays 75 percent of the cost of a course at Stanford for any of their employees—and presently, there are more employees in attendance at Stanford than we have students enrolled at the University of South Carolina.

This division has 279 doctorates on its staff. You begin to see—and feel the impact of the space age. Similar endeavors are underway in Alabama, Texas, Florida, Virginia, and Georgia. And the place to start is with that one nationally prominent professor.

It also gives us the quality we've been looking for. Raising the pay of the incompetent teacher will not make him competent. But raising the level of higher education elevates all levels of education. The professor will be more talented, his associates brighter, the students more challenged, the graduating teacher better trained and more inspired. And your children and mine, when they graduate from high school can get into college and compete in society.

STIMULATE

When you bring in the best men from outside—when you encourage and free the best men we have now on our faculties—when you do these things, you stimulate our students, you stimulate our society. Nothing is more urgent than for our State's now splendid array of brainpower and leadership, across the board, to be supplemented, infused and even cross-pollinated and inspired by an inflow of genius, spirited enterprise, and topmost talent.

This assembly must look at South Carolina's role in the Nation if it is to do its job well. Whether it realizes it or not, it is a part of the space age. And if we are to compete—if our people are to have a chance at good jobs—if the communities are to continue to attract new industry—if our children are to be educated and skilled, and if we are to retain these children as useful leaders for the State—then it will be because this assembly had courage. A call on this courage is imminent.

FACT OF LAND

We have all argued that the Supreme Court decision of May 1954 is not the law of the land. But everyone must agree that it is the fact of the land. Interposition, sovereignty, legal motions, personal defiance have all been applied to constitutionalize the law of the land. And all attempts have failed. As we meet, South Carolina is running out of courts. If and when every legal remedy has been exhausted, this general assembly must make clear South Carolina's choice, a government of laws rather than a government of men. As determined as we are, we of today must realize the lesson of 100 years ago, and move on for the good of South Carolina and our United States. This should be done with dignity. It must be done with law and order. It is a hurdle that brings little progress to either side. But the failure to clear it will do us irreparable harm.

THE ANSWER?

In the intriguing swirl of supernewness—with limitless mother lodes of progress, advancement and betterment in many forms becoming ripe for exploitation by the wise and the pioneering of this age—South Carolina should be, and I believe is, America's No. 1 opportunity State. Our ability to turn the crises into opportunities is beyond question. The real question is our willingness.

My serving with so many of you over the years confirms my confidence in your courage. But, years of public service have proved to me that we have to prove ourselves again and again. The space age is on us—the only question is—does it smother us or save us? This general assembly will give South Carolina's answer.

## Business Leader Supports President's Tax Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. James F. Oates, Jr., president of the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States, has just sent to Members of the House a copy of a letter addressed to the President, strongly supporting the President's recommendation for a cut in personal and corporate income taxes. In a message to Members of the House which accompanied his letter to the President, Mr. Oates states that he believes the tax reduction is "the main issue," and "contrary to earlier views I now strongly believe that we should not insist on concurrent enactment of tax reforms."

Significantly, the insurance company executive expresses the opinion that—

We should hold off on demands for concurrent expenditure reductions as an offset to tax reduction.

Controversy over these matters, however meritorious, will only serve to delay or defeat achievement of the essential goal.

We should instead join together to support vigorously the proposal for an across-the-board substantial tax reduction now. Here is a rare opportunity for all Americans to reaffirm their faith in free enterprise and to demonstrate once again its mighty capabilities.

Because of the high priority which this issue has been given by President Kennedy in his state of the Union message, and because of Mr. Oates' prominence in the business world, I believe the Oates letter to President Kennedy is one which will interest many people. On the assumption that this letter has already been made available to many by its author, and further publication should serve a similar constructive purpose, the text of the letter is made a part of these remarks at this point:

THE EQUITABLE LIFE
ASSURANCE SOCIETY
OF THE UNITED STATES,
*New York, N.Y., December 20, 1962.*

THE PRESIDENT,
*The White House,*
*Washington, D.C.*

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The tax program outlined in general terms in your speech to the Economic Club of New York on December 14 deserves the support of the Nation. In addressing yourself, as you made clear, not to the possibility of recession in the near future, but to the basic necessity of growth and employment during the longer term, you went to the heart of the matter. Your solution, an across-the-board cut in individual and corporate tax levels to increase demand for production and investment and thereby release the private sector of the economy to go to work, seems to be the right one. It should appeal alike to business, labor, and the consuming public.

On reading the full text of your remarks, it was a gratifying experience, if you will permit me to say so, to note the similarity in principle between your views and the position presented in a speech delivered by me before the New Jersey Association of Real Estate Boards on December 6 last, a copy of which is attached.

You have offered the choice before us in these words: "Our practical choice is not between a tax cut deficit and a budgetary surplus. It is between two kinds of deficits; a chronic deficit of inertia, as the unwanted result of inadequate revenues and a restricted economy, or a temporary deficit of transition, resulting from a tax cut designed to boost the economy, increase tax revenue and achieve * * * a future budget surplus."

Business, in my opinion, should endorse wholeheartedly your statement that "the Federal Government's most useful role is not to rush into a program of excessive increases in public expenditures, but to expand the incentives and opportunities for private expenditures."

Business should also welcome your decision, in line with the suggestion of Chairman MILLS, of the House Ways and Means Committee, to accompany tax reduction by "increased control of the rises in expenditures." Although one would prefer to have nondefense and nonspace expenditures cut back so as to hold total governmental expenditures constant in fiscal year 1964 at the fiscal year 1963 level, the main issue of prompt tax reduction should not be jeopardized by the inevitable controversy over the extent and incidence of budget reductions. In my judgment, therefore, the public—in furtherance of the long-term objective—should accept your statement that "defense and space expenditures will necessarily rise * * * but * * * that * * * all other expenditures combined will be held approximately at its current level."

Similar considerations should apply to proposed tax reforms other than the structural reform needed to change the level and degree of progression of our tax rates. Other reforms, such as so-called loophole reforms, the elimination of special privileges and tax simplifications, whatever their merits, are highly controversial and, as you have so well indicated, difficult to enact into law. There is every reason to believe that insistence on the enactment of such loophole reforms at this time would frustrate the achievement of the basic structural reform of tax reduction, with its far greater potential for furthering material growth. The detailed controversial issues should be left to the Congress for later debate and resolution. As you stated in answer to an Economic Club question: "Well, the purpose of reform really is directed to the encouraging of growth, and employment. I quite agree that to launch into a full-scale battle on general reform for academic reasons would be unwise."

It is my intention to support the broad principles of your tax reduction program. The views expressed in the attached December 6 remarks and in this letter will be given circulation among my friends within and without the business community and made known to the Members of the Congress. I hope that these steps will take place in what I confidently believe will be a broad-based and enthusiastic response to your tax program.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES F. OATES, Jr.

## Records Show Most Crime by Repeaters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for

inclusion in the RECORD an editorial from the January 2, 1963, issue of the Livingston Enterprise, Livingston, Mont., citing the accomplishments of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and commenting on causes for the rising crime rate:

RECORDS SHOW MOST CRIME BY REPEATERS

In his yearend report to the U.S. Attorney General, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover reported marked increases in all major categories of FBI accomplishments in the past year. The Federal Bureau of Investigation's final tabulations particularly will show marked increases in the number of criminal convictions, number of criminals apprehended, and well over 200 million in fines, savings, and recoveries this past year, compared with $148,421,000 in 1961. All this emphasizes the importance of a tightly coordinated, experienced organization, such as the FBI with its extensive and complete record on hundreds of thousands of individuals, in the endless war against U.S. crime.

In citing individual crime problems confronting the Bureau, Director Hoover called particular attention to a sharp increase in violations of the Federal Bank Robbery and Incidental Crimes Statutes, as the anti-bank holdup law is titled. Bank holdups showed "an increase of approximately 25 percent over the number committed in 1961," Hoover reported.

In short, there has been more crime, but the FBI has been keeping pace with it in stepped up results. The answer lies not in well-trained personnel and a well-run field organization alone, however, important as those factors have been. Much of the FBI's success rests in the hands of the unknown technicians who work deep in the Bureau's files and laboratories of its central offices across the country as well as in Washington.

Every day the FBI receives literally thousands of fingerprints of people all over the United States who have been newly arrested for some crime. In its criminal files today are fingerprints of more than 14 million individuals. In addition the Bureau has vast numbers of fingerprints of persons involved in purely civil matters, such as security clearance.

The striking fact standing out in this flood of fingerprints from criminal arrests arriving in Washington daily is that 8 out of 10 of them results in a "make." That means 8 out of 10 of the persons involved in today's arrests already have been arrested on a criminal charge at least once before. Clearly the bulk of the Nation's crime is the work of repeaters.

This is something to think about, for this evidence shows plainly that law enforcement is not the root problem in America's rising crime rate. The problem stems from what is done with these individuals after they have been arrested and convicted. There is the area where real study and tightening up are needed if this zoom in the U.S. crime rate is to be checked.

## Wanted: Maturity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Costa Mesa Pilot, Costa Mesa, Calif. This editorial points up the dangers threatening the freedom of the press as guaranteed in the first amendment. The present administration not only is covering up the truth, but has actually adopted the policy of false reporting to the American people, and every newspaper in the country should rise up to defend the freedom of the press.

The editorial follows:

WANTED: MATURITY

Robert F. Kennedy continues to disturb even his friends in Government with his uses of power.

Less than a year ago, in the United States Steel case, he ordered the FBI to roust Washington reporters out of bed to reveal what Big Steel's president had said to them.

More recently he used the implied threat of the Department of Justice's big stick to bludgeon money, food, and medical supplies out of individuals and companies in the Castro blackmail case.

Although never elected to office, he is wielding more power at the top level—thanks to his brother—than any Attorney General in history. His influence extends far beyond the limits of Federal law enforcement. He is a key figure, even more so than the Secretary of State, in determining foreign policy.

Now he has pressured a great newspaper to suppress a story. Without publishing this particular story, the newspaper's proud 86-year old reputation for honesty and integrity would have been severely tarnished.

The incident involved the James Hoffa conspiracy trial, which ended in a mistrial with a deadlocked jury December 23.

Someone pretending to be a reporter for the Nashville Banner talked to prospective jurors. Some of these had said in court that they had received such calls.

The newspaper promptly reported the incident, branded the caller an imposter and offered a $5,000 reward for the arrest and conviction of the person who made the false statements.

Last Thursday the Banner published the transcript of a telephone conversation between James G. Stahlman, publisher of the Banner, and Bobby Kennedy last October 23, the second day of the Teamster union boss's trial.

Kennedy, the transcript revealed, called Stahlman from Washington. The Attorney General said he understood the newspaper was planning a story on the incident and said Government attorneys felt that "if a detailed story in connection with the matter were made, it might very well lead to a mistrial."

Stahlman replied that he hoped the Government could get both a jury and a conviction in the case, and that the newspaper was "just as anxious to see a successful case against this fellow as you are."

However, he said he felt he should protect the Banner against this reprehensible stuff and therefore had published an offer of a $5,000 reward. He said he felt this did not jeopardize the Government's case or its effort to get a jury.

When Stahlman told Kennedy he could not leave his newspaper or its staff in a position of having false statements made about them, Kennedy replied, "These matters require sacrifices by many people."

To which Stahlman replied, "Attorney General Kennedy, I have made as many sacrifices for the Department of Justice as any man in middle Tennessee. I am suggesting to you that what has happened has made it necessary for me to defend the reputation of my newspaper, which has existed for 36 years, and I don't intend to have it sacrificed for Jimmy Hoffa, the Federal Government, or anybody else."

In publishing the transcript last Thursday, Stahlman said he did so with Kennedy's knowledge and because he felt nothing in it reflected on him, the Attorney General, or the newspaper.

With this we cannot agree. The fact that Kennedy would seek to suppress a story which involved the reputation of the Banner and its employees reflects on his judgment.

Bobby Kennedy has been too prone to act impulsively. Perhaps flat refusals to knuckle under—such as those by Dr. Arnold O. Beckman, of Corona del Mar, in the Castro blackmail case and by Publisher Stahlman—will help to make a mature executive of him.

## The Youth Conservation Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, one of the more dramatic and effective programs of the late great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, was the Civilian Conservation Corps. Not only did the work of the corps bring improvement and beauty to much of our Nation's countryside, but by their enlistment in the corps, many of the otherwise unemployable youth of the day were gainfully employed and thereby diverted from the danger of collective idleness.

There is not today the economic depression that then gripped the Nation. But there is the danger of idleness and wasted energies for many of our young men. There is also the need, as always in any nation, for public works to improve the appearance of our urban and nonurban areas. To meet that need, I now propose that we establish a Youth Conservation Corps.

Today, I have introduced such a bill. From talking with many of the community leaders of my own and other districts, and from my own studies of the proposal over the past few years, I believe that the corps can and will make important contributions to the well-being, the appearance, and the economic strength of the Nation.

I am not alone in this belief, I know. I recognized that others in the Congress share it with me. I know, too, from talks within and outside my district, many civic officials and private citizens share the belief, also. One of the more succinct comments on the proposal appeared this week in the major afternoon daily in my district, the Newark Evening News. And I would like at this time to bring it to the attention of my colleagues to assist their consideration of the legislation that I hope soon will come before this body:

IT WORKED BEFORE

The Nation's three-quarters of a million jobless youth, the apparent nonexistence of jobs for them and the ominous prospect for trouble thier idleness offers are eloquent arguments in favor of the youth employment corps proposed by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY's bill—promised vigorous administration support—would offer youths in the 16-to-21-age group a useful role much as the Civilian Conservation Corps offered during the depression of the 1930's.

The CCC, it will be recalled, discharged its program with credit. The Nation's parks, forest lands, farms, and streams were lastingly improved by the young men who responded to the call.

Even more valuable than conservation of land, forests, and streams was the CCC's conservation of youth. There is no way of knowing how many lives were enriched for idle city boys, but it doesn't take much imagination to picture what might have happened to many of them if left to drift in idleness during that trying period.

There is much to be done today in the cities as well as on the countryside. And there is a growing pool of young unemployed capable of doing it. Senator HUMPHREY's plan offers the framework for a useful harnessing of otherwise wasted and potentially troublesome manpower. The history of the old CCC is all in its favor.

## Thomas J. Quirk Dies, Retired Hartford Public High School Principal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, perhaps no one can leave a greater impression upon a community and its youth than an outstanding teacher or principal. Hartford lost an outstanding educator this week when Thomas J. Quirk, retired principal of Hartford Public High School, died in an untimely accident which, through a strange coincidence, occurred in front of the school where he had governed for nearly a quarter century.

A graduate of Holy Cross College, from which he later received an honorary doctorate as an alumnus of distinguished career in the field of secular education, he taught in Providence and was principal in his native Milford, Mass., before coming to Hartford.

I knew him personally and feel his loss keenly. He had entered recently upon a new venture in education and he looked forward to it with zest. The State and the community mourns him, but he has left behind him thousands of living memorials in the lives of the many pupils he taught and he saw graduated. In their accomplishments and achievements he always took his greatest satisfaction.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a news account of his life from the Hartford Courant and editorials from the Courant and the Hartford Times noting his passing:

[From the Hartford Courant, Jan. 15, 1963]

THOMAS J. QUIRK DIES, RETIRED HARTFORD PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL

A half-century career in education ended Monday when Thomas J. Quirk, retired principal of Hartford Public High School, died in front of the school he had headed for 24 years.

The 70-year-old educator was stricken with a heart attack as he drove up Broad Street, past Hartford High about 8 a.m.

He was on his way to Fairfield University where he became director of the teacher training program when he retired from Hartford Public High School on November 1.

COLLAPSES AT WHEEL

When Dr. Quirk collapsed at the wheel of his car, it swerved across the street and struck a tree in front of the Broad Street YWCA, directly opposite Hartford Public High School. He was pronounced dead on arrival at Hartford Hospital.

In his memory, Hartford Public High School will be closed all day Thursday.

For nearly a quarter of a century he, more than anyone else probably, personified Hartford High and its traditions and authority to those who went through the school.

He devoted himself to the school almost around the clock; the lights often burned late in the old high-ceiling office in the Hopkins Street wing where he kept his roll-topped desk.

Dr. Quirk entered into his new position at Fairfield University with zest and enthusiasm. But he was always eager for news of activities at Hartford High.

FIRM BUT GENIAL

A firm disciplinarian, he had the assets of a booming voice and imposing stature—but these were combined with geniality and a humorous twinkle that would often break through.

Interviewed at the time of his retirement 2½ months ago, Dr. Quirk said with a smile, "It's as easy to run a high school today as it ever was. But then, I've been at it so long it should be easy."

Dr. Quirk came to Hartford in 1932 as superintendent of the old Washington School District; when the city's school system was reorganized he became principal of Burr Junior High School in 1934. He was appointed to head Hartford Public High School in 1938.

Before coming to Hartford, Dr. Quirk taught at LaSalle Academy in Providence, R.I., for 2 years and served as principal of the junior and senior high schools in his native Milford, Mass., for 15 years.

He was born in Milford November 29, 1892, and was graduated from Holy Cross College in 1915. He received a master of arts degree there in 1919.

GIVEN HONORARY DOCTORATE

Holy Cross awarded him an honorary doctorate of laws in 1938, citing him as "an alumnus of distinguished career in the field of secular education * * * a man whose exemplary character is the living reflection of honor, justice, truth and charity."

He was also honored frequently by the students of Hartford Public High School, most recently at his final assembly as principal, with two scholarships bearing his name.

Although he never attended the school, Dr. Quirk headed its alumni association for many years. He also maintained a solicitous interest in the Hartford Public High School faculty and its retired members.

During his long career he has served as chairman of the State teachers retirement board, president of the Hartford Principals Club; president of the 2,800-member Worcester County, Mass., Teachers Association; president of the Hartford Holy Cross Alumni Association, and vice president of the Massachusetts Teachers Federation.

Dr. Quirk leaves his wife, Mrs. Marcella Quirk; and a brother, James F. Quirk of West Dennis, Mass.

THOMAS J. QUIRK

It was a queer trick of fate that had Thomas J. Quirk die in front of the building in which he had labored so long, and which he left in retirement just a few weeks ago. He had been principal of Hartford High School since 1938, and he left his imprint on the thousands of young men and women who walked its corridors during the years since then.

During his lifetime Mr. Quirk got the kind of recognition he wanted most—from the graduates of his school. Even though he was a stern disciplinarian he was fair and just, holding the interest of his boys and girls above all else. They sensed it, and they returned his affectionate interest with both respect and love.

A man who spends his life with young people usually stays young. And even until the day of his death Tom Quirk had that quality of youthful zest, of keen interest in the world around him, so that it was difficult to realize that he was 70 years old. In all, this man devoted 48 years of his life to teaching. Only a little more than 2 months ago he retired from Hartford High School not to rest, but to embark on a wholly new career at Fairfield University.

This kind of man does not quickly fade from memory. For many years to come his name will be synonomous with the best in education. Although people thought of him as an old-fashioned educator because of his basic virtues, he was neither old nor new. He was the timeless educator, dedicated and tireless in his job of educating the young.

MR. QUIRK'S DEATH WIDELY MOURNED

When it was announced last October that Thomas J. Quirk was to retire as principal of the Hartford Public High School in November there were widespread expressions of regret.

Dr. Quirk died suddenly Monday in his car in front of the school that he headed for nearly a quarter century.

In that span Dr. Quirk became an example of wisdom, tolerance, and good nature. He was greatly admired and beloved by students, graduates, and his fellow townsmen.

Dr. Quirk was one of a long line of distinguished educators who have filled the principal's post at Hartford High. He added luster and distinction to the office.

His untimely death so soon after retirement will sadden all who knew him because everybody liked him whether they knew him casually or intimately.

## An Integration Success Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the November 1962 issue of the Bulletin of the Antidefamation League of B'nai B'rith.

All of us owe a debt of gratitude to James C. Evans. He is a public servant of the highest caliber; the success of integration in the Armed Forces is a fitting tribute to a fine man.

The article follows:

THE ARMED FORCES: AN INTEGRATION SUCCESS STORY

(By Morton Puner)

"Certainly my Air Force days were the most influential time of my life. I served in nothing but integrated units. It seems to me the integration of the Armed Forces is one of the most important things that has happened to the Negro in the United States."—James H. Meredith (quoted in the Saturday Evening Post, Nov. 10, 1962).

Earlier this year, the ADL Bulletin featured a special issue on "The Administration and Civil Rights" with an introduction by President Kennedy and articles by Federal officials on their current activities in the field. All the authors of the articles were under 40; all but one had gone into Government service in 1961 as part of the New Frontier.

"It's a good thing to let the young fellows have their say," said James C. Evans, counselor to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, when he saw the issue. He looks with approval and hope at the efforts of the young men of Washington to bring equal rights to all Americans. He knows their frustrations and problems—and the hope of a better America which stimulates and goads them. He's seen it all before—and worked at it constantly for more than a quarter of a century. Evans' own entry to Government work, together with an earlier group of dedicated young men, is recorded in the book, "The Negro Vanguard," by Historian Richard Bardolph:

"When the New Deal brought its trainloads of bright young men into Government service, a few colored members came with them, recruited like the whites with scant regard for party affiliation or political obligation, and in most cases drawn fresh from college faculties. Men like Robert Weaver, James C. Evans, William H. Hastie, Frank S. Horne, and Ralph Bunche."

The office of James C. Evans in the Pentagon is today concerned with anything having to do with race and other minority group relations in the Armed Forces. The area is a huge one—more than 5 million Americans, servicemen, civilians, and their dependents, are directly involved. It is also a fascinating, encouraging area: Among the many types of American communities, it is in the Armed Forces that integration has been implemented must fully and has worked out best—offering substantial proof that racial harmony is workable on the job, in schools, and in everyday living.

And soft-spoken, 62-year-old James C. Evans, Tennessee born and MIT trained, is the man most responsible for carrying it out.

Integration in the Armed Forces, true, took a long time in coming. During much of World War II, Negroes were allowed to serve only in the steward's branch in the Navy, and as truckdrivers or heavy manual laborers in the Army. Sometimes they were sent into battle ill prepared, with disastrous results. Such incidents nourished the myth, "Negroes can't fight."

This was simply not true. At the height of the war in Europe, 50 Army researchers interviewed thousands of soldiers about their attitudes toward Negro platoons fighting experimentally within their white divisions. The findings: Negroes, fighting within an integrated framework, could do just as well as whites. But these findings were never made public during the war. Segregation generally remained the rule.

It was the lessons of the war, plus postwar drives for more democracy, that brought the change. In 1948 President Harry S. Truman's Executive Order 9981 set the policy for equal treatment and opportunity for all persons in the Armed Forces without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin." It took 7 years, under Presidents Truman and Eisenhower, to implement that order.

Negroes have flourished under integration in the Armed Forces to such a degree that they are now a crucial factor in America's defense. They constitute 15 percent of all non-commissioned officers in the Army, even though they make up only 10 percent of Army personnel. In the U.S. Air Forces in Europe, 14.5 percent of all noncoms are Negroes, though they represent only 7.5 percent of enlisted men—a testament to what Negroes can do given equal opportunity and training.

The number of Negro officers is expanding too, although not at the same rate. Now, 3 percent of all Army officers are Negro, compared to less than 1 percent at the end of World War II. Of Air Force officers, 1.1 percent are Negroes. Only about 0.1 percent of Navy and Marine Corps officers are Negroes; but there were none at all at the beginning of World War II. And 34 of the 8,500 cadets at the various service academies are Negroes.

The highest ranking Negro officer in the services is Maj. Gen. Benjamin O. Davis, Jr., Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations at USAFE headquarters in Germany. The Army and Air Force have more than 100 Negro colonels and lieutenant colonels. There are about 200 Negro officers on active duty in the Regular Navy and among the Reserves.

Above all, since Korea—the first war in which whites and Negroes fought in genuinely integrated units—no one in authority seriously questions the military value of integration.

There are still a number of problem areas. Pockets of resistance to the Federal policy of integration exist, mainly in the Southern States, in the National Guard, military Reserve units, and the Reserve officers training camps. But the overall picture is a heartening one. Evans, who is an electrical engineer as well as manpower specialist, uses an engineer's analogy to explain: "If there is a lag in a magnetic circuit, we change it, improve it, and it never snaps back. We've done the same thing for a cultural lag in our society; through integration we have changed it, improved it. It cannot easily snap back."

Despite his years at the job, Evans and his functions are largely unknown to the general public (but not unknown to the Negro community). His methods of work are quiet but effective and its consequences are far ranging. One of his jobs is monitor of the progress of Armed Forces integration, making sure that improvements in the cultural lag don't snap back. The force of Presidential orders supports Evans in his efforts to see that integration is in force and maintained in Federal military installations—in housing, training, educational facilities, for dependent children, in all aspects of the lives of military personnel and their families.

But there are other, less clear-cut areas. For example, Evans may learn that someone at a military post has decided to put on an oldtime minstrel show, complete with burnt-cork makeup and "mammy" songs. Minstrel shows are about as offensive to Negroes as Mike and Ike jokes are to Jews. Evans will act discreetly, writing to the post commander or other persons involved, explaining to them precisely why such stereotypes are insulting to Negroes—and damaging to American unity generally. His reasoned statements of principle are usually persuasive enough; his Pentagon position and prestige give him the authority to make his advice stick.

Or else, a much-decorated Negro officer, stationed at the air base near El Paso, Tex., may drop into Evans' Pentagon office with a problem. Suitable off-base housing is unavailable to a Negro family in El Paso; the officer, his wife, and children have had to take up residence across the Mexican border in Juarez, from where he daily commutes.

Such problems are grist for the mill of the Evans office. Because of his years of service—he started with the military in 1942 as assistant civilian aide to the Secretary of War—Evans has developed a formidable complement of friends and allies serving throughout the world. They are both white and Negro, from the North and South, eager to work with him to further compliance with integration orders.

For most servicemen—particularly those making a career of it—integration has now become a normal way of life. No matter how strong their preservice prejudices they seem to suspend them for the balance of their military careers. Mr. Evans tells the story of a white officer who was raised in Greenwood, Miss., attended the University of Mississippi, and became a lawyer. After several years of Army service in various parts of the world, the officer faced a dilemma. Army integration had given him new insights and attitudes. He did not know how he could ever return to Greenwood—a fountainhead of the White Citizens Council movement—"where 95 percent of my friends are council members."

"As a matter of conscience, I can no longer tolerate and live with their prejudice," he told Mr. Evans. The officer's wife agreed and suggested a solution: Don't go back to Greenwood. But a man's roots, spiritual and economic, are strong. The dilemma still faces the white couple.

Paradoxically, through Armed Forces integration, our mighty defense machinery, with all its potential for destruction, is sowing seeds of brotherly love and understanding among Americans. It has, as witnessed by the opening words of this article, contributed to the education and determination of James H. Meredith, Negro Air Force veteran now attending the University of Mississippi. It has produced such attitudes as that expressed by Negro Navy Lt. (jg.) L. E. Jenkins: "After a while you start thinking of whites as people." And the attitude of hundreds of military leaders who have seen integrated units in action, an attitude summed up in the words of Maj. Gen. Harvey Fisher, a West Pointer and Korean veteran: "Heart is heart, blood is blood, muscle is muscle. * * * What difference does color make?"

James C. Evans has seen all these changes come about in his years of service. In the late thirties, he was administrative assistant to the president of West Virginia State College, then one of the highest ranking Negro colleges in the Nation. War Department policy at the time prevented Negroes from becoming pilots or air crewmen in the Army Air Corps. Evans managed to start at West Virginia the first federally sponsored civilian pilot training unit to accept Negroes. Soon there were eight such units at Negro colleges; these formed the basis for the training program at the all-Negro Tuskegee Army Air Corps Airfield. Two of the first five Negro youths to receive their commissions and wings as pilots were Evans' former students. (One of the graduates is now Maj. Gen. Davis.) This was the pioneering effort leading to Air Force integration, and also served as a lever for further integration in all the services.

Recognition for his years of achievement has now started to roll in. The Defense Department cited him in 1956 for outstanding contributions in the field of racial relations. In 1959 he was given the Career Service Award of the National Civil Service League in recognition of his distinguished service to the U.S. Government. He also holds the Harmon Award in Science, the Dorie Miller Award in Human Relations and a host of honorary degrees. Most recently he was awarded the distinguished service citation of the Chapel of the Four Chaplains in Philadelphia.

His concern for intergroup understanding is reflected in many ways. He talks with reticence but deep pride about his forebears and his family. His wife, Rose McGoodwin Evans, is a New York University graduate and mathematics teacher; his daughter, Evangeline, is a Stanford University senior. His 21-year-old son, James Carmichael Evans, Jr., was the first Negro to be elected president of one of the 28 on-campus fraternities at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, from which his father graduated in 1926. Young Evans is an Episcopalian who attends services at Boston's Christ Church. But the fraternity which elected (and a year later reelected) him, Pi Lambda Phi, is composed mainly of Jewish youth. When its members gather for dinner, James C. Evans, Jr., as president, recites the blessings—in Hebrew.

# Appendix

## State of the U.S. Lead-Zinc Mining Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Friday, January 18, 1963*

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have had brought to my attention the remarks made by Mr. Lindsay Johnson, vice president, New Jersey Zinc Co., before the American Mining Congress at San Francisco, on September 27, 1962. Mr. Johnson has given a fine outline of the state of the lead-zinc industry and suggested some things that could be done to solve some of the industry's problems. This is a fine speech and I recommend it for the attention of every Member of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF THE U.S. LEAD-ZINC MINING INDUSTRY

(By Lindsay F. Johnson)

It is most appropriate that this report on the state of the U.S. lead-zinc mining industry has been scheduled for the afternoon of the last day of these sessions, right at the bottom of the program.

This is entirely consistent with the current position of lead and zinc in the politico-metal series—right at the bottom.

In this series the combined weight of the two metals appears to be zero.

This is a dismal subject, because such part of the U.S. lead-zinc mining industry that has not already expired is leading a dim existence, deep under the shadows cast over it by many things.

There has been no change for the better in the state of the industry since the last report to the mining congress a year ago. In fact, some of the shadows have deepened, and one or two additional ones have further clouded the lead-zinc horizon in recent months.

None of these overhanging and depressing shadows is the creation of the U.S. lead-zinc mining industry itself. But the industry is compelled to take the primary and secondary adverse effects of them because it is a captive of circumstances, with little apparent ability to influence or combat them.

First, there is the shadow of continued overproduction with its consequent depression of metal prices, resulting in turn in gross devaluation of the real worth of U.S. lead-zinc mine products.

Statistics show that there is overproduction of lead and zinc metal in the United States as well as the rest of the free world, as evidenced by mounting stocks in the hands of producers, both here and abroad. They show also a continued and growing aggravation of this condition by net exports of the metals to the free world markets from Russia and other centrally-planned economies, with West Germany and Great Britain receiving the bulk of them.

It took a long time to convince some people in the international lead-zinc study group of this fact, but it is fundamental that there can be no surplus production of lead and zinc metal without surplus mine production.

The U.S. lead-zinc mining industry is not contributing to surplus mine production, but it is a victim of the depressing effects of surplus created elsewhere finding its way to our shores.

Let us examine the facts behind that statement.

Because it has been reduced by external economic forces, for several years, the U.S. lead-zinc mining industry has been limping along on a bare existence basis. In the case of lead it has been producing at less than 65 percent of demonstrated potential, and in the case of zinc, at about 70 percent. Conversely, mine production of lead and zinc elsewhere has increased.

Of raw materials involved in primary lead products consumed in the United States, less than 40 percent now originates in U.S. mines. Of raw materials involved in primary zinc products consumed in the United States, but little more than 40 percent originates in U.S. mines.

Because it is caught in the web of inflation, with no compensating value of its products, the U.S. lead-zinc mining industry is captive within its own borders. It cannot profitably put 1 pound of its products into the world markets.

In summary these are the facts:

The decline of the U.S. lead-zinc mining industry has been seen. Its current economic distress is known. It is bound to its own national borders and has difficulty holding a place against foreign competition in our own markets let alone having any ability to compete in foreign markets.

In the face of these facts, I submit to you that to refer, as was done here on Monday, to the industry's plight and its inability to compete with foreign competiton at home or abroad as a myth is an affront to the intelligence of the Members of this Congress. This is cavalier thinking of the highest order.

We must face up to the facts that U.S. lead-zinc mines cannot possibly exist without U.S. smelters, but that U.S. smelters can, and in large part do, get along without U.S. mines. There are few, if any, smelters in the United States that do not operate to some degree on imported materials, and it is by this route and by metal imports that surplus mine production outside the United States finds its way in to create surpluses here.

Unless and until it is recognized that a healthy lead-zinc mining industry is a national necessity and asset and the will or the means are provided that will close off the influx of surplus foreign mine production into the United States, be it in the form of ores or metal or other manufactured products, the U.S. lead-zinc mining industry must live under this shadow, and the longer it stays under the shadow, the more it will languish.

By far the greatest shadow enshrouding the lead-zinc mining industry is the trade policy of our Government. This is not a new thing but is a continuation of what has been with us for some time.

It is a policy that seems sometimes to admit on the one hand that we need to preserve a strong lead-zinc mining industry but then proceeds to submerge the interests of such an industry so deep in foreign policy considerations that it becomes increasingly difficult to bring them to the surface.

This is a policy that has failed to come to grips with the problem of protecting a vital natural resource industry that has demonstrated beyond doubt that it has been seriously injured by the impact of imports.

It is a policy that has gone to great lengths to avoid facing up to the question.

It has involved us in such expedients as the international lead-zinc study group.

This group, which started out with a whoop and a holler, has slowly ground to an ineffective position. It has become increasingly evident that the participants, except the United States, are there primarily to protect their own lead-zinc industries. The United States submerges the interests of its mining industries in broad foreign policy considerations. Others take advantage of this and do not hesitate to berate us on any suggestions of moves that would control their participation in our domestic markets for metals and ores, even though these moves may be the only means of preserving some vestige of health in the domestic lead-zinc mining industries.

It is further evident that there is an underlying philosophy of the member governments, including ours, that the lead-zinc industries must accept and operate on a one-world basis. As pointed out earlier, our lead-zinc mining industry, involuntarily caught in the web of inflation, cannot profitably put one pound of its mine product into the world markets. We are the only nation so restricted. As long as this condition and this philosophy prevail, there is little reason to think that the other nations, who exploit our market without fear of retaliation or competition in their own markets, will voluntarily give up this advantage. So, the prospect of anything constructive for the U.S. lead-zinc mining industry coming from the international lead-zinc study group seems extremely remote.

Since the last report to the mining congress there have been two more sessions of the study group in Geneva, with no accomplishment that has been reflected in improvement in world market conditions.

Oddly enough, in the 1962 session our Government did not even barter any more foreign metal into our stockpiles, as it did to no avail in 1961.

Another session is scheduled for October.

There seems to be some prospect that the group is now leading into a discussion of an international commodity agreement for lead and zinc, based on a proposal by Mexico.

Representatives of the U.S. industry are opposed to this for obvious reasons beyond the hopeless complexity of it. Our State Department avers it is not in favor of such a commodity agreement but seems to lack the decision to close the door on it.

Should discussion of this subject get underway in this study group, I think it is reasonable for you to expect the first progress report at the mining congress of 1967.

Another expedient the policy has led us to is the quota plan.

As pointed out in previous reports to you, the quotas were another compromise to facing up to the problem. As it has turned out, the quota plan has been of more advantage to foreign producers than to the U.S. lead-zinc mining industry it was supposed to help. The quotas gave to foreign producers what amounts to a guaranteed quantitative participation in our markets, regardless of the

level of consumption. Since the last report to you, they have continued to use them to full advantage, pushing in practically 100 percent of the quotas and thus using their guaranteed place in the U.S. market as an umbrella over a perilously low price structure in their own markets.

Unfortunately, while the umbrella has been good and tight for exporters to this country, it has leaked all over the domestic industry. In their avidness to find a place for the surplus mine production they import, the metal producers and distributors have got into the habit of buying out the house every night for the popular Broadway show "I Can Get It for You Wholesale" and distributing the tickets to consumers. This is, no doubt, good entertainment for the consumers but is a sad result of surplus foreign mine production being attracted to and encouraged to enter the United States.

Also, there has been increasing adeptness in developing end runs around the quotas by exporting to the United States lead and zinc in manufactured or semimanufactured products. This has been particularly so in the past year with respect to certain lead products.

In fairness it must be said that while the quotas have failed to accomplish their purpose of stabilizing and improving the state of the U.S. lead-zinc mining industry, they have prevented chaos. There is little doubt that without them the U.S. mining industry would today be in a completely intolerable position.

And now in recent weeks we have been confronted with the policy at its zenith in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. We have heard much in these sessions about the evils and virtues of this highly controversial piece of legislation.

Analysis of the act and the history of its enactment would seem to indicate that the sacrificial prospects are greatly increased for many industries already beset by competition from imports.

Many of these industries can reap no benefit from the achievement of the ultimate general purposes of the act. Their inflated costs, not the least of which is labor cost, eliminate them from competing in foreign markets, and in many cases they will be driven in large part from their own markets. The act itself admits of this possibility.

In the case of lead and zinc, even though there seems to be some prospect that provisions of the act could lead to maintenance of the status quo, we all know that the status quo is not good enough.

Unfortunately, many remaining segments of the lead-zinc mining industry in the United States could well follow those that have preceded them into this sacrificial category.

However, it seems too early to judge how developments in our own Nation as well as elsewhere in the world will influence the exercise of broad powers under this act by our Chief Executive. One can only speculate at this point on what the course will be.

No rule can be hard and fast for everything. It is to be hoped that in the end the wisdom of preserving and encouraging natural resource industries will prevail and that, just as it is founded on anomalies of geology, the lead-zinc mining industry will be found to be an anomaly of political economy and receive by executive or legislative action treatment that will preserve it and encourage it rather than allow its partial or entire destruction.

Another event of the year that has cast a dark shadow over the lead-zinc mining industry has been the investigation of stockpiles. We have likewise heard this subject well covered in these sessions.

The effect of these investigations has been profoundly depressing, and the uncertainties involved most certainly have had their secondary effect on the U.S. lead-zinc mining industry.

This shadow unfortunately will remain as long as these uncertainties remain, and they will remain until reappraisal and wiser counsel demonstrate that stockpiles are not liabilities, as some would make them, but rather are of great value to the Nation, not only for their potential physical use in emergency but for their enhancement of our Nation's position in the current state of international political economy.

I do not mean to leave the impression that the U.S. lead-zinc mining industry is giving up; far from it. There have been some noteworthy achievements in opening new mines and developing means of reducing costs of production. Up to now, however, these must be counted as means of survival rather than accomplishments that can within themselves create a strong, healthy industry that can capture a fair and reasonable share of our own markets.

Likewise, the industries, through their joint research programs, are making highly commendable efforts to further consolidate and expand present uses for lead and zinc and to find new applications that may result in greater consumption.

One might infer from this glum picture of a national policy that the lead-zinc mining industry does not have a friend in the world, let alone in Washington. This is far from the case.

There are many in the Congress who have complete awareness of the importance of a healthy lead-zinc mining industry in the United States. We feel that they believe in the principle that it was on development of natural resources our vast economy was founded, and by their actions have shown they will do all they can in the interest of preserving the industry as an important and necessary part of our national economy.

To mention a few, foremost among them are our eminent Senators Clinton P. Anderson and Robert S. Kerr, supported by Senators Gordon L. Allott, Wallace F. Bennett, Alan Bible, Howard W. Cannon, Frank Carlson, John A. Carroll, Dennis Chavez, Frank Church, Everett M. Dirksen, Carl Hayden, Henry M. Jackson, Len B. Jordan, Estes Kefauver, Thomas H. Kuchel, Edward V. Long, Warren G. Magnuson, Mike Mansfield, Lee Metcalf, Frank E. Moss, Alexander Wiley, and on the House side, the Honorable Wayne N. Aspinall, chairman of the House Interior Committee, who has already stated his stalwart position to you from this platform, supported by the Honorable Howard Baker, Walter S. Baring, James F. Battin, Frank M. Clark, Peter H. Dominick, Durward G. Hall, Ralph R. Harding, Walt Horan, Harold T. Johnson, Richard Ichord, Cecil R. King, David S. King, Walter L. McVey, Joseph M. Montoya, Thomas G. Morris, Arnold Olsen, M. Blain Peterson, Gracie Pfost, Vernon W. Thomson, William M. Tuck, Al Ullman, Francis E. Walter, William B. Widnall, and Morris K. Udall.

These statesmen are firm friends of the lead-zinc mining industry, and the industry will do well not to forget that they are.

We believe that we even have some friends in Interior, Commerce, and State whose hearts basically are with us but whose hands for the moment must be tied.

For a decade now the once hardy breed of lead-zinc miners in the United States have been shouting for "Chloe" into the dismal swamp of the Potomac but without a rewarding answer. The anly answers that filter back through the morass seem to be in foreign languages, which the lead-zinc miners cannot understand, but they know they are not Chloe. It is certain though that they must keep shouting into the swamp for Chloe, and their smelter cousins, who are approaching equal peril, might do well to add their voices in unison. They must find her soon, for there seems no other way to avoid extinction of the breed.

## Those "Mercenaries"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ARTHUR WINSTEAD
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Evening Star, January 9, 1963, together with letters to the Star from Mr. Robert L. Buell, former American Consul General at Leopoldville and Mr. Aubrey Cox. Since the United States agreed to or advocated the support of the partition of Korea at the 38th parallel, the partition of Palestine, the division of India and Pakistan, and the division of Vietnam, it appears rather inconsistent to me that this administration would listen to the advisers in the State Department to the extent of encouraging, supporting, and financing United Nations forces in waging war on Tshombe and the people of Katanga—possibly the most civilized group in the Congo—in an effort to force them into union with other provinces.

I am unalterably opposed to our financing this type operation through the United Nations. I did not support the U.N. bond issue and sincerely hope that more Members of this House will vote against the appropriation of funds to finance further action of this type through the U.N. In my opinion, there is grave danger that the Congo will end up with another Castro.

The editorial and letters follow:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Jan. 9, 1963]

THOSE "MERCENARIES"

An especially irritating aspect of United Nations propaganada in the Congo matter is discussed in two letters appearing elsewhere on this page.

Time after time, the apologists for the U.N., as well as its official spokesmen, refer in slurring terms to the "white mercenaries" in Moise Tshombe's Katangan Army. The impression is conveyed that these "mercenaries"—a few hundred men at most—are the root of all evil in the Congo, and that if they could be given the old heave-ho all would then be sweetness and light.

The public is not told that many if not most of these so-called mercenaries have lived for years in Kantanga, and that it is at least possible that some of them are fighting for a cause in which they believe—not for money alone. Nor do the U.N. propagandists ever mention that the combat troops in the U.N. Congo Army—whether white, black or brown—are also "mercenaries" in the sense that they are being paid to fight—largely by the United States.

These points are well stated by our correspondents, one of whom is a former American Consul General at Leopoldville, and we think their comments are worth reading.

SOMETHING TO PONDER

The recently published Associated Press photograph of two European prisoners of

the Katangan forces, tied with ropes to their U.N. captors, labeled them as "mercenaries."

Who knows but that they were brave men who volunteered to fight for a cause they believed to be just. One was a Hungarian. Ponder that.

Who, pray tell, are the U.N. forces in the Congo if not mercenaries; yes, and with services paid for more than half by U.S. contributions to the U.N.?

Were volunteers in the Allied forces in World Wars I and II branded as mercenaries? The Hessians employed by King George III during our revolution were. So have Gurkhas always been. Let us leave dictionary definitions aside.

The misguided and, I fear, confused U.N. mercenary forces in the Congo were sent there after the end of Belgian rule, when murder, rape, and pillage ensued in some areas, solely to restore law and order and to protect lives and property. They were not sent there to engage in aggressive warfare; not to shoot innocent noncombatants, as they recently have done; not to impose by force of arms unification of discordant local political groups.

By the invasion of Katangan territory, controlled by the forces of a patriotic political leader, Moise Tshombe, it seems apparent that U.N. forces and those who control them have exceeded the authority which prompted these forces to be sent into this area.

The animosity engendered by this action in large areas of Africa and among our allies may well be the prelude to destroying the U.N. itself. The shocking precedent of misconduct by such mercenary U.N. forces will, I fear, preclude all possibility of future U.N. police actions elsewhere of a comparable nature. The U.N. has, alas, destroyed its alleged reputation as a great moral force for the maintenance of peace and integrity in international relations.

ROBERT L. BUELL,
*Former American Consul General at Leopoldville.*

---

The editorials in the Star on the Katangan situation have been excellent; and I am sure that the editor is not laboring under the illusion that the Belgian and French officers who are assisting in the defense of Katanga really deserve to be called white mercenaries any more than the trigger-happy Indian Gurkha and Irish officers and troops employed by the United Nations for the subjugation of Katanga deserve to be called brown and white mercenaries. We, American taxpayers, who are paying most of the hire of the Indian and Irish troops know that they are "mercenaries." And yet, most news stories relating to the Congo (including some of those appearing in the Star) manage to employ the phrase "white mercenaries" in referring to the Katangan army of defense in such a manner as to leave the impression that the Belgians and the French (who really do have a valid interest in Katanga) are in some way immoral in defending that interest, whereas the professional Indian and Irish troops that have been brought half way around the world to subjugate Katanga and deliver her over to a group of hostile tribes headed by Adoula are not subject to the same scornful term of "mercenaries."

I bitterly resent being subjected to the so-called brainwashing process; but I think there is overwhelming evidence that the public is being subjected to a brainwashing program carefully designed to make the strong odor of the United Nations policy in the Congo somewhat less offensive to the nostrils of the American public.

AUBREY COX.

## Each NATO Country Must Assume Full Responsibilities of Membership—Acting Secretary General of NATO, Hon. Guido Colonna, Addresses Paris Meeting of NATO Parliamentarians

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Friday, January 18, 1963*

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, as a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the United States is a shareholder in a 15-power partnership for world peace—a cooperative effort which demands from each participant a strong sense of understanding, trust, and responsibility. And, as our efforts are set in an alliance of 15 sovereign and independent states, and since the degree of cooperation and agreement among the member governments will necessarily dictate its effectiveness, it is essential to the interests of the free world that we unceasingly strive to reach a common accord.

One tangible evidence of a determined drive to attain this unanimity was the conference of parliamentarians from NATO countries in Paris last November. As a member of the official delegation from the Senate of the United States, it was my privilege to be in attendance, and, along with a number of colleagues, to participate in meetings aimed at promoting a singleness of purpose among treaty nations.

One significant highlight of the session was an informative address by Hon. Guido Colonna, who served as Acting Secretary General of NATO during the illness of Secretary General Dirk U. Stikker.

Mr. Colonna began his remarks with an informative digest of the changes in world affairs which had taken place in the last year, and the relationship of these alterations to the NATO alliance. He also discussed the current status of NATO in vital areas of political relationship, military preparedness, and civil emergency planning. The Secretary emphasized dangers which face the treaty countries, not only military, but ideological and economic as well.

In commenting on recent Western optimism over signs of strain between elements of the Communist bloc he observed that—

Anything that may make for more variety and more independence behind the Iron Curtain is all to the good. Here again, however, we should not indulge in wishful thinking and we should not base our policies for today on what may—or may not—happen tomorrow. A less monolithic, less oppressive communism will not necessarily be a weaker communism. It may well be stronger because more firmly based on public support: and indications are not lacking that this may be so.

Mr. President, fully aware of the far-reaching implications of a cooperative spirit among the NATO countries, it is nevertheless my conviction that the United States should move to stimulate a more proportionate degree of participation in alliance activity by some other members nations. Certain of these Allies have, of course, been weakened by shortages of materials and manpower, and they have not yet fully recovered from the devastation of World War II. But, the United States has been shouldering a far larger portion of the military and financial burdens, and it is time that we make clear our desire that others also assume their full responsibilities.

I request that excerpts from the address by Secretary Colonna before the NATO Parliamentarians Conference be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD. Additionally, I request that statements of mine dealing with the need for equal adherence to NATO commitments, as reported in the Elkins Inter-Mountain, Elkins, W. Va., December 17, 1962, be likewise reproduced.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM A SPEECH OF THE ACTING SECRETARY GENERAL, AT THE NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS CONFERENCE IN PARIS ON NOVEMBER 12, 1962

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, it is a high honor for me, as the Acting Secretary General of NATO, to welcome you at our headquarters building on the occasion of your annual conference. At the same time, I am all too well aware that this honor has fallen to me only because, owing to his recent illness, the Secretary General, Mr. Stikker, could not be here today himself. Mr. Stikker has, however, asked me to express to you his most cordial wishes for a successful meeting and his profound regret at not being able to be with you.

He has—I know you will be glad to hear—made a remarkable recovery from what was a pretty serious operation; but even he still needs some rest to be fully able to resume his duties. There is every reason to hope that he will be back with us very soon. Meanwhile, Mr. Chairman, I hope I may convey to him the conference's best wishes for a speedy and complete recovery.

During this important conference, as indeed at any other time of the year, the International Secretariat will do everything in its power to lend you such help and facilities as it can in order to promote the successful work of this gathering.

We attach, as you know, the greatest value to your work, because we are fully aware that what we are trying to do, we can never accomplish in a vacuum. To succeed, we need the full support of the public opinion of our 15 member countries, and this means, first and foremost, that of the elected representatives of our allied nations. You, parliamentarians, and we, officials, must work hand in hand in mutual trust and in a common conviction as to the common goal to reach.

Every word spoken by you during this conference, every idea thrown out and every resolution passed by you will be read and listened to by all of us with the greatest respect and with the greatest interest. The wishes expressed by you and the suggestions you make will guide us in our future work as they have in the past.

I now wish to turn to the world situation in general and try to assess what changes there have been since last year. We should be deceiving ourselves if we were to say that there had been any diminution in

the Soviet threat. Indeed, in some ways, it may even have increased. There is, therefore, no reason for either complacency or slackness on our part. Allow me to review the elements of the situation one by one.

The Soviet Union continues to gain economic, technological and military strength. It is true that she, as well as China and some of the satellites, encounters great difficulties in food production and the management of agriculture. The laws of nature often refuse to submit to the laws of Marx and Lenin. It is equally true that the standard of living in the Soviet Union, not to speak of that of Communist China, continues to be miserably low compared with that of the West. Progress is painfully slow, thus often straining the patience of the Russian masses, as manifested in the disturbances in some parts of southern Russia last summer.

But let us not be misled by the undoubted shortcoming in the Soviet system into underrating the expansion of Soviet industrial power, the rapid and in some respects admirable achievements in the scientific and technical field, and the formidable military build-up which these have enabled the Soviets to achieve. We in NATO have, to be sure, considerably improved our military posture. Our alliance possesses a formidable deterrent in time of peace and impressive fighting power in the event of war. The Soviet leaders must realize this. They must also realize that if they were to force a conflict upon us, they might certainly inflict fearful damage and loss on the whole Western alliance, but they would also provoke their own total destruction. That is the balance on which the peace of the world precariously rests. But that balance is not a static thing. If we have not stood still, neither—we may be sure—has our adversary. That is why we cannot be content with our efforts, but must renew and redouble them.

Over the years, there has been a gradual change in the face of communism. Since the death of Stalin, there have been one or two cracks in the grim, monolithic facade. Here and there, a little freedom, a little light has been allowed to seep in. We in the West have watched these developments with interest and not without sympathy. Not one of us would grudge the Russian people some relaxation in the burden they bear. None of us but would be overjoyed if they could have even a fraction of the right and freedom we take for granted. We have no quarrel with them: our enemy is the system under which they are forced to live. There may have been what some people call a thaw. The Soviet leaders may indeed have realized that the human spirit, even after 40 years of despotism, can stand so much tyranny and no more. But let us have no illusions. The central structure of communism remains. If anyone is inclined to believe that there has been a change of heart, let him look at the wall in Berlin, and at the tragedy and shame it has brought.

We know, it is true, that the Communist empire has its ideological and political strains and stresses. We know too that what in the horrible jargon of kremlinology is called "polycentrism" (ugly subjects seem to generate ugly words) is more and more replacing the monolithic bloc of Stalin's day. We have no reason not to welcome this. Anything that may make for more variety and more independence behind the Iron Curtain is all to the good. Here again, however, we should not indulge in wishful thinking and we should not base our policies for today on what may—or may not— happen tomorrow. A less monolothic, less oppressive communism will not necessarily be a weaker communism. It may well be stronger, because more firmly based on public support: and indications are not lacking that this may be so.

So much for our Soviet adversary. Let me now briefly review our own position today compared to our situation last year. Economically, the Alliance as a whole continues to prosper and progress. Production in most countries of the Alliance is still at an all-time high, though the rate of growth in some of the major industrial countries has levelled off, and we have had one or two warnings—in the stock market for example—that we cannot take our present momentum for granted. Encouraging progress is being made in the economic and social development of those countries and regions in the Alliance which had hitherto lagged behind. In the case of Greece and Turkey, two consortia have been set up under the aegis of OECD. This development warrants new hopes for increased and better coordinated economic assistance to these two countries.

The Common Market has proved an outstanding success exceeding even the hopes of its well-wishers. Its radiation and attraction is felt in every part of the Western World and far beyond.

The determination of the United Kingdom Government to negotiate acceptable terms for its entry into the Common Market will, we hope, bear fruit before long. With the addition of Great Britain and other Western countries, and with the association of large parts of Africa, the Common Market would become one of the most powerful units in the world and an entirely new element in world affairs.

If we needed any reassurance on the importance of the Common Market, it would be amply provided by the reactions of the other side. First of all, the line was that co-operation among capitalists was doomed to failure owing to the contradictions of a system under which—as some eminent Marxist once said—if one capitalist announced his intention of hanging himself, the rest would compete with one another to sell him the rope. It was indeed embarrassing when in a Europe which seemed ruined by war, rent by dissension, and doomed, by all the rules of the Marxist game, to decadence and decline, our free economy not only refused to lie down and die, but staged a spectacular renaissance. Later, the Soviets seem to have admitted to themselves that the Common Market could not be laughed or vilified out of existence. They would still like to see it fail. They, and those who consciously or unconsciously play their game, are still trying to prevent its further extension and to misrepresent it to the underdeveloped nations of the world as a cunning device to perpetuate their colonial bondage. But for better or worse they have had to accept that it is a force to be reckoned with—and lived with.

Politically, our alliance is in good health. Khrushchev's hopes to divide us on the issue of Berlin have been disappointed. We have stuck together, and jointly we have stuck to our guns. Most recently the alliance has shown spontaneous and magnificent solidarity with the United States in the Cuban crisis. Other issues which threatened to divide us in the past have faded into the background. Intensive political consultation carried on over the years is beginning to show its fruit, not necessarily by producing unanimity on each and every issue—which is perhaps not essential or even desirable in a community of free peoples—but in creating a common pattern of thought and of reactions to political events around the globe. In other words, we are not only overcoming past divisions, but we are in full process of growing together into a true family of like-minded nations. In this respect the spectacular Franco-German reconciliation—a long-evolving process whose completion was symbolized by Dr. Adenauer's visit to Paris and General de Gaulle's visit to Germany—is in its way as positive and momentous an event for the alliance as President Kennedy's declaration on 4th July of this year on interdependence between the United States and Europe. Europe must unite. None of us here, I think, would gainsay that. But we must not allow the bonds of unity which are growing closer every day to divert us from our goal of a true Atlantic community, or allow any contraction or conflict to arise between the two objectives of European unity and Atlantic solidarity. The Atlantic Ocean must unite, and not divide, the free world.

As to the development and strengthening of our Military Establishment, I have already had something to say in connection with the recommendations of your conference of 1961. I would now like to go into this question in more detail because it is, after all, an essential element in any review of Western strength and achievements that we wish to make.

You are all aware that since the Oslo Conference of May 1961 the North Atlantic Council has been engaged in a thorough examination of NATO defense problems with a view to determining long-term planning and policies. In his opening address to you last year, Mr. Stikker described some of these problems, particularly those relating to the control of nuclear weapons, and also explained to you why the council had temporarily to interrupt this study in order to give the highest priority to the urgent build-up of our military forces in face of the Soviet threat in Berlin.

I should, first of all, like to assure you that the determination and solidarity shown by NATO countries after the construction of the wall in Berlin in August 1961 has in no way slackened and that as a result the efficiency and state of readiness of the forces under SACEUR's command has greatly improved since last year and will continue to improve. But we have still a long way to go before we can be sure that our shield of conventional forces is fully capable of playing its role in the overall deterrent to aggression.

There is another aspect of our work in NATO to which I would like to refer this morning, that is civil emergency planning.

We regard progress in the wide field of planning and preparing for war in the civil sectors as of vital importance. Civil emergency planning is an essential complement to the NATO military buildup.

If our preparations in the civil field are obviously inadequate, the credibility of the deterrent is lessened. If war should be forced upon us, effective preparations in the civil sectors, both nationally and internationally, offer the only practicable means by which our populations could hope to survive and to sustain the allied war efforts to a successful conclusion.

We recognize of course that national preparations must remain the responsibility of the individual member governments. We recognize also that financial, and in some cases psychological, considerations cannot but hinder the full implementation of the wide range of measures ideally required.

We now review annually the progress made both nationally and internationally, and a comprehensive but, I regret, secret report is prepared each year by the senior civil emergency planning committee. Each government will thus be able to judge the success or failure of our international efforts and the extent to which they and their fellow governments have met national goals.

I will not hide from you that much remains to be done, but I am satisfied that the tasks with which we are confronted are being tackled with energy and determination by a sound and satisfactory organization acting under the direct auspices and responsibility of the North Atlantic Council itself.

At the same time I would like to point out the importance that we attach to the aid you can give in this as in other fields. Your sup-

port for legislation and financial measures aimed at enabling your respective governments to prepare for war in the civil fields is vital to the success of our combined efforts.

I should like now to look further afield. In a world in which two powerful alliances maintain an uneasy equilibrium, the position of those countries which remain outside the two alinements, is clearly of cardinal importance. This applies both to those countries which have formally adopted a policy of nonalinement, and to those which, though their political alinement is clear, do not actually belong to any particular grouping. Developments in those third countries are of the greatest importance to our alliances and we must pay the closest attention to them.

With this in mind I should like to try to draw up a kind of balance sheet of developments favorable and unfavorable to the West in those parts of the world which are not covered by NATO or the Warsaw Pact.

In the Far East, we watch with satisfaction and confidence the growing economic power, the social and political stability, and the sense of international responsibility of Japan.

In southeast Asia, the Geneva agreement has put an end to the dangerous fighting in Laos, though we still have considerable misgivings about what seem to be circumventions, if not breaches, of the agreement by the Communists.

In South Vietnam, the bitter guerrilla warfare between pro-Western and Communist forces continues, though the massive aid given by the United States appears to have given the edge of advantage to the West.

By a strange reversal of fortune, India—the aggressor of last year—has herself become the victim of a massive, ruthless and determined aggression by Communist China. It is too early to say how the conflict will develop. But there can be no doubt that it will have profound and far-reaching effects. It will certainly disillusion the Indian leaders and the Indian masses still further about the true nature of communism. The Indian Communists themselves have been unable to find any justification for China's action. It may well shake to its foundations the whole philosophy of nonalinement on which the Indians and many others, following their example, have based their whole foreign policy.

Mr. Nehru himself has virtually admitted that for the past 15 years, India has been living in a fool's paradise. It has already created a major problem in Sino-Soviet relations. Can the Soviets continue to give economic and even military aid to a power which with the other half of the Communist world is in a state of undeclared war, and what will happen to their relations with China if they do?

The Middle East has remained relatively calm, except for the revolution in Yemen and the Kurdish rebellion in Iraq, which General Kassam appears to be unable to put down, and which may yet have wider repercussions.

In north Africa, the farsighted and courageous action of the French Government has ended the 7 years' nightmare in Algeria. It has opened the way for a new pattern of cooperation, on a basis of sovereign equality, between two countries whose fates have been closely linked for more than a century. It has afforded France the opportunity of resuming in the near future her rightful role in the military effort of our alliance. It is our earnest hope that the great work begun at Evian will continue and that the new Algeria will develop along democratic lines and in close friendship and cooperation with France.

In Africa, south of the Sahara, the process of decolonization has gone steadily and peacefully on.

The road from colonial dependence to full sovereignty is a hard one for both sides to travel. There have been difficulties, and there are bound to be many more. But all that has happened over the past year has confirmed the wisdom of the decision to end the colonial link in freedom, order, and friendship. Even in the Congo, the gradual emergence from chaos and civil war affords some hope that some measure of stability may return to that unhappy country. Such progress as has been achieved has been won against heavy odds. The Soviet bloc has been concerned only to exploit and intensify internal divisions. But with patience and goodwill, order may yet prevail.

To turn now to Cuba, the swift and courageous action of President Kennedy has foiled a major threat to the security of the West and the peace of the world. It is too soon to say how things may turn out. It may be that this brave and well-judged stand may have opened up new possibilities and new prospects. Many of us may think so. But in our relief that, this time, catastrophe has been averted let us not forget that negotiations between East and West have been burdened for too long by a legacy of all too well founded suspicions of Soviet intentions and all too blatant Soviet bad faith. The events of the past few weeks can only have added to that burden. It is hard to negotiate with confidence with an interlocuteur whose main weapon in debate is the lie direct.

While the credit for the outcome of the crisis must be given in full measure to the courage and steadfastness of one country, and indeed of one man, I feel certain that the hand of the President of the United States was greatly strengthened by the response of the Organization of American States and by the full support he was given by this alliance. Therein lies a lesson for the future.

On the whole, and despite the alarms and excursions of the past weeks, I think the picture of the uncommitted world emerging from the survey is an encouraging one. Decolonization has continued swiftly and in general peaceably. Gradually, some measure of order and stability seems to be emerging in the southern half of the world. And—perhaps most important of all—slowly, painfully, but nonetheless surely, the neutrals are beginning to understand the realities of the world situation and the realities of world power. The shedding of illusions is always a painful process. We have found that ourselves. It is likely also to be a long one. We shall need all our patience and all our sympathy. But if we keep our heads, and steadily and consistently pursue our policy of promoting the independence, the economic well-being and the social stability of the emergent countries, commonsense is bound to prevail in the end. The neutrals are learning fast. Sooner or later they will realize—as many of them do already—that neutralism only makes sense in a world in which the opposing forces are more or less evenly balanced: that the attempts to upset that balance come from one side and one side only; that they themselves could not survive in a world dominated by communism; and that they bear a heavy responsibility not to upset the balance in favor of those who are in truth the last real and unrepentant imperialists of today.

However, provided we have the willpower to see things through, there is good reason to hope that peace will be preserved and that in the long run our side will win the race. There are many signs and facts to encourage us. Our economic strength and with it our social stability continue to grow. In the scientific field, we are making great strides forward and the recent splendid successes of our U.S. ally in the space field give us hope that the headstart which the Soviets have had in this field will be gradually diminished and finally overtaken by the West. Politically, our solidarity and cohesion as allies are growing and the prospect of a permanent interdependence of a united Europe and a United States of America, opens entirely new vistas into a better future.

Our greatest handicap often seems to be our lack of confidence in our own strength and our skepticism about our own values. A more positive, a more offensive psychology appears to me the necessary complement to a defensive strategy in the military field. And let us never forget that the West is not only NATO, but all those who, whether they are formally associated with us or not, share our aspirations and our way of life. In resolutely pursuing its policy of peace through strength, this alliance is fighting their battle as well as its own.

Mr. Spaak, in a recent and most eloquent speech before the United Nations, appealed to the Soviets to recognize the peaceful character of the Western system and to show through deeds that they are in earnest with their slogan of peaceful coexistence. This speech and this appeal received one of the most thunderous ovations the United Nations General Assembly has witnessed. Will it receive any response? On the answer to that question hangs the whole future of the world.

We live in the midst of many and great dangers, but the dangers that beset us are matched by the opportunities within our grasp. Let us seize them boldly and advance to our goal of a world in which war shall be no more.

---

[From the Elkins (W. Va.) Inter-Mountain, Dec. 17, 1962]

### RANDOLPH SAYS UNITED STATES MUST INSIST ALLIES MEET OBLIGATIONS

Insistence by the United States that its partner governments of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization meet their defense obligations, is imperative in the belief of U.S. Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, who returned only recently from a trip to Europe and a visit to the Supreme Allied Headquarters in Paris.

Before leaving Elkins this morning, following a visit here on Sunday, the legislator indicated that America is 10 percent over its commitment for conventional forces, while many other countries in the alliance against communism (Soviet Russia) are below promised strength.

"It is a fact that the covenant has not been adequately met by several nations," declared Senator RANDOLPH, who stated that "we have been the bulwark in this cooperative effort and have reason to be critical of certain deficiencies of our allies. They have, of course, been weakened by some shortages of materials and manpower and they have not recovered from the devastation of actual war destruction. But the United States has been committing 10 percent of its gross national product to defense as Great Britain allocates but 7.4 percent which is a little more than is done in France. In West Germany, the figure is only 5 percent but there will be an increase soon in that crucial area of West Europe."

"We know that the average of 1.1 percent of population in the armed forces in the NATO nations as a group does not equal the 1.5 percent of America.

"A month ago in Paris at the Supreme Allied Headquarters, I was told by Gen. Lauris Norstad, top commander, that we must have a stronger conventional force if our deterrent shield is to command respect of the Communist leaders, I fully agreed with his experienced conviction and so stated in public addresses in several cities in West Virginia."

Senator RANDOLPH went on to stress that citizens of West Virginia are concerned that NATO be more effective and they have been

studying the cost in our budget of the alliance.

Later today at Salem College, the State's senior Senator will speak to the students there on the subject of "the alliance and our part in the organization."

"NATO," said the Elkins citizen, "is generally viewed by the public as primarily a military alliance. The success of this historically unusual venture is due in large part to the military shield which has prevented a Soviet takeover either by direct aggression or internal subversion, but there are other achievements which should be recognized.

"The fundamental objective of the alliance to maintain peace and stability having been achieved, NATO found itself forced to counter Soviet offenses in the political, economic and psychological areas. This led to purposeful cooperation, involving prior consultation among the nations in order to develop a common political front. Exchange of information and views before announcing a national policy has created mutual understanding and trust, especially as such a procedure forces each nation to consider and understand the point of view of its fellow nations before deciding on its own policy. Thus a degree of unanimity has been achieved, without sacrifice of national principle or national policy, unique in the history of the world.

"As a member of NATO, we are shareholders in a 15-power partnership for world peace—a cooperative effort which demands from each participant a strong sense of understanding, trust, and responsibility. And, since our effort is set in an alliance of sovereign and independent states, and since the degree of cooperation and agreement among the member governments will necessarily dictate its effectiveness, it is essential to the interests of the free world that we unceasingly try to reach understanding and accord.

"Though we attempt to maintain open and realistic diplomatic relations with nations the world over, it is in the scope of our NATO commitments that we perhaps meet our most challenging tests of loyalty, determination and resolve."

## Banking World Spotlights Hon. Henry S. Reuss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD today an article entitled "Banking's Spotlight on HENRY S. REUSS," which appeared in the January issue of Banking, a publication of the American Bankers Association.

Those of us who have served with Congressman REUSS on the Banking and Currency Committee know him to be an energetic and tireless worker for sound monetary and economic measures; he is indeed a battler for those things in which he believes. I know all of HENRY'S friends will be most interested in reading this most complimentary article:

BANKING'S SPOTLIGHT ON HENRY S. REUSS, MEMBER, HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE AND JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

HENRY S. REUSS, 50-year-old scion of Wisconsin German ancestors, is a Republican family's gift to the liberal wing of the Democrats in Congress.

A prominent member of the House Banking and Currency Committee and of the Joint Economic Committee, who by his probings of Fed and Treasury policies has attracted the notice of the banking world, Mr. REUSS in November won his fifth term in the House by a safe margin of 43,000. He campaigned partly on Cuba, but mainly on the need for a more dynamic economic policy and more vigorous export efforts. These may not all have been the issues the voters would have selected, but they seemed to like Mr. REUSS' leadership and gave him 63.3 percent of the total of ballots cast in his district.

HENRY REUSS is a battler for those things in which he believes. He fought in World War II, entering the service as a private and emerging from the war as a major with bronze battle stars for Normandy, central France, and Germany. In the Congress he fights for the liberal monetary and economic measures he deems necessary, although this brings him into inevitable clashes with the views of the more conservative school represented by Chairman Martin of the Fed.

Congressman REUSS paid no major attention to economics on his way through Cornell and Harvard Law School, but since college days he has read extensively on our central banking system, money and banking, and economic questions. He is chairman of the Joint Economic Committee subcommittee which is concerned with the balance of international payments.

"The commercial banking system plays an indispensable role in the United States," says HENRY REUSS. "The growth we need for our own welfare and for our world responsibilities can come only with a healthy banking system. Since the great depression, our banks have worked well, but there are at least two areas in which the House Banking and Currency Committee under Chairman PATMAN will take a long and deep look: (1) The laws governing the national banks cry for revision and improvement in many particulars; (2) the relationship of the Federal Reserve System to the Congress and to the executive branch needs attention. I believe the Fed should be independent, but also that it must play a responsible role.

"While I don't want the Executive to have the power to overrule the Fed, I do want the lines of authority fixed so that responsibility of decisionmaking won't be blurred and obscured. I think this needs to be the subject of a full-fledged study by the House Banking and Currency Committee, a legislative committee, unlike the JEC which has had many hearings," he continued. "If the public is to understand its government, it must know who makes decisions and why. In this matter the JEC has come to the end of its abilities. Now it is a matter for the legislative committee.

"As for the recommendations of the three interagency committees which have reported to the President on subjects dealt with by the commission on money and credit and others, we'll look at their recommendations. I'd welcome a broadly based Presidential program for reforms; but this does not relieve the Banking and Currency Committee from its constitutional duty to survey the Nation's needs and seek passage of needed laws. I feel a sense of urgency on this, as domestic and foreign policies are almost totally interdependent.

"Under Chairman PATMAN for the first time in recent history I expect the Banking Committee to study the entire field of money and banking and to draft and report appropriate legislation. Also for the first time in many years, I expect subcommittees with specified jurisdictions to be appointed. Congressman PATMAN will prove to be a vigorous, forthright, and responsible chairman."

Asked for his views on particular changes he favors in the banking system, Mr. REUSS explained: "I can't be very specific on the changes in the national banking system, since I need to do a lot more research and study. The one thing that I am clear on is that the present system of divided jurisdiction between the Federal Reserve, the FDIC, and the Comptroller of the Currency results in divided authority and responsibility, particularly in the field of mergers. Unified regulation should be the first order of business."

Mr. REUSS has been following money and banking not only on the two committees already mentioned, but also as a member of the House Government Operations' Subcommittee on Foreign and Monetary Affairs. Twice during the past year he has carried on individual inquiries on these subjects in Europe and has lectured before several German university groups. Mr. REUSS was one of several Members of the Congress who attended the International Monetary Fund meeting in Vienna in 1961.

In 1939–40 Mr. REUSS was assistant corporation counsel in Milwaukee County. Next he was with the OPA in Washington. In 1945 he was with the price control branch of the Office of Military Government for Germany. Later, before running for Congress in 1954, he held various public and private posts. Mr. REUSS explains how he got into politics very simply: "I didn't like the way the older generation was handling the world."

ONCE A REPUBLICAN

How did a Republican scion become a Democrat? "In the early 1950's Joe McCarthy dominated Wisconsin politics." How did he happen to land on the House Banking and Currency Committee? "Couldn't get Public Works or Foreign Affairs, my first preferences."

The Congressman's grandfather came here from Germany in 1848 as a youth of 18, soon had a job with the Marshall & Isley Bank in Milwaukee, and ultimately became its president. The bank, the oldest in the Northwest, is now Wisconsin's second largest bank. The Congressman's father also made his career with this bank and HENRY REUSS himself, during his college vacations, did stints there as a runner and as a teller in the transit department. Until he entered politics HENRY REUSS was a director of the bank.

ARTICULATE CONGRESSMAN

Mr. REUSS is one of the most articulate of Congressmen. Time magazine has called attention to his "energy, ability, and ideas." He is a leading Congressional conservationist. A former deputy general counsel in Paris for the Marshall plan, he is now a lieutenant colonel in the Infantry Reserve. Mr. REUSS is an enthusiastic outdoorsman; he likes to fish, hunt, hike, camp, sail, and play tennis with his wife and their four children.

The Wisconsin Congressman is keeping a close eye on banking. Bankers should keep an eye on him.

## Well Done, FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, while I am sure that all Americans are aware of and appreciate the great contribution being made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation to the safety and welfare of our

country, it is gratifying to note the praise of our newspapers concerning the recent accomplishments of the FBI during the year 1962. I am herefore pleased to call to the attention of the Members of Congress and the American people an editorial which appeared in the News-Dispatch, Michigan City, Ind., praising the work of the FBI:

WELL DONE, FBI

By custom, FBI agents toil in quiet anonymity, preferring effectiveness to personal glory. Consequently the public often is unaware how well these modern-day "untouchables" fight crime.

Appreciation of the FBI's remarkable record can be gleaned from Director J. Edgar Hoover's yearend report to Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy. Here, briefly, are a few of the things FBI men accomplished in 1962:

1. Apprehended 11,400 fugitives, compared with 10,668 in 1961; provided evidence which led to 12,700 convictions against 12,418 the prior year.

2. Ran up a total of fines, savings, and recoveries well over $200 million—considerably more than it costs to operate the FBI and much higher than 1961's $148.4 million.

3. Located 19,000 cars stolen and driven out of State—and 2,500 fugitive felons for local authorities.

4. Processed 23,000 fingerprint cards a day while maintaining an unmatched identification file that contains 165 million sets of prints from an estimated 77 million persons.

5. Made 236,000 scientific laboratory examinations of evidence for local police in all 50 States—without charge.

6. Assisted, upon request, in more than 3,600 local and regional police schools—and trained another 165 picked lawmen at the famed FBI National Academy, bringing the Academy's graduate total to 4,258 since 1935.

7. Furnished more than 100,000 items of criminal intelligence to other law-enforcement agencies, resulting in some 2,400 arrests and $32.5 million in recoveries—plus the smashing of an international dope ring and seizure of $20 million worth of illicit drugs.

On the security front, the FBI continued to enfeeble the Communists' American apparatus; nabbed three pro-Castro saboteurs and seized their cache of explosives; caught a Navy man passing military secrets to the Russians and developed evidence leading to the expulsion of several Communist bloc diplomats.

In addition, it was largely the FBI which turned up witnesses and information leading to conviction of the U.S. Communist Party as an organization for failure to register with the Attorney General—a decision which puts American Reds in a tighter straitjacket.

In the South, FBI agents turned up church burners who tried by intimidation to keep Negroes from the polls. In Chicago—for the first time in years—they brought gangland killers (of union official John Kilpatrick) to justice and ultimately to prison.

Impressive as it is, the FBI's record of accomplishment is not the only reason Americans should be grateful to Director Hoover and his quiet crimefighters. There are others even more important.

No police agency in the world is more scrupulously considerate of individual rights. None works more harmoniously with other lawmen. And rare indeed is the police force anywhere in the world which can match the FBI's dedication of purpose and incorruptibility.

If you feel, as we do, that these splendid public servants deserve a "well done," why not say so in a letter to the Director? The address is J. Edgar Hoover, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Washington, D.C.

## What Is Self-Determination?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Friday, January 18, 1963*

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the Savannah (Ga.) Morning News has editorially noted that the policy of self-determination subscribed to by the United Nations is often inconsistent with its actions. Cited as a case in point was the United Nations military venture to force Katanga's union with the Congo, and its failure so far to urge self-determination for the nations in Europe held under the iron heel of communism.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Savannah Morning News be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS SELF-DETERMINATION?

Many people may wonder, in the light of recent and current history, just what definition of "self-determination" is subscribed to by the United Nations and the United States.

Spokesmen of the U.S. Government, in accordance with this country's own founding, profess a heartfelt belief in independence and self-determination. They have supported the policy of self-determination in some cases so extreme that close allies have been alienated.

The United Nations, which is to say the controlling Afro-Asian and neutral bloc is committed by charter to freedom of people and to noninterference in the internal affairs of nations. The Afro-Asians have made a fetish of anticolonialism and continually espouse the principles of self-rule even though often ignoring the responsibilities which go with independence.

Yet what is the record of the U.N. and the United States in respect to self-determination? Katanga was denied even negotiation on the subject of independence and was invaded to force its union with the Congo in what many call a raw act of aggressive colonialism by the U.N. Goa and West New Guinea were not turned over to India and Indonesia by a vote on self determination; they were invaded and taken over by force or, as in the case of New Guinea, by threat.

In two of these cases, the United States and the U.N. were active participants in the actual denial of self-determination. In the other, both condoned conquest by force.

The record is even worse. The U.N. has yet to call for self-determination for the captive nations of Europe or to oppose totalitarian rule in Cuba or Communist invasions of Vietnam and India. It dropped its lukewarm criticism of the Soviet Union's suppression of Hungary.

The United States has done little better. Our Government soft-pedals its criticism of Russian colonialism and actually sponsored the desertion of Hungary. It has promised not to invade Cuba or to interfere with the flowering of a Communist state in the Western Hemisphere, even if that means discarding this country's historic principles which until now, no foreign power has dared to challenge.

Yes, there is reason to ask what the United States and the U.N. means when they pledge allegiance to the principles of self-determination. But there is an answer.

Self-determination means whatever the Afro-Asian bloc wants it to mean. It means, in most cases, berating the great powers of the West for their colonialism and ignoring the more deadly Soviet brand of the same evil. It means acceptance of aggression by members of their bloc and the turning away from any member, as in the case of India, who has been unfortunate enough to clash with the Communists.

Self-determination, as subscribed to by the Afro-Asians and uncommitted nations, is a self-serving hypocrisy, a policy as devious as their pro-Communist neutralism. Since these countries dominate the U.N. and have their own man in the Secretary-General's chair, their policy is naturally that of the U.N.

The reasons for this are clear. The Afro-Asians and so-called neutrals care for themselves and themselves alone. They have no fear of the West which will accept their hypocrisy and their criticism and still subsidize their irresponsible governments. The Communists are a different matter: Unwilling to give aid without something in return, scornful of world opinion, resentful of criticism, and quite adept at using force to get what they want. This kind of policy the neutrals understand and even admire.

What is not clear is the reasoning of the U.S. Government, which condones all this and allows the U.N.'s boldest hypocrites to set our foreign policy. No wonder the neutrals have little respect for us. Washington doesn't even practice self-determination itself.

## A Protest From the Rural Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. VERNON W. THOMSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 18, 1963*

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, an alert and perhaps indignant editor of a prominent weekly newspaper makes some pertinent observations about Secretary Freeman's complaints. Because of the relevancy to the farm policies being proposed, I submit it for the benefit of others:

A PROTEST FROM THE RURAL PRESS

U.S. Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman has complained that the smalltown newspapers in the West and Midwest are an impediment to the success of the Kennedy administration's farm program. This information was carried in a daily newspaper report printed Friday, January 4, 1962.

In a memorandum which he gave to President Kennedy at Palm Beach, Fla., last Thursday, January 3, Secretary Freeman referred to the "strongly GOP orientated press" and contended those newspapers were making it difficult to present to the farmers the claim that farm progress had been achieved the past 2 years due to efforts of the present national administration.

Of particular interest to residents of the areas mentioned by Mr. Freeman is his statement that, "The small towns of the West and Midwest where current farm programs have been most beneficial, seem to appreciate it the least."

It would almost seem that Mr. Freeman is convinced that small towners out here are an ungrateful lot—that they appear unable to recognize all the good things he is doing for them. What a sad day when folks don't know how much better off they are now that the ex-governor of Minnesota is doing the

major painting in the farm picture. What can logically be said about such a wealth of ingratitude?

The fact that there have been failures in the national farm administration, even despite the earnest, and no doubt sincere, efforts of Mr. Freeman—is certainly no secret. But what is most amazing is that Mr. Freeman thinks the smalltown newspapers to be largely responsible for rural people not appreciating what his Department is doing or attempting to do. His statement is surely one of the few left-handed compliments regarding the prestige and power of the rural press. While his statement may not be welcomed by most smalltown publishers (whether Democrat or Republican) it is a recognition to the degree that now, at long last, a high-placed official has found out that there are smalltown newspapers.

However, smalltown papers will not be panicked by the unprecedented statement of the Secretary of Agriculture. They will not be extremely nervous for the simple reason that the politicians owe a far greater debt of gratitude to the small rural papers than those papers owe to generations of politicians.

For years the smalltown papers have had to take it on the chin and the business mortality rate of the rural press is a grievous testimony to the growing forces of urbanization and misguided liberalism. And the economic difficulties of the small towns are not by any means limited to the newspapers in those towns.

First of all let's set the record straight. Who is most concerned about the economic welfare of farmers? At the top of that list, and rightfully so, are the farmers themselves. They head the list because their existence is at stake—and the changes in markets and expenses and taxes are of extremely vital concern to them and their families. The advantages which they can give their families depend entirely on the balance between income and expenditure. The situation is of far greater importance in rural areas than the most effective influence that has been exerted by politicians of several administrations.

Next in line among those concerned with farm conditions are the smalltown retailers, doctors, dentists, technicians, artisans, and all those who are dependent upon the patronage of the farmers. These people, who have not been a primary consideration in governmental economic programs, are more appreciative of anything that benefits farmers than any politician can ever know. If times are bad for farmers, they just as quickly become bad for those who sell to the farmers. Farm prosperity is always greatly wanted by all the people who live in small towns. The prices of milk, corn, cotton, wheat, livestock, poultry and eggs, vegetables, and fruits are far more critical in smalltown America than in any big city, including Washington. Policies affecting the economy, the freedom of the people, and the future of America's agriculture are also of much more importance to rural citizens than their concern for the popularity of one political party over another. If politicians have failed to appreciate this latter fact, then they are drifting out of harmony with their farm and smalltown constituents.

There are many reasons why rural conditions, which have caused the worry of many diverse farm organizations, do not go unnoticed by businessmen and other residents of small towns. What easy talkers in far-off places never seem to understand is that in rural areas farmers and small townsmen are of one and the same social-economic family. They go to the same churches. Their children attend the same schools. They belong to the same civic and patriotic organizations, to the same lodges, to the same service groups and to the same political parties. They are of similar ethnic stock in many areas. And, most important of all, in a very large number of rural communities, the farmers and townspeople are interrelated—and many of the townsmen are retired farmers. Add to all this the basic fact that rural people are just as good, loyal Americans as those alined with the powerful forces of mass unification and growing centralization and there seems mighty good justification for rural America to protest unjustified criticism directed their way.

The smalltown newspapers have no enmity toward the Department of Agriculture which most generally moves in an orbit far removed from the editorial paths of the weekly press. But newspapers in any area have a right to speak in defense of their own integrity when an undeserved missile is hurled at them—in a sweep that has the potential of alienating them from their rural friends and neighbors. Such denunciations, if not refuted, could be injurious to the life and progress of the smalltown press and also the advancement of the people and communities served by that press. For this reason, all those interested in such newspapers must register their protest without any equivocation, no matter how much they may regret differing with any governmental official.

A general criticism of bureaucrats is that they often make neat plans for supposed progress and then become angry or petulant when the citizenry fails to become enthusiastic about those plans. Maybe Mr. Freeman's observation is really a compliment to independent-thinking farmers—an acknowledgement that after carefully sifting the facts many have refused to comply with the Department's plans, basing their decision on what they consider best for themselves and their families. Is it possible that thousands of rural people are utterly wrong in their lack of acceptance of some of the Department's programs? Or is it possible that there are policies in the national agricultural program that rightfully should be corrected?

Mr. Freeman received a very great honor when he was chosen to be U.S. Secretary of Agriculture. He was chosen because the President had hope that Mr. Freeman possesses the qualifications to lead American agriculture out of the many ills that sorely beset it. Certainly, it must have been a nettling disappointment to hear the Secretary even indirectly blame the rural press and small towns for the lack of further success of certain programs advocated by his Department.

All serious-thinking persons in State or Federal Governments know of the loyalty (in peace as well as wartime) of the smalltown press in carrying news of governmental and political importance to their readers. In what way then, can Mr. Freeman's criticism of smalltown newspapers be justified?

## Effective Speaker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GRAHAM PURCELL
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, January 18, 1963*

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, the well-known Capitol Hill weekly newspaper Roll Call carried an editorial in yesterday's edition titled "Effective Speaker." I believe it reflects the feelings of most Members of Congress concerning our distinguished Speaker, the man we have come to know and love as an outstanding and effective leader and a true and valued friend. The editorial follows:

EFFECTIVE SPEAKER

We are getting annoyed at the daily papers' constant harping about Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK's alleged lack of leadership. Some 50 years ago a Speaker was cut down to size when his tyrannical leadership became too strong for his colleagues to stomach. Speaker Rayburn ruled with an iron hand, but in his final years he had lost much of his absolute influence and suffered several reverses on major points.

Congressman MCCORMACK became Speaker following the death of a man who had served longer than any other Speaker of the House. Many oldtimers were chomping at the bit to assert their independent thinking, as well they should.

The record will show that Speaker MCCORMACK has racked up an impressive score of major victories, accomplished in a manner constant with the type of leadership that should be exercised in a body of independent legislators.

To say that he is not an effective leader because one Congressman who aroused the ire of several factions of his party failed to gain a seat on an important committee is unrealistic analysis.

The Speaker has the respect and fidelity of his colleagues. And because he is not one to abuse the power of office, he will maintain both, gaining in the process their admiration and devotion.

## Grazing on Lands Managed by Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANK E. MOSS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Friday, January 18, 1963*

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech made by Utah County Commissioner George Buzianis at the annual meeting of the National Association of Counties in December 1962. This speech deals with grazing on the lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service. It is timely and interesting.

As one who has long been interested in county government and who recognizes the effectiveness of our counties, I am extremely pleased with the concern being shown by county officials in effective administration of public lands.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY TOOELE COUNTY, UTAH, COMMISSIONER GEORGE BUZIANIS, AT THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES' GRAZING, WATER, AND REVENUE CONFERENCE IN LAS VEGAS, NEV., DECEMBER 11–13, 1962

I am very happy to have been able to accept Mr. Stearn's invitation to participate in NACO's grazing, water, and revenue conference. The title of my talk today will be "A County Commissioner's Interest in Public Grazing Lands." I don't profess to be an expert but I will do my level best to bring to you a county commissioner's view-

point on this subject. I am sure most of you know the definition of an "expert"—that is just an ordinary man who is far away from home.

One might say that public lands have no direct concern of public officials because they do not directly support the local property tax structure. That statement is entirely wrong. We as county commissioners have a great deal at stake in this matter. We are concerned with the problems which relate to the productive use of the resources of our public lands. The economy of many Western States counties is dependent upon the use of these public grazing lands.

Before I proceed any further on this matter I would like to present to you some figures on this subject "grazing." It is astounding to note that one-fifth of the land in the United States is used as cropland. Somewhat over one-fourth is in grassland, pasture, and range. One-third is in forest. If grassland and forest land used for grazing are included, about 60 percent of all lands in the United States are in crop and livestock production. If all forest land was included, the area for agriculture use would be approximately 80 percent of the land area. It is interesting to note that grassland, pasture, and rangelands were 22 million acres lower in 1959 than in 1930. Why? Much of this change was due to forest use and some nonagriculture uses. Also conservation and soil bank programs have had some effect on this decrease. From 1950 to 1960 there have been approximately a million acres a year of agriculture lands being used for urban expansion, highways, airports, and so forth.

Most of the country's crop, pasture, and range production is on private lands.

Now let us see how much of this agriculture land is federally owned or administered by a department of the United States.

Federally owned lands make up 34 percent of the land area in all of the 50 States. The greatest majority of this land is in the western part of the United States. This land is in timber and grazing uses and also in mineral development. It is also used for recreation, water development, and wildlife.

Of the 765 million acres of federally owned land in the United States, 483 million acres are in forest or grazing land. The federally owned lands are classified in two groups: public domain which consists of 714 million acres or 94 percent, and land that was acquired by purchase or other means which amounts to 51 million acres or 6 percent. It may be of interest to note that the State and local governments own only a total of 121 million acres or 5 percent of the land area in the United States.

Grazing is the largest single use of agricultural land. The gross income from cattle and sheep alone in 1960 was well over $12.5 billion. There are approximately 10 million head of deer, elk, and antelope that also obtain forage on these ranges and pastures which also has a great effect on the local economy. In the past years there have been a continuous cut in grazing permits on Bureau of Land Management and forest lands which has affected the economy in most western counties who are dependent on agriculture as their key source of revenue.

I have taken the time to find out just what the economic value of the Utah cattle industry has to Utah's economy. Just 1 year ago the University of Utah's staff of the bureau of economic and business research made a very thorough study.

The total cash receipts from farm marketing have been running about $160 million a year in Utah. Of this, 78 percent comes from livestock and livestock products. Forty-eight million or 30 percent of this total comes from cattle and calves. Actually cattle and calves are the single most important agricultural product produced in Utah. Approximately 25 percent, or 40 million, of this total comes from sheep.

Another way to evaluate the industry is to examine the number of cattle and calves on farms, the number of animals produced each year and the trends of production in the cattle industry compared with other important industries of the State. In January 1961 there were 726,000 cattle and calves on Utah farms. If the count were taken in the summer at the seasonal peak rather than the low it would be higher than the figure I have cited. According to the 1959 census of agriculture we have in Utah 18,000 farms, 13,500 of these farms have cattle and calves. Keeping this 13,500 figure in mind and compare it with the following: we have in the State only about 700 mining firms; about 3,700 construction companies; only 1,400 manufacturing establishments; 10,000 retail and wholesale stores; 2,000 banks, finance, real estate offices and insurance companies. Altogether we have a total of approximately 25,500 nonagriculture businesses in Utah, or only about twice as many as we have farms with cattle and calves. The value of this industry is approximately one-half billion dollars, as compared to the value of all airlines, trucklines, gas and other pipelines, power companies, railroads, telegraph and telephone companies which amount to just a little less than $1 billion.

The net contribution to Utah's income stream from the cattle industry alone was over $63 million in 1961.

These figures alone indicate the importance of the cattle industry to the economy of the State of Utah. Most of these cattlemen depend upon the grazing lands administered by the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management.

Note: Utah doesn't rank with the top half of Western States in livestock production.

Not being critical of the actions taken by the Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service in this matter and realizing that there is definitely an over grazing problem and our range conditions are depleting very rapidly, the question now is what are the Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service going to do to correct this problem. They cannot go on forever making cuts and eventually do away with grazing on public lands. Livestock people everywhere who depend upon Federal lands on which to graze are very much troubled by the present day trends. It could well mean that many livestock men could be out of business before too many years if the present cutting trend continues.

Now back to the question, What are the two Federal agencies, the Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service, doing to correct this problem? Several years ago a large group of Senators and Congressmen called to the attention of the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior the decline in range use because of the deterioration of Federal rangelands. They felt there had been no comparable range appraisals. They also felt there was a need to coordinate range development programs and to develop data on the character and quality of our range resources.

Last year the Senate Committee on Appropriations directed the Secretaries to conduct a trial program of public land range appraisals. There were three areas selected and they were areas administered both by the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service. This study was not only for grazing purposes but also for watershed, wildlife and other important uses. I might add at this time the areas selected were in Alamosa, Colo., Dillon, Mont., and Lakeview, Oreg.

Selection of the sample area within each State was contingent upon three basic requirements: (1) Presence of considerable acreages of rangelands administered by the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management; (2) several representations of broad classes of range operations using Federal lands; (3) existence of data relative to the needs of the range appraisals.

In July 1962, the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior released the findings of the so-called pilot range study.

This data was assembled on factors important to management of these lands. These factors include area and suitability for livestock grazing, past and present management, range condition and trend, current and potential grazing capacity, range use by livestock and wildlife, and existing and needed conservation practices and improvements.

These areas varied in elevation from 4,200 feet to 13,000 feet. The vegetation varied from sagebrush ranges in the lower elevations to the timbered mountain slopes. The three areas studied contained 14,571,850 acres. The Federal Government being the largest owner of the land in each of the areas.

Although the livestock industry in all three areas is dependent upon the public rangelands, all of the livestock industry does not use these public lands. Some operators depend solely upon private lands. Although most operators had a combination of Federal lands and private lands to maintain a year-round operation.

Capacities in these areas were estimated through use of standard methods of range inventory and analysis and were expressed in animal unit months. An animal unit month is defined as one cow unit grazing for 1 month. Five sheep were considered equal to one animal unit. It might be of interest to note in the study areas that Colorado had a total grazing load decrease of 46 percent in the last 10 years, Montana, a 16-percent decrease in 15 years and Oregon a 19-percent decrease in the last 10 years.

It was found that range improvement practices now in force have proved practical and necessary in the three study areas. This being fencing, stock water development, range seeding, control of less desirable brush and weeds, access roads and trails, boundary markings and pest control. The ultimate result of this study showed that all areas need more improvement practices than now exist. There was a definite need of more fencing and more stock watering facilities and last but not least a continued increase in range seeding to convert depleted ranges into productive grazing lands. It pointed out that areas were the vegetation and the soil stability conditions were poor or very poor, the trend was always downward. These study areas showed they had a potential increase in animal unit months from 11 to 41 percent above current capacities providing there were better management and range improvements. You might note that even this potential figure would not equal the cuts made in the past 15 years in these same areas. I feel this study has been very beneficial.

Now the thing that troubles me more than anything is the cost estimated by these two Federal agencies to make this study on all the lands. Now don't take me wrong; I am not opposed to these studies. There have questioning—and this is strictly personal—the cost to make these studies. There have been two procedures suggested. One estimated to require 5 years at a cost of $25 million. This would provide both a generalized appraisal of resources condition and a complete area-by-area inventory useful for administration. The alternative route would require only 5 years at a cost estimate of $7 million and provide only a general appraisal of relative low acuracy.

Now, after talking to some so called range specialists and Bureau of Land Management personnel I am under the impression that this information is available at the present time from Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service districts. At the present time the Bureau of Land Management conducts a continuous 5-year inventory program of the range conditions and I am sure that each

district manager in a short while could plan out in detail what areas should be improved. This could be done in much less time than 5 years and much less money than $25 million.

While I am on the subject of grazing on public lands I would like to comment briefly on the much discussed subject "Grazing Fees on Public Lands." In February of this year the Department of Interior announced there would be no increase in the present rate of grazing fees for 1962. The present rate is 19 cents per animal unit month. Now bear this in mind, that means one cow can graze for one month on public grazing lands for 19 cents. Five sheep which are considered one animal unit month can also graze for 19 cents per month or 3.8 cents per sheep. This fee was set about 28 years ago under the Taylor Grazing Act. I am sure that these fees have not increased proportionately with other costs.

I am sure that much time and thought has been given by the Department of the Interior on grazing fees in the past 10 months. According to Assistant Secretary of Interior John Carver, Jr., in his report at the Albuquerque meeting of the National Advisory Board he requested that the Board come up with a plan for scheduled moderate upward adjustments designed to reach mutually agreed upon standards. A plan suggested would have the Department of Interior fix a minimum and maximum fee, allowing the local districts grazing advisory boards to recommend adjustments of fees within this range based on individual circumstances. One feature of his plan would permit the local districts to retain the amounts collected above the minimum and use them for range improvements within that district. I am sure that most sound livestock operators would welcome such a program.

In summarization:

1. I have shown the amount of public land used for grazing and the value of this grazing to our local economy.

2. Local government depends greatly on assessment of livestock that graze upon these public lands for revenue.

3. We as county officials are deeply concerned with these continuous cuts in grazing allotments.

4. We urge modern methods of range improvements to continue at a much faster pace.

In closing, I would like to commend the Department of Interior and Secretary of Interior Udall's decision to increase the members of the State multiple-use advisory boards and include members of county and State governments. In the past, these boards have been known as grazing advisory boards. Membership was limited to livestock men and wildlife representatives.

Secretary Udall's announcement provides the first opportunity for county government to be represented on these important State advisory boards, whose functions have now been expanded to include all phases of public land management.

## Water Resources and Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, January 18, 1963*

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues in this great body are well aware of my devotion to the cause of the full development of our wealth of natural resources. Perhaps, at times, some of my distinguished friends have puzzled over the preeminent position in which I regard our Nation's water resources. Recently, one of the recognized authorities on water resources, William H. Nelson, the associate editor of the Grand Junction (Colo.) Daily Sentinel, published a series of three articles dealing with some of the problems that are challenging some of our water-short areas. For a brief glimpse at how wide-ranging these problems can be, I recommend to my colleagues the final portion of Mr. Nelson's series.

WATER RESOURCES AND UNITY
(By William H. Nelson)

If water is so scarce, why continue to build irrigation projects?

With farm surpluses costing taxpayers billions not only for purchases but also for storage, why bring more land under cultivation?

Why not use the water still available in industry?

Magazine writers periodically ask these questions and provide answers critical of the reclamation West.

The answer, so far as western Colorado is concerned, to the first question is that using water to grow crops is the only way available at present to establish firm rights to the use of water.

The answer to the second is that reclamation projects do not produce surplus crops.

It is hard to convince easterners of this fact, but it is true.

Industry isn't ready yet in western Colorado to use big amounts of water. Oil shale development is still in the future, and coal hydrogenation may be even further off. Coal will probably be put to use first in thermal electrical generation plants.

If industries were ready to start diverting from streams, there would be less emphasis on irrigation.

A fact which makes the situation more encouraging for the future is that when an industry moves into an area or when a residential development springs up, the amount of water used for farming is about the same as that needed by industry and homes. Water rights acquired for irrigation can be transferred by purchase to industry and municipalities.

With eastern Colorado groups devising new and more fantastic schemes to take water through the Continental Divide, western Colorado water users must prove to the courts they have put water to use to get absolute water decrees.

The lower basin States, California, Arizona, and Nevada, are anxious to use any water which Colorado or other upper basin States do not use. Western Colorado citizens must put the water to use as quickly as possible to perfect and keep rights.

Many farmers and ranchers in western Colorado need dams and canals to increase their supplies of water for irrigation of land now under cultivation. Changes in climate have reduced the precipitation, and the farms and ranches need supplemental supplies.

The Bureau of Reclamation is paying more attention to water for industry and municipalities, but the effort is meeting with considerable criticism from easterners who feel they are subsidizing competition for themselves. They don't look upon reclamation as a national investment that brings in new taxes, creates new business, and helps stabilize the economy. Reclamation farming is more diversified than one-crop farm economies of other sections of the Nation.

A change in criteria—rules, regulations, and procedures—for passing judgment on reclamation projects may result in approval of some projects which would have been rejected under the old A–47 set of rules used throughout the Eisenhower administration.

Demands by Mexico for additional Colorado River water are a threat to future western Colorado projects. The fact that the matter might be submitted to an international court of arbitration group or the possibility of the Kennedy administration being magnanimous to placate Mexico and impress Latin America worries Colorado water men.

Another factor in the speed in which potential western Colorado reclamation projects can be translated from ideas and plans to structures of dirt, concrete, and steel is the attitude of the new Colorado administration of Governor John Love. If Love should openly oppose reclamation or just drag his heels, project promoters will experience additional difficulties in Washington.

How well western reclamation States work together in Congress is perhaps the most important factor, even though one of the least understood. Representative WAYNE ASPINALL was sharply critical of western Congressmen who supported only projects from their own States or own districts and voted against other projects or at best were only lukewarm in support.

How well interstate compacts on administration of rivers work determine in part how must cooperation our neighboring States will give us in backing our projects. Difficulties over the Rio Grande compact, for instance, threaten to cause New Mexico and Texas to oppose openly western Colorado projects.

Promoters of projects face many obstacles. They must find ways of avoiding as many as possible and of overcoming those they must hit head-on. Unity among western Colorado residents is essential, and unity among the reclamation States is also a must. Achieving unity at both levels will require tact, diplomacy, and clear thinking.

## Management's Problems in a Dynamic World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, January 18, 1963*

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, we frequently read that our railroads should do more to take advantage of modern technology, research, and development in order to improve their position. However, I doubt whether there is a general understanding of the great strides which the railroad industry has actually made in research, development, and technology; industry leaders have demonstrated exceptional enterprise and initiative.

Mr. Alfred E. Perlman, president of the New York Central System, discussed this challenge and related considerations in an important address delivered here in Washington, D.C., last November before the American Institute of Industrial Engineers. Entitled "Management's Problems in a Dynamic World," Mr. Perlman's address met with great acclaim in the press and elsewhere. One columnist, Mr. Frank C. Porter, writing in the Washington Post of November 2, had this to say, in part, about Mr. Perlman's speech:

His plea for greater understanding of Government was perhaps the strongest made by a leading executive since the row over an

abortive steel price increase brought a wide rift between the Kennedy administration and much of the business community last April.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby submit the complete text of Mr. Perlman's address so that others may have the benefit of his thoughtful discussion of the industry's responses to the challenges of today's society:

MANAGEMENT'S PROBLEMS IN A DYNAMIC WORLD

(By Alfred E. Perlman)

I want to speak today about management's problems in a dynamic world.

Our world is characterized by constant activity and change, which is a result of the explosive growth of science and technology.

We stand at the dawn of a new age. Through a second industrial revolution, we will lengthen lifespans, create more leisure, produce a higher standard of living, and provide increased economic security. This revolution, utilizing the automated machine controlled by the computer, will eliminate much of the human monotony and drudgery of mass-production industry. For the first time in history, great numbers of people will have the opportunity to develop and use their highest abilities.

The new technology has already placed in the hands of management the means to overcome one of its major problems, the problem of how to increase productivity. This problem has always been with us, but today it is of far greater importance than ever before.

We must increase our productivity just to maintain our present standard of living. Our total population is increasing at a faster rate than our labor force. Young people are staying in school longer, and older people are retiring earlier and living longer. By 1975, we will have to nearly double the amount of goods and services produced by each worker.

Secondly, we must increase productivity to offset long-range inflationary pressures. Even with continued high employment and without a traditional business depression, it is obvious that inflation can effectively and silently destroy the real buying power of millions of people.

Thirdly, we must increase productivity to meet the growing economic challenge from other nations. In the years ahead, virtually everything we produce will be sold, even in our own country, in competition with products moving in international trade. Thus, the efficiency, or the lack of it, of our own industrial establishment will decide whether or not we hold present markets and move into new ones.

Although we now have the means to increase productivity, or are developing them rapidly, the problem is not just a technological one. We have developed our technology to the point where we can do almost anything we desire with matter. But the rapid accumulation of scientific technique has not been matched by a corresponding improvement in the sphere of human and group relations. Our sociology has not kept pace with our technology. We may find ourselves unable to utilize our technological advances, unless we are also able to advance in the social sphere.

Technology deals with material things, while management deals with both material things and human beings. Thus, management, in its efforts to increase productivity through technological innovation, must take into account the human factors involved in such advances. To do this, management must learn to communicate with many diverse groups.

Let me describe a management problem resulting from the disparity between what we are able to do technologically but which we are unable to do because of social factors.

The technology to develop crewless trains is available today. Such trains would give us great savings through higher efficiency and lower wage costs. But, at the present moment, we are not able to operate such trains, primarily because of labor contracts and State laws—unjustified by today's technology—which require a specified number of crewmen on each train.

It is clear from this instance—and I could cite many others—that enlightened labor and enlightened management must communicate with each other, in order to achieve mutually satisfactory solutions to the problems of labor in our modern society. We must increase understanding and cooperation. For certainly, as productivity is increased—and, as I have said, it must be increased—some jobs will be eliminated and some will be radically changed.

The new age will need more technologists, more highly skilled people than we have today. These people will come from today's labor forces. We must seek to create a widespread understanding of the fact that as each individual increases his skill he will deserve added prestige and a higher income. After all, the same thing happened during the first industrial revolution, which raised the manual laborer to the semiskilled worker of today. Today's semiskilled worker is certainly tomorrow's skilled technologist, who will enjoy the benefits of increased productivity.

Of course, business leaders who intend to communicate effectively with any group must remember that communication is a two-way process. If management wants to be understood, it must first understand the views of others. If it wants to be heard, it must listen. And if it wants others to support its aims, it must attempt to support the aims of others.

Thus, management must realize that, before it can propose acceptable employee programs, it must understand its employees' problems. Only then, will it be equipped to ease worker adjustment caused by technological change.

The art of effective communication also applies to a second important area—government relations. As cybernation produces increased interdependence between producers, consumers, and the government, it is clear that greater centralized control will arise. Businessmen will find it increasingly essential to understand the expanding role of goverment in our economy. The most successful managers will be those who know how to communicate their needs to the various governmental legislative and regulatory agencies, and who understand the functions and inner processes of government. Communication and understanding will enable them to utilize the activities of government as an aid to their own business operations.

We should not be blind to the fact that there often exists a true community of interest between Government and private business. Government, which spends about a third of our gross national income, will have a real and legitimate interest in certain facets of business. And, certainly, it is right for businessmen, who occupy such a pivotal position in our industrial society, to seek to counsel with those who set public policy and enact law.

The American Telephone & Telegraph Co. is an outstanding example of an organization that knows how to communicate effectively its policies and objectives to a wide range of audiences. It has representatives in hundreds of communities explaining their company's intentions and actions. With A.T. & T., this is a 24-hour a day program. As a result, the company has the public on its side on most important issues. And, even though it is a true monopoly, it enjoys the confidence and support of Government.

In recent years, my own industry has learned to present its legitimate interests more effectively to the public and the Government. Our efforts were instrumental in securing the passage of the Transportation Act of 1958, which was the first major revision of policies that had been in effect since the days of the railroad monopoly. Legislative reform was long overdue.

We are now experimenting with freight rates for the first time in history and getting a pat on the back from the Government for doing so. We also feel that the President's excellent message on transportation was influenced by more effective communication between Government and industry. This message indicated a real awareness on the part of Government of the many inconsistent and unnecessary regulations under which the American transportation industry must operate. The President referred to a "chaotic patchwork of * * * obsolete legislation and regulation * * * which does not fully reflect either the dramatic changes in technology of the past half century or the parallel changes in the structure of competition." No other President in recent history has spoken so strongly or truly concerning our industry.

The recent report of the Presidential Commission on Railway Labor, which upheld many of the views of management, is one more instance of the impact of effective communication with Government.

However, because my industry was a long time awakening to the need for real communication, we still must endure unnecessary and restrictive regulation in many areas. Concerning most of our rates, we are treated as if we were still a monopoly, even though we have only 3 percent of the total passenger business and 43 percent of the total freight. Every State has a railway regulatory commission, despite the fact that the Federal Government's Interstate Commerce Commission exercises a firm control over all our operations. In the State of New York, we have three regulatory bodies which must approve our actions. And we have been unsuccessful in some cases in securing permission to price our services or reduce our costs to the point where we can make a reasonable profit. In Albany, for example, we still are not allowed to move our passenger station a block and a half, even though it would free valuable land for first-class development and save hundreds of thousands of dollars annually for the New York Central.

But we are narrowing these inequities, and the prime tool we are using is communication with a wide range of diverse groups.

The third important management problem centers on marketing. As productivity is increased, it is obvious that managers must employ the true concepts of marketing—as distinguished from merely selling—if they are to distribute the flood of goods produced by a cybernated economy. Marketing takes into full account the needs of the customer, whereas selling considers only the needs of the seller himself. We must increasingly tailor the product to fit the specific needs of the customer. Increased sales, resulting from customer-oriented production and distribution, will create more jobs and income for many people.

In line with this need, 2 years ago the New York Central completely revamped its own marketing operations. We realized that we could expand our market only if we fully understood the business and the needs of our present and potential customers. We set up a marketing industry planning department with specific responsibility to make detailed studies of particular industries and individual shippers, and to act as a logistics consultant for customers. It coordinates the Central's own efforts to develop and sell new services. Working with other groups, including our market research and industrial development departments, this new organ-

ization was primarily responsible for the establishment of a whole new market for the Central—the transportation of automobiles, which had been moving by truck over the highway.

I cite this as an example of the kind of marketing we are going to need as the second industrial revolution progresses. We are going to have to find markets; we are going to have to create markets; and we are going to have to develop new products and services to satisfy old and new needs.

Of course—and I want to emphasize this—managerial freedom to move forward into the new era will be of little use unless management maintains its own energy and creativity. This is the fourth major problem management now faces.

This creativity will be difficult to maintain, since cybernation will place a premium on conformity and standardization. As more and more companies become linked by interdependent systems of production and distribution, the mental ability to see the whole picture may be difficult to acquire. The tendency may be to rely too much upon computers, in order to eliminate the possibility of human error. Carried to extremes, this could lead to a programed mediocrity pervading all facets of life.

We must preserve the ability to think and the initiative to act, in spite of the trend toward pushbutton operations. This is especially true in relation to the traditional training ground for new executives, the area of low middle-management, which is likely to have many of its functions taken over by computers. Thus, we must guard against doing away with the one place where creative People can acquire knowledge and skill. We must preserve autonomous, decentralized operations wherever possible—despite the centralizing tendencies of cybernation—so that we will maintain the freedom for creative individuals to express and exploit their own ideas.

We must find and develop intelligent, decisive people to fill management ranks—the kind who will be so necessary if we are to increase productivity, communicate with many diverse groups, and create the marketing innovations essential to the second industrial revolution. We can maintain closer contact with educational institutions, in order to advise them concerning the type of education needed in the evolving world of business. We can institute internal training programs, to upgrade our own people. We can guard against inbreeding in executive groups, by bringing in people from other industries. And we can delegate more responsibility to younger people, who have greater drive, energy, and ambition.

Management must also create incentives that will attract and reward the right kind of management candidates. The traditional incentive of higher pay for greater responsibility has been weakened by our income tax laws. What happens to a creative person's initiative, when he realizes that the next salary increase may mean the same or even less take-home pay? But, even though our tax situation is not what it should be, we can devise incentives to attract creative people.

The ambitious, talented person sometimes considers money a secondary goal. One may want more prestige. Another, more power. And a third, the freedom to act on his own initiative. Whatever the incentive may be, it is the responsibility of management to find and offer it to the people it needs. To do this, the successful manager must spend a tremendous amount of energy gaining an understanding of what motivates people—even though there are no unchanging rules concerning human behavior, as there are in the world of science. In our dynamic world, managers must acquire the experience, knowledge, and skill to promote and expand human creativity.

To increase productivity will require more than just technological knowledge—it will require the ability to deal with people. As Government becomes more influential and as centralized computer control becomes more prevalent, we must make even stronger efforts to develop—not the common man, the organization man—but the uncommon man, the creative man. He's the one who will lead the way into the new age.

We face no insurmountable obstacles. We have the ability to meet the problems I've outlined today. And, in meeting them successfully, I believe we will be creating a world far better than the one we've known. We no longer face a geographical or technological frontier; we face a human one. On this frontier, we will find our greatest challenges and gain our greatest rewards.

---

## Going Now and Paying Later

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Friday, January 18, 1963*

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a column entitled "Going Now and Paying Later" written by Jenkin Lloyd Jones and published in the Wednesday, January 16, Washington Evening Star. I commend this column to the attention of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOING NOW AND PAYING LATER

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

The American people have taken first class passage on a ship bound from Buffalo to the Big Rock Candy Mountains via the Niagara River. So far there have been cocktails and canapes and caviar for just about everybody.

You get a lot of funny people on a cruise, of course. Occasionally, some loudmouth has started running around the deck waving a chart, calling attention to the gradually increasing current, and pointing excitedly to that attractive cloud of mist up ahead. But the rest of the passengers have thrown these alarmists overboard. Anyone with a lick of sense knows that the faster the current the quicker we'll get to where we're going.

Not only is the ship traveling faster than we thought it would, but it is lighter, too. It used to be loaded down with a lot of gold, but most of that is gone. There was the cost of protecting our friends abroad who would rather not go to the expense of protecting themselves. And there was foreign aid.

And then some of our newly prosperous pals from Europe came aboard and hauled away the gold on which they had a claim. It was really funny to see them wrestling the heavy ingots ashore when we would have been glad to give them our paper dollars as surety for our debts to them. You would almost think they doubted the future value of our dollars.

We've got a pretty quarrelsome crowd aboard. Every few minutes the propellers quit turning or the water doesn't run in the faucets or the deckhands throw down their swabs and paintbrushes. The crew wants easier work and more money. The passengers want more service, bigger staterooms, fancier meals, and cheaper tickets. And the captain says everybody is right.

The U.S. Government will end this fiscal year 1963 next June 30 with a deficit of about $8 billion. The President's economic advisers had, in contrast, forecast a surplus of about half a billion for the same period. Never has the arithmetic been so far off.

Yet the President is pushing a sweeping program of tax cuts. He makes the point (and he couldn't be righter) that the tax burden is now so great that it is slowing down the economy's expansion. In other words, taxes have removed so much of the incentive to take risks and earn profits that we are not producing as well as we might or creating jobs or providing new opportunities for our young people. Amen.

But, at the same time, there is no inclination to cut Government spending. For fiscal 1964 it looks as though we're going to have a $100 billion budget. This will be greater than in the peak years of World War II. The national debt limit, now at $308 billion, will have to be raised this spring as usual. If we honestly added in the unfunded actuarial liabilities for social security, the figure would be about $65 billion higher.

Our trouble is that we can't tell the difference between our needs and our wants any more. That devilish word "need." We need low cost housing. We need to be first on the moon. We need interstate highways. We need medicare. We need more aid for education. These are all desirable things. But change each "need" to "want" and you get closer to the truth. A need is a necessity. A want is a desire. We are being drowned in our druthers.

And, simultaneously, we are becoming rebellious about paying the cost of what we have. Of course, we haven't been quite paying the cost. The steady progression of the national debt is eloquent testimony to our refusal to meet our bills. But, as the President correctly asserts, even though we have taxed ourselves too little to meet our expenditures, we have taxed ourselves too much. The fires of enterprise are getting smothered and the steam gauge may soon be dropping.

What is the way out? You'd never guess—unless you've been reading the papers. Government officials, business braintrusters, union leaders have discovered a marvelous escape hatch. You don't have to cut spending. What you do is cut taxes and then the rapid growth in the gross national product will so expand the tax base that the deficit will be overcome and we'll be put ashore on the Happy Isles.

This is probably the finest piece of economic bluebird twittering since F.D.R. waved his cigarette-holder airily and dismissed the national debt with the remark, "After all, we only owe it to ourselves."

In the meantime, the able and busy people of Europe's Common Market, whose war-wrecked industrial plant was largely rebuilt by U.S. funds and who have cheerfully shucked off on American taxpayers most of the cost of their common defense, are now beginning to whip the pants off us in many fields of competition. Their steel makers blow oxygen into their converters while we still blow air. Their featherbedding problems are insignificant. Their currencies grow harder while ours grows softer.

But, so far, we've had a pretty good ride down the Niagara River. In spite of the squabbling and grabbing, the guzzling and gobbling have been good.

And there was that wonderful sign over the ticket office back on the dock:

"Go now, pay later."

## Legislators Work for You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Friday, January 18, 1963*

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, one of the great needs of this country is a better knowledge and understanding on the part of people generally as to how legislative bodies operate both on the State level and in the Congress of the United States. A better understanding would be of mutual help to both the general public and legislators who represent them.

One of the finest articles I have ever read on this subject was one written by Lloyd W. Sveen in the November 16, 1962, issue of the Fargo Forum in his widely read and respected "Column Eight."

I ask unanimous consent to have this column printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATORS WORK FOR YOU
(By Lloyd W. Sveen)

Now you have voted, at least some of you, and a select group of your fellow men will represent you in the Congress and in your State legislature. Perhaps your candidates won, perhaps they lost, but if you want your voice to be effective in government your job isn't over just because you voted.

You may not realize that your voice among the millions of us can be heard by the relatively few who pass our laws, so do not sell yourself short.

I have never met a Senator or Representative who does not want to hear from the people back home. His principal business is to represent you in the legislative process of the State and Nation, and faithful representation of his constituents balanced against the national interest determines whether he will be reelected or not.

There isn't anything magic or complicated about getting effective representation. Here, based on the experience of Congressmen, are some do's and don'ts:

Get to know your Congressman or legislator, either in person or by letter. Let him know who you are, ask him to send you his newsletter and let him know of your interests. By knowing you and your principal interests he can better understand your point of view.

Write to him about matters on which you have some information and in which you are concerned. Be sure your letters reflect real information, which you know personally, and show from your own experience how an issue (such as medicare) will affect you.

When you have an interest in a subject write in plenty of time. Remember that the basic work of legislation is accomplished in committees; you can't look for a miracle from your Representative in changing a piece of legislation once it gets to the floor of House or Senate.

Don't make the mistake of trying to give instructions on every vote, and don't berate your man if his every vote isn't the same as your thinking. Legislation is a process of compromise between many points of view, and not every law is going to be precisely what you want in every detail.

Don't join pressure campaigns of petitions, mass mailings, and mass telegrams. A personal letter based on specific points has meaning far beyond a sheaf of identical letters or telegrams.

Don't abuse your Representative if he does not agree with you on all points. Perhaps he voted against a bill which you think he should have supported; write to find out why. The bill may have been amended so it contained features which would have hurt you, which led your man to vote against it. If you are not satisfied with his reasons, tell him why you disagree and if you object seriously you can vote against him at the next election.

Don't rely blindly on voting records kept by pressure groups to rate your Congressman's ability. These groups often compile a list of favorite issues and rank Congressmen only by their votes on those issues. Here again, your man in his campaign may have supported certain issues but when these came before him in bill form he felt the proposed law faulty.

Do judge your Congressman and legislator by the total effect of his work—in committees and in representing his district in the interest of the State and the Nation.

If you follow these suggestions, remembering to speak for yourself without pretending to represent more political influence than you have, you'll help your Congressman and legislator do a first-class job.

## Poor Management, Bad Policy Blamed in Army Shakeup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. PAUL C. JONES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, January 18, 1963*

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in reviewing past actions and in the light of current proposals of the Department of Defense, it appears that the executive department intends to remove an effective National Guard from the States and build up the Reserve which is completely under Federal control.

Because of the milita clause of the Constitution, this cannot be done legally, but unless the Congress writes a specific law preventing continual changes and spelling out in the appropriations bill preventive measures the present method will be used to gradually weaken the National Guard.

The periods of time since World War II in which the National Guard of some State has not been undergoing a reorganization, or an impending reorganization, have been relatively small.

In the past, as is the case now, a number of reasons have been offered the public as a basis such as "to increase readiness," "more responsive to possible contingencies," "strengthen the Reserve components," "modernize the Reserve components," "effectively complement the Active Forces," "improve reinforcement capability," et cetera.

For many years, outside the larger cities, single units of the Missouri National Guard have been recognized as important parts of the economic and governmental structure of many towns. As a result of prior realinements, and in order to maintain a unit in these towns and make use of established facilities, it has been necessary to split one unit between two towns.

It now appears that in order to prevent vacant armories and to keep a token National Guard in these towns, it will be necessary to split one company size unit among three towns.

Maj. Gen. Thomas A. Lane, U.S. Army, retired, the military writer of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, has set forth in the following column the reasons why he believes "it might be well for Congress to prohibit the reorganization of the National Guard and Reserve Forces more frequently than once in a decade since the Army seems to lack the self-restraint to impose so reasonable a rule upon itself."

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my colleagues will consider the basis for General Lane's suggestion, as set forth in this article, "Poor Management, Bad Policy Blamed in Army Shakeup":

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Jan. 9, 1963]

POOR MANAGEMENT, BAD POLICY BLAMED IN ARMY SHAKEUP

(By Maj. Gen. Thomas A. Lane, U.S. Army, retired)

WASHINGTON.—The new Congress will have before it the revised plan of the Secretary of Defense for the reorganization of the Army National Guard and organized Reserve Forces.

Revisions were required to meet the hostile criticism which the original plan received from the last Congress. The plan originally was designed to correct deficiencies disclosed in the callup of 1961.

Reorganization looks like the wrong medicine.

The problems of the callup were not organizational; they were created by poor management and bad policy decision. In some degree they are chargeable to reorganization, for the Army had completed in 1960 a reorganization of Reserve Forces which undoubtedly introduced confusion into the mobilization problem.

IT TAKES TIME

It takes time to shake down new organization, to train the new units, to build teamwork, to perfect the new logistical programs.

The first virtue of military organization is stability, for only an old organization can be a good organization. This ancient truth has been little understood by our Army in recent years as it has worked on a series of disrupting reorganizations.

The concept that change is progress seems to be the Army's answer to the atomic age. If it had put as much attention on training and on mobilization planning as it had on reorganization, there might have been less difficulty in the 1961 callup.

Fortunately, the virtue of stability seems to be better appreciated in the Navy and the Air Force.

The 1961 mobilization troubles are chargeable in the first instance to bad policy decision. The callup should not have been made at all, and this should have been clear to anyone familiar with our national defense organization.

Our Reserve Forces are manned by citizens who pursue normal civilian occupations in our society but who have trained and are ready for military duty in time of war. It is not in the basic conception of these forces that they will be called from their civilian occupations every time some international pressure makes desirable an augmentation of Active Army strength.

IMPLICIT CONTRACT

Thus, the callup violated an implicit contract which is part of the very organization of the Reserve Forces.

It was obvious to our people that the Soviet coup in building the Berlin wall merely exploited an opportunity and did not portend any radical change of foreign policy nor threat of war. Thus, the mobilization seemed wholly unwarranted.

An increase of Active Army strength could have been accomplished in good time by retention of men in service, increased draft quotas and voluntary recall procedures. It is a tribute to the patriotism of men called under these conditions that they groused so little.

Reserve Forces are based upon area organization and upon armories and other training facilities which have been built or maintained to support them. If these forces are to have stability and the efficiency which it promotes, it is obvious that their structure cannot be changed every time an administration sets a new manning level for them.

Changing force priorities and related manning levels are normal elements of good mobilization planning. This kind of action does not require reorganization as strength changes. It requires better Army management.

Military organization should be approached from the view that change is bad, that it should be made infrequently and that the disruption and confusion caused by change must be more offset by substantial gains introduced by the change.

In other words, change should not be made for small or questionable advantage, nor to avoid a confession of bad management, nor to cover up a bad policy decision.

It might be wise for Congress to prohibit the reorganization of the National Guard and Reserve Forces more frequently than once in a decade since the Army seems to lack the self-restraint to impose so reasonable rule upon itself.

---

## Hon. Samuel Woden Gralnick Receives the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and Diploma of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation, of the Republic of Panama, in Recognition of Humanitarian and Philanthropic Services to His Fellow Man

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 18, 1963*

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the highlights of the proceedings of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation, of the Republic of Panama, on the occasion of the luncheon and ceremony in the gold room at the Van Cleve Hotel, Dayton, Ohio, at which the award was made to Mr. Gralnick on November 7, 1962. This high honor was bestowed on him in the presence of a very distinguished group of his friends.

The invocation was delivered by Rabbi Selwyn D. Ruslander.

Dr. Herman A. Bayern, American provost, was then introduced, and he set forth at length the achievements and accomplishments of former President Eloy Alfaro, President of Ecuador at the turn of the century, as follows:

We are gathered here today to honor a great humanitarian and philanthropist, Mr. Samuel Woden Gralnick, for his distinguished public and private services to mankind and in further recognition of his efforts toward the establishment of international peace.

But because many of you may not be fully aware of the background of the foundation, I would like at this point to describe it to you. The foundation was authorized by decree issued by His Excellency, Domingo Dias Arosemena, the President of the Republic of Panama, on January 22, 1949, to perpetuate the memory of Eloy Alfaro, martyred ex-President of Ecuador, a movement which has been devoted to the task of encouraging the study and propagation of the liberal ideals and principles, for which this Ecuadoran statesman and leader fought and died for during more than a half century.

General Alfaro was a soldier, patriot, statesman, and martyr, was a citizen not only of his native Ecuador, but of all the Americas. The personal integrity, the unwavering defense of the principles of truth, justice and friendship among nations, the self-control and self-sacrifice that marked about a quarter of a century of unflagging service to his fellowmen, extended beyond the confines of his own country, Ecuador.

He was a rebel and a conspirator—but his rebellion and conspiracy was directed against hatred, injustice, discord, and tyranny. He was the leader of a generation fired with the hope and desire that responsible political action would enhance the prosperity of their country and the welfare of their people. General Alfaro advanced the cause of his nation by setting up the judicial system, and expanded her schools and colleges and other institutions of learning.

How the world needs another Alfaro today. History records that 70 years ago there was convened in Washington, D.C., the Conference of American States, in which Eloy Alfaro actively participated as the dynamic leader. Subsequently, the Pan American Union developed. So that as long ago as 1890, Eloy Alfaro firmly advocated measures for improving the status of the Indians and the downtrodden, in his country and emancipating them from exploitation.

In 1907, Eloy Alfaro again was the dedicated leader who played a leading part at this International Conference in Mexico City, where the United States and six other Pan-American nations assembled and did discuss and resolve questions relating to the well being of the American states. As a matter of historical fact, Eloy Alfaro welded together the factions of the Cuban Freedom Party in December 1895, 3 years before the Spanish-American War, when he publicly petitioned the Queen of Spain demanding Cuban independence. In view of his achievements and accomplishments, there are monuments in the memory of Eloy Alfaro in almost every capital of the Western Hemisphere. And so today, we stand inspired by his example. The magnificent lessons resulting from so many noble undertakings by Eloy Alfaro are worthy of being transmitted from generation to generation for the honor and benefit of an entire community of nations.

Were he alive today, he would be in the forefront of the fight to preserve for the Western Hemisphere the pan-American unity of freedom loving people, that would be the perpetual harbinger against the attempt of any form of despotism to plant the tyrant's heel on even the tiniest portion of the soil of our pan-American nations, as the Soviet Union and Dr. Castro have actually done in Cuba.

Were Eloy Alfaro alive today, he would be a zealous supporter of the work of the program of our United Nations and the Organization of the American States, and he would leave no stone unturned to assure, for all peoples of the world, that hope and peace and good will to all men that is our common heritage from our common Creator.

The philosophy of Eloy Alfaro was based principally on service to his fellow human beings and to the cause and promotion of international peace. The public and private motion of peace. The public and private activities of our distinguished guest of honor, Mr. Samuel Woden Gralnick, comes within the framework of this kind of service to humanity. In recognition of this fact, and that you are a great humanitarian and philanthropist, the ruling body of the foundation grants you, Mr. Gralnick, its highest honor—the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and Diploma.

You know, my dear Mr. Gralnick, that you now join a goodly company of distinguished Americans, who have been similarly honored in the past. They include President Kennedy, former Presidents Hoover, Truman, and Eisenhower, Governor Nelson Rockefeller, General McAuliffe, Commissioner Moses, General Crittenberger, along with J. Edgar Hoover, who typify the caliber of men who hold this high honor.

Indeed, we further the ideals to which we are dedicated, we who are presented to do honor to ourselves, when in behalf of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation it gives me genuine pleasure to exercise a pleasant duty, imposed upon me by the board of dignitaries of this foundation to carry out its determination to honor Mr. Samuel Woden Gralnick with the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Gralnick then acknowledges receipt of the award which reads as follows:

Eloy Alfaro International Foundation—"Thus one goes to the stars"—recognizing the special value of the services rendered by the Honorable Samuel Woden Gralnick in support of the objectives of this institution, he has been awarded the Cross of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation. In witness whereof, this diploma, with the seal of the foundation, is presented in the city of Panama, Republic of Panama, on the 25th of June 1962.

Mr. Gralnick acknowledges receipt of the award as follows:

I am overwhelmed with the great honors you have bestowed upon me and at joining such distinguished company. I little thought when I followed the dictates of my conscience that I would one day be so honored amidst such outstanding company from all over the world.

To be the recipient is indeed a high honor, and I shall regard it as an inspiration to accelerate my efforts in carrying out the high ideals and principles of Gen. Eloy Alfaro, and the principles for which General Alfaro laid down his life.

I wish to again express my personal appreciation and gratitude for your kindness in conferring this Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross on me.

May God be with you all, always.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join the many friends of Mr. Gralnick throughout the United States who sent congratulations which were read by Rabbi Ruslander. The Third District of Ohio is honored by the selection of this public

spirited person to receive such an important award for his achievements and accomplishments.

## Top Career Employees Pressured for $100 Democratic Gala

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.**
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, January 18, 1963*

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, prior to his recent illness, our colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL], was preparing to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following column written by Joseph Young, an eminent writer on Federal employee matters.

As I share Mr. BROYHILL's concern over the pressure being placed on career employees to contribute $100 apiece to the Democratic National Committee, I am pleased to insert on behalf of Representative BROYHILL and myself the "Federal Spotlight" column from the Washington Evening Star of January 10, 1963:

TOP CAREER EMPLOYEES PRESSURED FOR $100 DEMOCRATIC GALA

(By Joseph Young)

The Democratic National Committee is putting increased pressure on Government career employees to attend the $100-ticket Democratic gala in President Kennedy's honor on January 18.

All Federal careerists who haven't responded to the committee's formal mailed invitations to attend the dinner are being contacted by telephone at their homes at night and asked if they plan to attend.

Another gimmick being used by the Democrats is to tie the gala affair with an invitation to attend a cocktail party preceding the affair at the home of the head of the agency where the worker is employed. For example, Veterans' Administration career employees are being invited to attend a cocktail party at the home of VA Administrator John Gleason as part of the $100 affair. This same inducement was used for District government career employees, who were invited to a cocktail party at the home of the president of the Board of Commissioners.

The Star last month disclosed the letters mailed to Government career employees in many agencies in grades 12 and above, asking for the "pleasure of their company" at the affair to be held at the armory.

Career employees charged that this amounted to pressure on them to buy tickets, and they also reported that some of their bosses were getting in the act and asking them to attend.

The last week or so has seen a followup effort by the Democratic National Committee's gala salute committee to have Federal career employees attend the affair which is being held primarily to swell the Democratic campaign fund.

Democratic National Committee spokesmen acknowledged that a squad of Democratic volunteer workers has been telephoning all Government career employees who haven't responded to the written invitation.

The career employees are being reminded that the affair is being held in honor of President Kennedy and Vice President JOHNSON and that it is one of the most important events of the year.

Career employees charge that the Democratic National Committee is receiving the lists of career employees in grades 12 and above from officials in the various Federal agencies.

The dinner, incidentally, is strictly an entertainment affair, with such top personalities as Judy Garland scheduled to entertain. As one career employee, who reluctantly bought a ticket, remarked: "We're not even going to get anything to eat for our $100."

The gala committee is under the chairmanship of Bedford S. Wynne, Dallas, Tex., attorney and coowner of the Dallas football team.

Employees declare that threats of denial of promotions, in-grade salary raises, etc., are being made by agency bosses in an effort to force purchase of tickets.

Meanwhile, Representative BROYHILL, Republican, of Virginia, has invited any Federal career employee who has been pressured in the matter to gather whatever evidence they can and contact him.

"I will do all in my power to bring the offenders to justice and see that they are prosecuted to the full extent of the law," Mr. BROYHILL said.

Mr. BROYHILL also said he will bring the matter to the attention of the House Civil Service Committee, of which he is a member, and ask for a full-scale investigation. If a stronger law is necessary to prevent such pressure on Federal career employees, Mr. BROYHILL said he will push for such a measure.

Mr. BROYHILL said that while contact with Federal employees at their homes by non-Government workers such as employees of the Democratic National Committee does not constitute a violation of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, it constitutes highly questionable ethics. However, he stressed that Government officials who "release their files, including names and home addresses, to the Democratic organization" are violating the law.

He warned that these officials are subject to imprisonment or fines or both under the law.

One career employee summed up the dilemma regarding the invitation to the Democratic gala:

"We're damned if we do and damned if we don't. It's not just the $100 involved, although that certainly is a big factor. But if we don't attend, we may be jeopardizing our careers. And if we do attend, we may also be jeopardizing our careers.

"You may recall that when the Eisenhower administration came to power, some of the Republican officials secured the lists of Federal employees who had attended Democratic $100 affairs and these employees were on the blacklist as far as promotions and even holding their jobs was concerned. The same thing could happen again when a new administration comes into power."

## Donations by Intimidation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. H. R. GROSS**
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, January 18, 1963*

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, is there installed in Washington an administration that resorts pressure and intimidation to resolve problems external and internal, including the raising of campaign funds for the Democrat Party?

Is this the real meaning of the New Frontier?

When a Federal employee, supposed to be protected by the civil service system and the Hatch Act, is invited by his or her boss to attend a "booze with the boss" party and it is made plain that a $100 contribution to the Democrat campaign kitty is in order, who is supposed to protect the civil rights of such employee? Is the Civil Service Commission interested?

When defense contractors are called to the White House and told they are expected to contribute to a National Cultural Center, what happens if they refuse to yield to such pressure and their contracts are quietly yet effectively stripped from them?

In these and other dealings, including the tributes being exacted from Federal employees, where is the Attorney General of the United States? Are civil rights covered by a political patent, obtained and controlled by the Attorney General?

The Waterloo, Iowa, Daily Courier has printed an editorial dealing with some of these questions. Under unanimous consent, I submit it for reprinting in the RECORD:

At a time when the President is asking increased powers from Congress, the administration has been criticized in several instances for abuse of the immense power it already possesses:

(1) Administration officials called in a group of leading defense contractors and President Kennedy told them in frank terms that they ought to contribute to the National Cultural Center being planned in the Capital.

(2) During the trial of James R. Hoffa in Nashville, the statement was made in court that someone describing himself as a reporter for the Nashville Banner had contacted one of the jurors by phone. Attorney General Robert Kennedy called the publisher of the Banner and asked him not to publicize the matter for fear of causing a mistrial. But the newspaper nevertheless printed the story and offered a $5,000 reward for the arrest and conviction of the person falsely identifying himself as a Banner reporter.

(3) During negotiations on the release of Cuban freedom fighters, Castro demanded payment of $2,900,000 which had been promised for release earlier in the year of 60 ill or injured prisoners. Attorney General Robert Kennedy raised a million from an anonymous donor and Gen. Lucius Clay borrowed $1,900,000 from a bank on his personal signature. American corporations are now being asked to make donations for the Cuban deal; and the question is whether they dare to refuse. During the drive for medical supplies, one company which has been indicted for antitrust law violation received a call from the Justice Department requesting a contribution.

There is nothing wrong, of course, in the simple act of requesting donations from corporations. None of the companies have openly charged that they were promised immunity from antitrust actions if they contributed or the loss of defense contracts if they refused.

But there is, nevertheless, an inference of impropriety when administration officials, with the power of life or death over businesses, ask for voluntary contributions. While the motives involved in the cases cited above are worthy, many examples could be cited to show that the Kennedys are fully capable of retaliating against those who re-

aist pressure. The launching of an antitrust violation against steel companies which refused to accept the voluntary price stabilization program is the best example of this ruthlessness.

## The Law Observance Committee of the Federal Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 18, 1963*

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, because of its important current value, I refer to the speech of a distinguished Philadelphia lawyer, Harry D. Shargel, Esq., before the 11th annual conference of the National Association of Citizens' Crime Commissions, held at the Warwick Hotel in Philadelphia on November 13, 1962.

Mr. Shagel is the national chairman of the Law Observance Committee of the Federal Bar Association, and his remarks are concerned with the current drive of the association on a national scale to promote respect for law. I am sure that my colleagues will be interested in the material which the national chairman presented:

REMARKS OF HARRY D. SHARGEL, NATIONAL CHAIRMAN, LAW OBSERVANCE COMMITTEE, FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION, AT THE 11TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CITIZENS' CRIME COMMISSIONS, WARWICK HOTEL, PHILADELPHIA, PA., NOVEMBER 13, 1962.

When Dan Michie asked me to speak I believe it was our mutual intention that I discuss the work of the law observance committee of the Federal Bar Association and our endeavor to promote respect for law and those who enforce it. I shall do this but before I do, I want to mention something that disturbs me and I hope disturbs all of us and will inspire all of us to constructive action.

I want you to know that I am honored to share this session with Chancellor Scott of the Philadelphia Bar Association. Not only is he the leader of a bar association which has a record of outstanding accomplishments but he is a great leader who in recent months has evidenced the type of courage and impartiality and loyalty to the principle of our profession that should serve as a lesson to other leaders of the bar—a lesson, I am said to say, these leaders should not have needed.

I am a firm believer that the courts are the bulwark of our liberties, our Government, and our established society; that unless we have an independent and courageous judiciary, the America that we know will not be possible. It is incumbent upon all citizens, but especially upon members of the bar, to uphold the dignity of the courts and to do nothing to cast aspersions on the integrity of its members merely because the judges may have rendered a decision with which they do not agree.

Not only must we agree with President Kennedy that the law of the land is what the Supreme Court of the United States says it is but we must go further and say that, until reversed, the law of the case is what the judge presiding over the particular case says it is. Those holding public office as well as those running for public office cannot pick and choose the laws that they will obey or the decisions that they will respect. I have difficulty distinguishing between the acknowledged criminal who does this and the public official. As a matter of fact, I am inclined to condemn and damn such public officials more because they set an example for law-abiding citizens whereas the acknowledged criminal speaks only for himself. The public official in his defiance of the law contributes an aura of respectability to what otherwise may be regarded as a criminal act and when he evidences to the public that it is proper to pick the law that is to be obeyed and the decision to be accepted, he is contributing to the chaos that results when each person is a law unto himself.

I am happy to report that in the course of my activities as chairman of the law observance committee of the Philadelphia Chapter of the Federal Bar Association and as national chairman of the law observance committee of the Federal Bar Association I have had contacts with many judges and law enforcement officials and I can tell you this—these people are honest, dedicated, courageous men trying to do an impartial job in the best way they know how. We must remember that the decisions that they make are based on the facts and the law as they see them. Facts the public may not be aware of and law that the public may not understand. It is incumbent upon all the citizens to realize this and to refrain from wild criticism but it is especially the duty of members of the bar not only to defend the courts, but to refrain from wild disparaging remarks about judges who disagree with them or with whom they disagree. I for one feel that it is the duty of the organized bar to discipline its members who violate these precepts. I urge all of you to consider the importance of the courts, of promoting respect for the courts, and of defending its members so that we may maintain an independent and courageous judiciary and protect our liberties and our form of government.

Now that I have gotten this off of my chest, I want to tell you about our law observance committee.

We are endeavoring to promote respect for law and those who enforce it. Our message to the public is a simple one: "The law protects you, respect it, uphold it, obey it. It is a personal message to all our citizens—to every man, woman, and child. The emphasis is on the fact that the law protects you—you personally; that none of us can continue in his day-to-day functions if we are not governed by the rule of law. There would be no safety for the person, no civil liberties, no property rights. Society could not exist without the rule of law. We must appreciate what law does for us and in appreciating it, we will respect it, uphold it, and obey it.

We must also appreciate the important part played by all those concerned with law enforcement in maintaining this rule of law—the local policeman, the Federal agent, the prosecutor, and the courts. By and large these people are dedicated servants trying to do the best job they can with the tools they have. We recognize that ours is a self-regulating society; that in general, our citizens are law abiding; that our law enforcement machinery necessarily assumes that our citizens are law abiding and that the lawbreaker is the exception. It is our objective to reinforce the law-abiding community and to deter the lawbreaker. We must promote the law enforcer's self-respect. We must promote the competence of the law enforcer. We must increase his standards and attract the best personnel to the field.

I do not know whether you are aware of the fact that the Federal Bar Association consists of lawyers who are or were employed by the Federal Government. We have over 50 chapters all over the United States with 3 in Europe. Our national association has established a law observance committee. Our objective is to have each of our chapters set up chapter law observance committees to promote respect for law and those who enforce it. Our national committee provides guidance and assistance and initiates national activities which transcend the jurisdiction of the local chapters. Incidentally, the concept of a law observance committee started here in Philadelphia and we are modelling our activities on that of the Philadelphia chapter.

Here is some idea of what the Philadelphia chapter law observance committee has sponsored:

(a) Coordination conferences among the law enforcement officials, among organizations concerned with juvenile problems and among law enforcement officials and service organizations.

(b) We have prepared a "Directory of Law Enforcement Agencies" in the Philadelphia area describing the jurisdiction and scope of each as well as the cooperative services offered to others. It includes the names of the top officials of each agency as well as his phone number and lists the names of police chiefs of adjoining counties and the presidents of the police associations in Philadelphia and vicinity.

(c) Our efforts have resulted in a course in police science and administration at the Community College at Temple University—the first degree course of its kind in this area.

(d) Exhibits of the work of the various law enforcement agencies were held in a central location and portions of these exhibits were made available to the schools and to other banks in other areas.

(e) We have sponsored radio and TV programs designed to inform the public of the work of the various law enforcement agencies. Incidentally, a weekly series is now in process on station WIBG and we have commitments for TV time on WFIL this Christmas and Easter.

(f) We have disseminated thousands of pieces of literature through the schools.

(g) Our speakers bureau, under Norris Harzenstein, has provided speakers for schools and service organizations.

Our national law observance committee has brought together authority, talent, and ability from the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government and from industry so that working together we can accomplish our program. The following are members of our national committee: Hon. Tom C. Clark, Justice, Supreme Court of the United States; Hon. Robert F. Kennedy, the Attorney General; Hon. Emanuel Celler, chairman, House Judiciary Committee; Hon. Cyrus H. Vance, Secretary of the Army; Abram Chayes, Esq., legal advisor, Department of State; Robert H. Knight, Esq., the General Counsel, U.S. Treasury Department; John T. McNaughton, Esq., General Counsel, Department of Defense; Daniel B. Michie, Jr., Esq., president, National Association of Citizens Crime Commissions. Public information adviser: Mr. Charles R. DeHaven, manager of Public Relations, Philadelphia Gas Works. Community relations adviser: Mr. Milton Eisenberg, vice president, Yellow Cab Co. of Philadelphia. Advertising adviser: Mr. Arthur G. Petry, executive secretary, Traffic Safety Program, Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc.

Radio and television advisory subcommittee: Mr. Alfred R. Beckman, vice president, American Broadcasting Co.; Leon R. Brooks, Esq., assistant general attorney, Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc.; Howard Monderer, Esq., National Broadcasting Co.; Mr. Stephen McCormick, vice president, Mutual Broadcasting System; Mr. William J. Wheatley, program manager, Station WIBG, Storer Broadcasting Co.

Here is what the national committee is doing to help and supplement the local programs:

(a) The first thing we did was to publish a "Law Observance Committee Manual" which was furnished to each of the chapters. This manual was conceived and prepared by our public relations adviser, Mr. Charles R. DeHaven, manager of public relations of the Philadelphia Gas Works. The manual furnishes the names of our national committee, describes the committee objectives, the functions of the national committee, sets forth a sample organization of a chapter law observance committee and suggests specific activities for the local chapters.

(b) Supreme Court Justice Tom C. Clark, who is a member of our committee, wrote to members of the Federal and State judiciary requesting cooperation with the local chapters and he received letters from judges all over the country offering to cooperate. As the names of these judges were received they were sent to the local chapters with the recommendation that they be invited to become members of the chapter law observance committee.

(c) The Federal Bureau of Investigation has issued directions to its local field offices to cooperate with and participate in the activities of the law observance committees.

(d) The coordinator of Treasury enforcement agencies has urged the Treasury enforcement agencies—locally and nationally—to cooperate in our program.

(e) Your national president, Dan Michie, has requested local crime commissions to participate in our program.

(f) We have a radio and TV advisory subcommittee consisting of representatives of the major networks who are endeavoring to facilitate local programing and to arrange national programs on radio and TV. We have tentative plans for a 26-week program on NBC's "Radio Monitor" starting in January which will describe the work of many different law enforcement agencies over a network of over 200 radio stations throughout the country. Within a few days we hope to inaugurate a series of short messages on the role of law in our society and the need to respect the law and those who enforce it. We expect to start on local station WIBG which is owned by the Storer Broadcasting Co., then—if successful—expand it to the other seven stations of the company throughout the country and ultimately make them available to all radio stations so that the radio will ultimately bring our message to over 100 million people on a repetitive basis. We are also considering plans which may ultimately bring our message through television on a national basis.

(g) We have established an exhibit subcommittee headed by Inspector Lynn Edwards of the FBI. By contacting one person our local chapters can now coordinate exhibits of the work of all national law enforcement agencies.

(h) The Pennsylvania District of Kiwanis International has furnished an initial printing of large 24-sheet posters bearing our slogan, "The Law Protects You, Respect It, Uphold It, Obey It." These posters are to be placed on outdoor billboards. We are endeavoring to establish a revolving fund which will permit us to make these posters available to local chapters for posting on billboards in local communities. The Pennsylvania Kiwanis is endeavoring to induce other districts of Kiwanis to participate in this program and make these posters available throughout the country. Local chapters are being asked to secure billboard space through their own efforts. The General Outdoor Advertising Co. has made 20 billboards available in the Philadelphia area and has arranged for its Washington office to make billboards available in the District of Columbia. The Baltimore chapter has made its own arrangements for billboard space and so has the Omaha chapter. Where chapters need assistance in obtaining billboard space, we will supply such assistance.

(i) We are exploring plans to secure the assistance of industry organizations. We believe we will soon have concrete actions to report.

We urge all organizations to participate in this program. We claim no patent, copyright, or monopoly. You are free to use our materials with or without credit to the Federal Bar Association. We will assist any organization to start its own program and we will cooperate with any organization that wishes to participate in our program.

We are most optimistic. The soil is fertile. We have planted many seeds. We expect a bumper crop.

Thank you.

## Mississippi Doctor Writes Voicing Disappointment in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, January 18, 1963*

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, typical of the many letters I received during the controversy over the Rules Committee was one from Dr. James E. Safley, of Brookhaven, Miss. Dr. Safley's letter poses some searching questions which, I think, would be well for this body to ponder. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including the text of Dr. Safley's letter, and commend it to the attention of the House:

BROOKHAVEN, MISS.,
*January 8, 1963.*

*Members of the 88th Congress, Washington, D.C.:*

GENTLEMEN: Speaking as a disturbed and concerned citizen and more important as a parent, I wish to convey my pride and thanks to many Members of the Congress for a job well done but I emphatically wish to voice my disappointment of the Congress as a whole. How does one answer his 12-year-old son who asks, "Dad, if they [the Congress] can pack a committee to get what some people want, why can't you and I slip in and fix the cards so we can beat Mother and Susan at rook?"

How can we, the parents of children who hold the destiny of our country in the palms of their now innocent hands effectively teach them that honesty and truth is the only way to greatness while you "stack" committees to do the bidding of an ambitious family. As Ed pointed out with his question, this is essentially no different from the crooked gamblers who tempt and often succeed in ruining the lives and future of college athletes.

Our President, who is personally ambitious, and his power-mad brother, the Attorney General, speak from both sides of their mouths. First, they justify some of their actions by resorting to court rulings dating back to the 1800's, while at the same time they utilize a "stroke of the pen" or a "packed" U.S. Supreme Court to hand down rulings in the 1960's to justify the New Frontier.

I beg you learned gentlemen to review that part of ancient history which deals with the early stages of the fall of the Roman Empire and compare that with the current history of the United States of America. I believe you will, as I have, find an amazing parallel. I implore you to search your hearts and then vote your honest convictions.

Sincerely,

JAMES E. SAFLEY, M.D.

## Civil Service Cocktail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, January 18, 1963*

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, at last some attention is being given throughout the Nation to the coldblooded blackjacking of career Federal employees for the purpose of raising funds for the Democrat Party.

Let it be pointed out that this campaign to exact political tribute from civil service employees actually started early last December as duly reported by Mr. Joseph Young, expert writer on civil service matters for the Washington Evening Star.

Unfortunately, most of the Members of Congress had not yet returned to the Capital on December 6, 1962, when Mr. Young, in a front-page story in the Washington Evening Star, called attention to this brazen, outrageous, fundraising campaign.

To keep the record straight and to silence any Federal official stationed in Washington who may argue that he or she was unaware of what was taking place, I submit for printing in the RECORD the December 6, 1962, article as printed by the Evening Star:

PRESSURED FOR $100 TICKETS, FEDERAL WORKERS CHARGE

(By Joseph Young)

Government career employees are getting formal invitations to purchase $100-a-plate tickets for the second inaugural salute dinner being sponsored by the Democratic National Committee.

Civil service careerists in grades 12 and above in many of the departments and agencies have received letters at their homes mailed by the Democratic National Committee asking for "the pleasure of your company" at the affair to be held at the Armory on January 18.

The dinner, in honor of President and Mrs. Kennedy and Vice President and Mrs. Johnson, will swell the campaign coffers of the Democratic National Committee.

FOLLOWUP AT OFFICE

Some of the career employees are complaining that the invitations are not-too-subtle pressure on them to pressure tickets if they want to remain in the good graces of their bosses and hang on to their jobs or receive promotions.

In some cases, employees complain that their immediate bosses are following up on the letters of invitation by asking them at work if they plan to attend and stressing that the agency would like to see a good turnout.

Civil Service Commission officials said no violation of the Hatch Act is involved so long as the invitations were mailed to the employees' homes and were not mailed from Government buildings nor at Government expense.

However, some Government personnel officials question the ethics in such a procedure and feel that it does not help the merit system.

The practice of some Government officials in following up on letters by contacting employees personally in their offices to see if they are going to the dinner could be a violation of the Hatch Act, it was pointed out. But it would be difficult to get a criminal

conviction without the definite proof which most employees would be loath to give because of fear of losing their jobs.

The letter received by career employees requesting the "pleasure of your company" was accompanied by a reservation card in which employees were invited to send back in an enclosed stamped-addressed envelope to the Democratic National Committee.

The card contains the information that for each $100 contribution to the Democratic National Committee, one ticket to the dinner will be sent to the employee. It provides the adequate spaces for filling out how much money will be contributed along with the number of tickets desired.

Officials of the Democratic National Committee defended the invitations, declaring that Government workers were also solicited to attend Republican fund-raising dinners during the Eisenhower administration.

They denied that employees' careres would be jeopardized if they failed to buy tickets and said it all was on a voluntary basis.

The personnel director of one of the biggest Government agencies, who for obvious reasons didn't want to be quoted by name, declared:

"While my office wouldn't stand for any direct pressure on Government career employees, and I'm sure in this we would be fully supported by the head of the agency, there is a rather subtle form of pressure used in the sale of the tickets to the dinner.

"The Democratic officeholders, for the most part, are more enthusiastic and politically minded than the Republicans were. And some of them do mention to their career subordinates that it might be nice if they could see their way clear to attending the dinner.

"I'm certain that most of the officials don't intend it to be a 'you-attend-or-else' proposition, but nevertheless some of the employees probably feel that it would be best for their careers and job security if they do go. Our office has made it clear that employees don't have to go and that their jobs won't be jeopardized, but some employees just don't want to take the chance of offending their bosses by not going."

In a few cases, eager-beaver agency heads let it be known to some of the political appointees under them that it will be good for the agency to make as good a record as possible in dinner ticket sales, and this in turn results in pressure on career employees to purchase tickets, the personnel man noted.

The question arose as to where the Democratic National Committee got the list of names of career employees in each department.

"Don't be naive," said the personnel man. "This is a Democratic administration, isn't it?"

## Keep the Trucks Off MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 18, 1963*

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, as one travels throughout the country and, particularly, in the State of California, one finds that this is certainly the age of freeways and expressways, to take care of the large number of motor vehicles owned by our growing population.

The urgency of meeting the traffic needs of this growing number of motor vehicles presents many complex ancillary problems. This situation is illustrated by a very interesting editorial that was delivered on KCBS radio in San Francisco.

It concerns the interest of Oakland, Calif., in keeping trucks off the MacArthur Freeway which is a main artery currently being developed in that community.

I am pleased to insert this editorial in the RECORD in the interest of my colleagues and other citizens throughout the country who either do face these problems today or will be facing them in the future:

KEEP THE TRUCKS OFF MACARTHUR

The city of Oakland is waging a serious battle to keep heavy trucks from using the new MacArthur Freeway. The people of the city, through their representatives, have taken every legal step available to them to keep trucks from being routed through a fine residential neighborhood, past homes, churches, and schools. The final step has now been taken, in the form of an ordinance passed unanimously by the Oakland City Council, prohibiting trucks from using MacArthur, and designating Nimitz Freeway as the alternate route.

Unfortunately, this ordinance, although it is perfectly legal, is not enforceable.

The reason is that a city has no control over traffic inside its borders if that traffic uses a State highway. The new MacArthur Freeway is not only a State highway, it is also a part of the Interstate System, and a great deal of Federal tax money was spent on its construction.

So at this point Oakland can only ask for help. The city has forwarded its ordinance to the division of highways in Sacramento, asking that the State publicly designate Nimitz as the alternate route for trucks. The division of highways, however, must in turn recommend to the Bureau of Public Roads, an agency of the Department of Commerce, that the Oakland ordinance be enforced.

The MacArthur Freeway, for the benefit of those who have not seen it, is immense. Eight lanes wide, it cuts a tremendous swath through the heart of Oakland. It runs through one end of the Mills College campus, within 100 feet of one residence hall, and an off ramp and underpass will be only 90 feet away from the Mills College Fine Arts Building.

This routing itself is inexcusable, and even with the freeway restricted to passenger cars the effect on the neighborhoods through which it passes will be drastic enough. But if heavy freight rigs are allowed on MacArthur, the situation will become intolerable.

Mills College is not alone in demanding a truck ban. As Dr. C. Easton Rothwell, president of that college, said recently to KCBS:

"Mills College, and all the institutions that have joined to form the committee called citizens against trucks on the MacArthur Freeway, are very much concerned about the increase in noise and dirt and vibration that is going to be caused if these heavy trucking rigs come out through what is the residential and educational and religious heart of the city of Oakland.

"We know that, even taking the estimates of the State highway engineers themselves, the number of trucks when the peak is reached will be more than one a minute, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week."

As Dr. Rothwell further declared, this is a problem of values. The point is, do you build a huge concrete strip through the finer residential area of a great city, and then run huge trucking rigs over it? The matter is too important to be left to the engineers. And especially in this case there is no excuse to justify running trucks on the MacArthur Freeway. If they were to be required to take the Nimitz Freeway around Oakland, rather than MacArthur through it, the distance would be no greater.

KCBS strongly urges the State authorities in Sacramento, and the Federal authorities in Washington, to support the city of Oakland. The time is long overdue for the highway builders to recognize the need for more thoughtful handling of heavy traffic through our major cities. Let's start by banning trucking on the MacArthur Freeway in Oakland.

## Dr. W. F. Bond

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include in the RECORD a well-deserved tribute to one of the pioneer educators and welfare officials of my State, Dr. W. F. Bond.

The tribute was delivered by Mr. Kirby P. Walker, superintendent, Jackson Public Schools, Jackson, Miss., on the occasion of the observance of the anniversary of the founding of the University of Southern Mississippi as a normal college, September 18, 1912, and the dedication of Willard Faroe Bond Hall at Hattiesburg, Miss., September 18, 1962.

I should like to associate myself with this splendid tribute to this outstanding Mississippian. I have had the privilege of knowing Dr. Bond for almost a half century. His whole life and efforts have been unselfishly dedicated to the people of Mississippi and in particular to the youth of my State.

Superintendent Walker's speech follows:

President McCain, honored and distinguished guests, members of the faculty, alumni, students, and friends, it is a difficult taks which I am undertaking.

A résumé of 61 years of continuous public service canot be recounted properly in the few minutes I have been allotted. But I hasten to confess that even with more time I would be far from adequate to the honor which has been accorded me in paying deserved tribute to Dr. Willard Faroe Bond. I trust you will be tolerant of my shortcomings.

I

Since attaining the age of accountability W. F. Bond has demonstrated a consuming interest in people and in their welfare.

He committed the first 42 years of his active career to public education. That period of prodigious effort was zealously given for those whose productive years were before them. They were devoted to that segment of our population who needed advantages of education to make them more useful to their families and to their State.

When 16 years old he was teaching in his community for $10 a month, and board. After several years of teaching and going to college, he served as superintendent of a south Mississippi high school for a decade, then professor of Latin and history at Mississippi Normal College for 4 years, followed, by a score of years, as State superintendent of education.

There were no guidelines to follow when Professor Bond entered upon his assignment as chief State school officer. Specialists in education as we now know them

were few in number in that day and when found the limited resource of the State department of education placed most of them beyond reach.

His critics have said of him that his genius was in his ability to judge the competencies and personal qualities of others and to recruit for his colleagues the best of those who would share with him the challenge and excitement of helping to build a creditable State system of public schools.

Such renowned leaders in public education as Claude Bennett, Jim Broom, M. D. Broadfoot, J. T. Calhoun, Sam Hathorn, C. O. Henderson, F. J. Hubbard, G. D. Humphrey, H. M. Ivy, F. C. Jenkins, W. C. Strahan, and Sam Woods, to name a few, are illustrative of educators who joined Professor Bond to give a forward thrust to public education in Mississippi which is not yet spent.

From the beginning of his educational career he used a yardstick which he consistently applied to measure the merits of every proposition or appropriation made in behalf of education—namely, children of Mississippi and their future.

II

The second era of Dr. Bond's public service was fully committed to those persons, in most instances, whose productive years were behind them, who through misfortune or otherwise, required an assisting hand or an opportunity for rehabilitation.

In public welfare administration as it was when he entered State educational administration, there were no guidelines for a State welfare program.

Again the yardstick of human values was employed, and through his sound judgment and unremitting work, Mississippi founded and developed another valued instrument for its people.

III

In my childhood, Horatio Alger novels were to be found in the homes of most boys. Such fiction—from log cabin to White House, from poverty to riches. They were spun out of the pathos and the aspirations of people whose native land was founded on the principle that everyone in the United States had an opportunity to better his station in life. With the turn of the century we needed the romantic dream of better times. The burdens of reconstruction laid heavily upon the shoulders of Mississippians.

The biography of W. F. Bond records a series of experiences from 1881 to 1957 which will thrill young and mature readers as no Horatio Alger fiction could. Listen to these lines which relate his earliest recollections:

"In a lonely place among the trees near a dwelling deep in the pine forests of southeast Mississippi, a young woman had just been buried. There was not much ceremony at the funeral, for it was many miles to the home of the nearest preacher, and the woman had been only a housekeeper in the home of a farmer and stockman where she had worked for board and lodging for herself and her 5-year-old son. As the boy was led away from the scene, he left behind the only relative he had ever known. Three years before, he had been brought to this farm home with his mother. Now she was dead, and there was no will or other papers, for there were no possessions.

" 'What shall we do with the boy?' asked one.

" 'We will keep him,' replied the head of the house, a kindly old gentleman who had no family of his own. A year later [he had] died. This time there was a will, and the first section stated that $500 of his estate should be set aside for the education of the boy, Willard Faroe Bond."

Dr. Bond's extensive, fruitful life of public service had its genesis just a few miles south of this great seat of learning.

He learned how to win friends and influence people long before books were written on the topic. He is chief among the few people I have known who can win others to his view even though their earlier positions were known to be hostile to his.

From raw experience he can attest that "organized society finds human nature the toughest problem to solve," but this never quelled him in working for solutions to improve it.

His great humanism combined with eloquence and power of persuasion provided the thrust and attitude necessary for building and expanding our public school system.

Two things Dr. Bond was not, and is not, to this good hour. He has never been self-centered, nor has he been vindicative. Being human and having to deal with some who were amply supplied with these traits, he had many provocations and temptations to be selfish and revengeful during his long tour of duty in education and welfare.

Through his perceptiveness, his broad experience, and his remarkable vigor, he promoted and defended the causes which he represented with all of the prestige of the office he held and with statesmanlike acumen and leadership.

IV

It is timely and proper that Dr. Bond's public service be dramatically highlighted in the ceremonies of this day and in this particular locale.

The splendid new residence hall for men which bears his name will serve the university for years to come. Not only this generation of students but future generations will be grateful for their commodious campus home which this new dormitory provides.

All of us rejoice in this commemoration of Willard Faroe Bond. We are pleased to see his name and his portrait so fittingly enshrined in public remembrance. Above all, however, we know that the most meaningful, the loftiest, and the most lasting monument to Dr. Bond is the memory which will live in the minds of all who know him. It will remain in the hearts of those for whom he worked with inspiration and devotion, who have been and will continue to be beneficiaries of his noble needs which were designed and measured by his boundless love and faith in his God and in the people of his beloved State.

Mississippi will always be in his debt.

## Auto Excise Repeal Logical Starting Point for Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 18, 1963*

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the President has called on Congress to enact measures to revitalize the growth of our economy by reducing income taxes and corporate taxes. I have recently reintroduced my bill to repeal the discriminatory and depressive 10-percent automobile excise tax, a measure that will not only remove a tax inequity but help give the economy the kind of boost the President wants.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial from the December 27, 1962, issue of the Flint Journal, of Flint, Mich., which reflects the sentiment of that community with respect to the continuation of this tax. This editorial, entitled "Auto Excise Repeal Logical Starting Point for Tax Cut," points out that the excise tax has outlived its usefulness and its repeal would be a boon to the growth of the economy.

Under unanimous consent, I present the editorial for inclusion in the RECORD herewith:

AUTO EXCISE REPEAL LOGICAL STARTING POINT FOR TAX CUT

"Our tax system is a drag on economic recovery and economic growth." These were words spoken a few weeks ago by President Kennedy.

In that same speech he promised a tax reduction aimed at "creating more jobs and income and eventually more revenue."

The form such a tax cut should take has been the subject of much discussion and argument over the past several months.

Representatives CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN, of this district, has used the President's concern about the tax drag on economic growth to renew his fight for repeal of the 10-percent excise tax on automobiles. He contends that this is the logical starting point for chartering sound tax revision.

Preparing to again carry his campaign to the floor of the House, he pointed out last week during a Flint visit that while Mr. Kennedy has urged that we get this country sailing economically, "we can't do much sailing without raising the anchor. As long as tax inequities and other burdens are heaped on the economy's major industry, the ship of state won't get very far out of harbor."

By the major industry, of course, he was talking about the production of automobiles. And to underline its importance he called attention to the fact that this industry is responsible for one out of every six businesses, and it employs one out of every seven workers.

"You don't have to be told what automobile production means in the way of jobs," he admitted. "It directly affects everyone in Flint. But sometimes people lose sight of the overall impact of the industry.

"Take the steel industry, for instance. One-fifth of all steel produced in this country goes into the production of automobiles. Car makers also use 62 percent of all rubber, 11 percent of all aluminum, 35 percent of all zinc, 47 percent of all lead and 63 percent of all leather upholstery sold in the United States.

"In the highway transport industries alone, employment totals 10.5 million—one-seventh of the Nation's work force.

"When you think of some of these figures you start realizing what automobiles mean to the economy of this country. And no matter how you look at it, the retension of such a highly discriminatory and depressive tax on this vital industry cannot be construed as conducive to the expansion of our economy."

The excise tax that has been CHAMBERLAIN's target ever since he has been in Washington was levied as a "temporary" measure during the Korean war. Every year Congress has voted to extend the 10-percent levy.

CHAMBERLAIN's proposal is to repeal the tax. But even if Congress won't support such legislation, it would be a step in the right direction if it would see fit not to vote its annual extension. Without such an extension, the levy would revert by law from 10 to 7 percent.

"Either of these actions would be a giant step toward releasing an emergency brake that has prevented new automobile sales from reaching even greater levels than they have experienced," he insisted. "And as car sales increase, so does employment."

His estimate is that repeal of the excise tax would make possible an average price reduction of $230 per car, which would be a boon to auto sales and a boost to the entire economy.

We agree it is a discriminatory tax that has outlived its usefulness. It is discriminatory in that it is directed at one industry. If it is necessary to levy an excise tax then it should be a 1- or 2-percent excise on all manufacturing. The automobile industry shouldn't be expected to carry the entire load.

Repeal of the tax would cost an estimated $1.4 billion in Federal revenue. Reduction of the tax from 10 to 7 percent would cost an estimated $400 million. But an average $230 price reduction would boost sales enough to permit the Government to recoup much of the revenue in tax receipts from automobile manufacturers, their suppliers, transportation companies, dealers, finance companies, salesmen, production workers and many, many others down the line.

The President is seeking "long-needed tax reform" aimed at "creating more jobs and income and eventually more revenue." Support for CHAMBERLAIN'S repeal of the temporary excise tax on automobiles would be directed at that very target.

## Tax Cuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the Evening Star of January 17 carries an interesting article by Mr. David Lawrence in which he comments on the Government's fiscal problems in much the same vein as my remarks in the House on that same day. I ask leave to include the Lawrence column with my remarks.

POLITICS AND KENNEDY TAX CUTS—PARTY BELIEVED AIDED, EVEN IF CONGRESS SKIPS REDUCTION AFTER FIRST YEAR

(By David Lawrence)

When President Kennedy delivered his state of the Union message just a year ago, he told the American people he was submitting for fiscal 1963 a balanced Federal budget. A few days later he sent Congress a budget showing there would be a surplus of $500 million for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1962, and ending June 30, 1963. Actually the figure officially indicated now for that same year is a deficit of $8.8 billion. This is a mistake of $9.3 billion.

What assurance does the country have that another mistake isn't in the offing? The President in his state of the Union message earlier this week frankly predicted in general terms that there would be a deficit for the 2 fiscal years 1963 and 1964. How are the people to know the extent of the deficit if such a gross error as was made in January a year ago doesn't get corrected for many months thereafter?

It so happens that economists were quite sure early in 1962 that the President's prediction about fiscal year 1963 was wrong, but not until after the congressional elections in November were the official figures revising the January estimate given out. The excuse for the delay was that Congress was still in session and might change the appropriations. But there was no reason why the Government couldn't have issued revised figures as early as August 1962, when it could have conceded the possibility of a slight increase in the deficit. The people at least would have been told that the $500 million surplus was a "myth."

Persons who have followed budget figures for years now say that the President's estimate of a deficit of around $12 billion for the fiscal year ahead is too rosy a prediction. They think the deficit will go much higher.

It is always difficult, of course, to estimate tax receipts. Under the Eisenhower administration and its predecessors the final figures often varied from those forecast, but the percentage of overestimate has seldom been as big as the one Mr. Kennedy made in his state of the Union message in January 1962.

Plainly, the new device of spreading the tax cuts over 3 years will not tend to clarify the picture. Individuals will not know when or whether they will get the promised tax cuts. Congress has a way of changing its mind from session to session about legislation projected for the future. Thus, for 9 straight years Congress has declined to permit certain taxes to expire at the time set under the laws previously written. Instead, these taxes have been regularly retained.

Many Members of Congress are by no means convinced that the President's new formula will ever be applied as he outlines it. For if economic conditions get worse instead of better, there may have to be changes in the formula. Also, if business does boom and big deficits still continue, the demand will be for a cut in the deficits by postponing some of the tax cuts.

The whole picture is, of course, political. The administration apparently feels that, by promising cuts in three separate years, the voter will look forward to them and will reward the Democrats in the 1964 election. But there is also the possibility that the tax cuts will not spur the economy because of the presence of other factors, such as the insistence of laborunion leaders on high wage rates as their share of the savings from a lowering of corporate taxes. Naturally, the employers will then want to increase prices. If the increased wage costs cannot be offset by higher prices, more profit squeezes will develop and the Treasury will get less tax receipts than it has anticipated.

Altogether, America is in for a period of economic confusion and an era of uncertainty that is not conducive to the development of the confidence so essential to business planning. Juggling budget figures for political purposes may win the 1964 election, but the state of the Union messages in 1965, 1967, and 1968 will have to acknowledge the futility of relying on tax cuts alone to stimulate sound business growth. It is already conceded by high officials that the budget will not be balanced until 1967.

An inflationary price wave seems certain to cut down the purchasing power of the dollar to the lowest point in 50 years. This is because the idea of cutting down nondefense expenditures has been scorned by the administration.

Evidently the theories of the 1930's that kept American's unemployment figures high, as pump priming failed, are being applied again. If a tax cut doesn't stimulate the economy this year or next, will it be argued that higher deficts will then be in order? This dilemma will someday confront an administration which is borrowing billions to reduce taxes.

## An American Creed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DURWARD G. HALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 18, 1963*

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, recently the Medical Society of the District of Columbia brought to my attention an editorial reprinted from Philadelphia Medicine, volume 58, No. 38, of September 21, 1962, entitled "An American's Creed." The executive board of the society reviewed this creed and wholeheartedly endorsed the thoughts behind it and the views expressed in it. It is recognized as Dean Alfange's "Message of 1952; My Creed," which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune December 30, 1951. A framed version hangs in the office I occupy in my district as furnished by St. Clair County chairman, Don Giesler, M.D. Under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I believe the creed is again deserving of consideration by the Members of the House of Representatives, due to its timeliness and as forwarded by our District of Columbia Medical Society:

I do not choose to be a common man. It is my right to be uncommon—if I can. I seek opportunity—not security. I do not wish to be a kept citizen, humbled and dulled by having the State look after me. I want to take the calculated risk; to dream and to build; to fail and to succeed. I refuse to barter incentive for a dole. I prefer the challenge of life to the guaranteed existence; the thrill of fulfillment to the stale calm and dry rot of Utopia. I will not trade my freedom for beneficence, not my dignity for a handout. I will never cower before any master nor bend to any threat. It is my heritage to stand erect, proud and unafraid; to think and act for myself; to enjoy the benefit of my creations; and to face the world boldly saying, "This I have done with my own hand, I am a man. I am an American."

## GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

## RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

## CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

# *Appendix*

## Theodore F. Shuey, Late Official Reporter of Debates, U.S. Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, January 21, 1963*

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I have in my hand an article giving a vivid and interesting sketch of Theodore F. Shuey, at one time the Chief Official Reporter of Debates of the Senate.

Mr. Shuey was born in Staunton, Va., and while in Washington in 1868 was appointed by Mr. Sutton, then the Official Reporter, as a member of his staff.

From 1868 to 1933, when he passed away, he was Official Reporter of the Senate, and during the 65 years of his service he was never absent a day on account of sickness.

I am sure this article will be of absorbing interest to Senators, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Shorthand Reporters' World, New York, February 1916]

THEODORE F. SHUEY, AGE 71 AT THE TIME

"Let us read together the life story of probably the most scholarly reporter in the world."

There is nothing more inspiring than a conspicuously successful life. Of all the bright names that have honored and adorned the profession of verbatim reporting, there is none greater than that of Theodore F. Shuey, now for more than 47 years and Official Reporter of the Senate of the United States, and today one of the youngest and most vigorous men of all the hundreds who work beneath the dome of the Capitol.

There are great lawyers, great surgeons, great engineers. Let us read together the life story of a great reporter. Let us see what it means not only to put words on paper swiftly and clearly, but to transmute colloquial speech into the finer metal of the smooth, written record. This is the fine art of the linguist, the scholar, the master of speech. "Our business is with words," says Mr. Shuey; "and the more we know about words, the easier and the better is our work." There is no language so rich in its treasures as the English; for it has ruthlessly snatched the wealth of many other tongues, and no one can be a really great reporter of the English spoken words unless he knows a good deal about other languages. The French parliamentary reporting system is better than ours in one respect at least, because in France no man can enter that gate unless he is at least a bachelor of arts.

Of the famous report of a great speech in the British House of Commons it was once said that the scholar in the gallery thought that the scholar on the floor would, in his remarks, make a certain classical allusion which was very apt; but the orator forgot to do so, and the reporter put it into his speech for him. There may be others who can do that sort of thing as well as Mr. Shuey can, but none who can do it better. And when there is a fierce personal debate, and the words are called for, there is no one who can stand up and read them more fluently to the listening Senate. When you add to that the fact that never in more than 47 years has he missed a day of a session of the Senate, and that he has sometimes gone 2 or 3 days and nights at a stretch, without taking off his clothes, when there was a "physical endurance" debate running continuously, you begin to realize something of the fiber and caliber of the man who is the subject of this too brief and modest sketch. For buoyant resiliency in the face of long hours there are few young men who are his equal.

Theodore F. Shuey was born near Staunton, in Augusta County, Va., February 2, 1845. His Huguenot ancestors came to this country nearly 200 years ago. For generations they were successful farmers. When Theodore was 14 years old a farmer clergyman, who was a guest at his father's house, had a copy of Elias Longley's "Manual of Phonography," which he showed to the boy. This clergyman, Rev. Samuel Evers, taught Theodore the alphabet of phonography, and thereby made the career of the most noteworthy shorthand reporter now living. In less than a year Shuey had gone through the Benn Pitman books, and then the "Handbook of Standard Phonography," by Andrew J. Graham.

In Virginia everybody who aspires to be anything gets a classical education. Thomas Jefferson, father of the University of Virginia, believed that no man can lay the foundations of an education except in Latin and Greek; and today, man for man, there is probably no State in the Union where you will find such a general knowledge of the classics as in Virginia. Shuey went to Otterbein University, at Westerville, Ohio. There he began the conquest of Latin and Greek, which he has carried on for more than half a century, so that Homer and Virgil in their original tongues are to him a vacation pastime. Blessings on the hundreds of small colleges in this country, which open to so many thousands the door to the wonderful past, rich with the spoils of time.

Before young Mr. Shuey had been long in college the cannon began to boom the the muskets to rattle in the great Civil War. He lived near the border of West Virginia. As a lad he had seen the sale of the slaves on a neighboring estate at the owner's death. He had seen mothers separated from their children, brothers from sisters. He had seen the slavetraders from Charleston and Savannah bid them off like cattle, and march them away handcuffed, going they knew not where. The unusual sight made him an abolitionist at heart; and when the time came—when in that border region one man chose one side and another the other side, Shuey went with the Union.

In 1863, not waiting to finish his collegiate course, he wrote a cousin in Pennsylvania that he was about to enlist in an Ohio regiment then at the front, in which were some of his classmates. His uncle immediately sent this cousin to bring Mr. Shuey to Pennsylvania, and going there he fairly ran into th Battle of Gettysburg, which he witnessed and of which he made a diary in shorthand. In response to the call of the Governor of Pennsylvania for emergency troops he enlisted, but in this service saw only 6 weeks of soldiering. Then he enlisted in the 3d Pennsylvania Heavy Artillery, and was sent to Fortress Monroe, where he remained until April 1864. But his real fighting came after that.

In the last year of the Civil War those who wanted action got it. In April 1864, the 188th Pennsylvania Infantry was organized from volunteer members of the 3d Pennsylvania Heavy Artillery. Mr. Shuey was in Company H, which, consisting of 82 enlisted men and 3 officers, lost in killed, wounded, and missing in action, 55 of its members. These missing men were killed, so that the total loss was far above the average of the fighting regiments of that bloody conflict. We who are too young to remember have little conception of the terrible character of some of these battles. Mr. Shuey never drilled except under fire, as in the intervals of comparative quiet he was doing high-grade clerical work for his regiment; but whenever there was any fighting to be done, he was in it. A comrade, the same Geist, referred to in the shorthand specimen herewith printed, has published of him the following tribute:

"Having served with him as a member of Company H, 188th, I know that no braver or more faithful soldier ever carried a musket. In the campaign of 1864 he was nearly always on detached service as company clerk and at regimental headquarters, yet he refused to give up his gun, which he always kept in apple-pie order; and in every action in which the 188th was called upon to take part, volunteered to take his chance with the rest of the boys—at Drury's Bluff, Cold Harbor, Petersburg, Fort Harrison—in fact, all of the hard battles of 1864."

General Grant has been described as the most terrible general of all the wars until his time because of the way in which he sent his own men to death to gain the object on which he had set his heart. In his memoirs he says that the Battle of Cold Harbor was one of his greatest military mistakes. At all events the regiment of which Mr. Shuey's company were a part was ordered to charge the outer rifle pits of the enemy, just outside the main Confederate earthworks. Only a few Union troops reached the rifle pits, and these were at once swept by a terrific hail of lead. Shuey and his company comrades were far to the right, where they had no protection, and lying flat on their faces, men were killed and wounded faster than the story can be told. Now read a page from Mr. Shuey's diary, written in shorthand while the scene was fresh in his memory—one of the few shorthand diaries of that war. A photographic facsimile of the page describing the thick of that slaughter is here presented; and while this article was being written, 51 years later, Mr. Shuey wrote the same page again from dictation. The history of his changed shorthand style will be told later. Now read the diary:

"KEY TO THE PAGE OF NOTES FROM MR. SHUEY'S DIARY, MADE IN 1864

"Just then another ball struck him, and then another, which finished his mortal career. In his death agonies he writhed right over the fork [of the limb] behind which I was lying, and remained there, presenting his front to the enemy. To this circumstance I may probably owe the preservation of my life, for I think during the

time I was lying there his dead body received at least half a dozen bullets. Geist who was near me, received a ball through his leg, and made his way out of that as soon as possible. Julio, who was also wounded, crawled to a tree. Price lay almost beside me, and received three balls, all in his legs. Our men who had gained the pits were not able to fire upon the rebels, as the pits could scarcely protect them sufficiently by lying flat on their faces. The bullets passed over and around me in every direction. Many grazed me. I remained there an hour, probably two of them, for in such a position one cannot judge of the time; when a brigade of our troops on the right made a charge which drew the whole rebel fire. Then I sprang up and reached a tree, from behind which I called to Julio, who crawled to me, and then I helped him back. The poor fellow received six or seven wounds, and will undoubtedly die. Crossley was killed just as he reached the pits on the left, and Bates badly wounded. As far as I can learn, in our company there are 6 killed, 12 wounded, and 7 or 8 missing. Captain Leckie and Lieutenant Bean were wounded. Our company, that is, what remains of it, is scattered in every direction. At night I made some coffee, and slept at the edge of the woods, about the same place I did two nights before. There was a good deal of firing on the left."

There may be braver acts than carrying a wounded comrade to safety under such a fire. There are not many. This is just a glimpse of Mr. Shuey's Army experience. In March 1865, he was in the hospital, where at one time he lay unconscious for 13 days and narrowly escaped being taken to the dead-house. He says that since his recovery he has never had a day of sickness, in more than 50 years.

After the war was over he went back to Otterbein, and then home to Virginia, where he worked for the Richmond Whig and Lynchburg News, but in that limited field there was not room enough for a shorthand career. In the first 10 years of his shorthand experience he had never met a verbatim reporter, but when he did so, found himself well equipped. A. F. Crutchfield, proprietor of the Literary Pastime, was about to remove his publication office from Richmond to Baltimore, and asked Shuey to go with him. On the way Shuey stopped in Washington, and there met Col. John W. Forney, editor of the Washington Daily Chronicle, who had been Secretary of the Senate, and on his saying to Colonel Forney that he knew more about shorthand than he did about newspaper work in a strange city, Colonel Forney told Shuey to go and see Mr. Richard Sutton, contractor for the shorthand reporting of the Senate for the Congressional Globe. He went to see Mr. Sutton, and was employed as an amanuensis at $20 a week.

In 1868 the actual reporting of the Senate was done by Dennis and James Murphy, who, with their brother, Edward, formed the most remarkable family of shorthand reporters that the world has ever known. Dennis had been a reporter in the Senate for 20 years, and most of the note-taking was done by him. James was also a fine reporter, and in those days Edward was in charge of the transcribing department, reading the notes of his brothers with the utmost fluency. In later years Edward became one of the reports, and now, in 1916, he and his son James—namesake of his famous uncle—are doing one-third of all the Senate reporting. If anyone will take the trouble to read the Senate debates of 1868, or any of the preceding years, he will see that we of modern days know nothing more of splendid verbatim reporting than did the Murphy brothers. Dennis in particular was a perfect shorthand machine; he could write at 200 words a minute for hours at a time, if necessary, making notes that several people could read easily. He once called the attention of the writer of this article to a day's debate in the Senate which averaged 208 words a minute for 4 hours. For mere manual skill no one can possibly beat this.

Into this wonderful opportunity came young Mr. Shuey. During the long vacation of 1868 he learned to read Dennis Murphy's notes; and naturally he lapsed into the long, simple outlines of which Murphy was the dextrous master. No one need write such long outlines as Mr. Shuey does, but if God has given a man fingers as nimble as a hummingbird's wings, there is no easier way to record human speech. Compare now the diary of 1864 with the corresponding page, written from dictation on December 20, 1915.

Since December 1868 Mr. Shuey's professional life has been one long, uninterrupted success. In 1872 he assisted in the reporting of the Pennsylvania constitutional convention. In 1876 he went to California in the congressional recess and reported the first senatorial investigation of the Chinese question. In 1896 Dennis F. Murphy died, and Mr. Shuey and Edward V. Murphy were unanimous made the principal reporters of the Senate.

In 1902 Virginia held a great constitutional convention, which began during the recess of Congress. Two men from Washington, with more ambition than skill, obtained the reporting of this convention, and fell down. Then, without solicitation or desire on his part, Mr. Shuey received, at his ancestral home near Staunton, a summons to come to Richmond, where the reporting of the convention was offered to him substantially on his own terms. He and Milton W. Blumenberg did the reporting till Congress met in December, when it was continued by other skilful hands.

In 1904 appeared the Encyclopedia Americana. For that publication Mr. Shuey wrote, and was paid for, the article on the history of shorthand. In it he gave just tribute to the great work of American shorthand authors, Andrew J. Graham, Benn Pitman, and others. It is one of the curiosities of literature, and one of the mysteries of the cyclopedic art, that when this article appeared in print in the Encyclopedia Americana—word for word as Mr. Shuey wrote it except for certain mutilations—it was signed by another name. Mr. Shuey, who showed the manuscript of his article to the writer of this sketch when he was writing it, in 1904, often laughs at the queer transformation, and wonders how it came about.

Some of the reporting in the Senate, as elsewhere, is very easy. Much of it is terrifically hard. When the Senate squares away for months of debate on a tariff bill, it sits 9 hours a day as a regular thing, and often much longer. In recent years there was a debate which lasted 3 days and 2 nights without a break. It is at such times as these that Mr. Shuey's wonderful vitality and perennial youth come to the front. He is tireless and indefatigable, cheerful and elastic as a boy.

But it is as the trained nurse of ailing sentences that Mr. Shuey shines at his best. He is probably the most scholarly reporter in the world. During the past congressional vacation he read the Iliad and part of the Odssey in the original Greek. He is very fond of this quotation from Max Mueller:

"What people call 'mere words' are in truth the monuments of the finest intellectual battles, triumphal arches of the grandest victories won by the intellect of man. When men had found names for body and soul, for father and mother, and not till then, did the first act of human history begin. Not till there were names for right and wrong, for God and man, could there be anything worthy of the name of human society. Every new word was a discovery; and these early discoveries, if but properly understood, are more important to us than the greatest conquests of the kings of Egypt and Babylon. Not one of our explorers has unearthed with his spade or pick-axe more splendid palaces and temples, whether in Egypt or Babylon, than the etymologist. Every word is the palace of a human thought; and in scientific etymology we posses the charm with which to call these ancient thoughts back to life. Languages mean speakers of language; and families of speech presuppose real families, or classes or powerful confederacies, which have struggled for their existence, and held their ground against all enemies."

Here is a reporting incident that has never been told in print. In a recent session of Congress Senator Money, of Mississippi, was whiling away the time during a filibuster by telling the story of an old Greek play, "The Cloud," with the names of the players, and many other interesting facts about ancient heroes of mythology and bygone song. Senator Money always spoke rapidly, and not very distinctly. A former Senate reporter, now dead, who was a great note-taker and splendid reporter of current English, told the writer of this sketch that the only time in his senatorial reporting career that he had been absolutely floored by a speaker so that he could not dictate his notes, was on this turn of Senator Money. After the day was over, Mr. Shuey, with that kindliness which is ever a part of him, bound up the wounded and gave first aid to the injured.

When you have known a man for 25 years, and every year you have admired him more; when his life is full of interest to the younger men in the business, it is a great temptation to write on and on, crescam laude recens. On his father's death he became the owner of his ancestral home, where in congressional vacations he lives the life of a quiet country gentleman. He has been twice married. His only son is a distinguished chemist, and he has three charming daughters. Long may he be with us.

FRED IRLAND.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *December 20, 1915.*

---

## Fiscal Fantasy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 21, 1963*

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the President has submitted a staggering Federal budget to the Congress for the 1964 fiscal year, with an estimated deficit of almost $12 billion. Judging from past experience, the deficit will go even higher than estimated, and will be the highest ever for a peacetime year.

If the President's recommendations are accepted, we will incur a record deficit, despite the fact that the Government will have the highest Federal income in history. The reason is that the President is proposing the highest level of Federal spending by our Government or any government in the world's history.

These extravagant and uncontrolled proposals seem to have stunned people throughout the Nation, and rightfully

so. Leading newspapers in western New York are reflecting the general reaction, and under leave to extend my remarks I would like to submit two newspaper editorials dealing with the budget; the editorials are, "Red Ink Forever," from the Buffalo Evening News of January 18, 1963, and "President's Frugal Budget Threatens Fiscal Disaster," from the Rochester Times-Union of January 17, 1963.

[From the Buffalo Evening News, Jan. 18, 1963]

RED INK FOREVER?

One year ago today, President Kennedy sent Congress a balanced budget of $92.5 billion. The economy, he said, was "moving forward strongly," and to "plan a deficit" under those circumstances would be to risk inflation.

Now the President has submitted a radically different sort of budget, rationalized on a radically different set of economic theories and assumptions. This one is more than $6 billion higher and nearly $12 billion in the red—by far the largest deliberate deficit any President ever recommended in peacetime.

This time, the President says, the economy is still moving forward, but not strongly enough. High taxes are holding it back, and cutting them drastically is his major economic objective of the year. This, he says, obliges him to "limit severely" his 1964 expenditure proposals.

What follows, however, is evidence of a continuing spending spree that, by any conceivable measure, is heading rapidly skyward.

This new budget, besides being $6.3 billion higher than the one submitted a year ago, is $10 billion higher than last year's actual spending—$17.9 billion higher than the last Eisenhower budget (submitted 2 years ago)—$22.3 billion higher than the last full Eisenhower fiscal year (1960).

Or judge it, if you prefer, by another telltale symptom, "new obligational authority." When this runs significantly higher than current spending, it means the spending trend in future years will be higher still. It is here, rather than on current spending, that a really determined economy drive would show up first. Last year, the total of these requested "licenses to spend" was $5 billion greater than actual spending. But in the budget for next year, it is $9 billion greater.

In other words, while this budget's total of spending estimates (which may prove quite wide of the mark) is held below $100 billion, the total of Kennedy requests for new authority to spend comes to $107.9 billion.

Still another overall sign of how little economy the administration has in mind is the trend in Federal employment. Even though the Defense payroll is down, the rest of the vast Federal bureaucracy is scheduled to go up by another 46,000 employees. This will bring the total increase to about 260,000 since this administration took office 2 years ago. And virtually every department and agency shares in the rise.

The President, in presenting all these figures, makes much of the claim that next year's spending for everything but defense, space and interest has been stabilized, or even cut a little. The claim is misleading. For the spending trend in most categories is distinctly up. What causes the illusion of stability is a collection of some $2 billion worth of bookkeeping entries or hopefully low estimates of spending required on programs (like farm subsidies) that are controlled by statute. Where any administrative discretion is involved the trend is generally and markedly up—far short of justifying any claim to have held the line.

The budget contains no suggestion anywhere of an apology for the huge $11.9 billion deficit, or of a challenge to Congress to help reduce it. On the contrary. The President tells us our choice is only between "a chronic deficit of inertia due to inadequate economic growth" and a "temporary deficit" which has been purposely designed to "boost the economy" and "achieve future budget surpluses."

When? He doesn't say, though some aids hopefully mention 1967 as a target date. But if Congress votes a massive tax cut, and still has any hope that its middle-aged members will live to see any of those "future budget surpluses," it had better take a king-sized economy ax to the spending side of this swollen budget.

For the Government actually to step up its spending pace this much while drastically cutting taxes when faced already with a near-record deficit—at a time when the President declares that "America has enjoyed 22 months of uninterrupted economic recovery"—is, to us, fiscal irresponsibility.

Lower taxes and faster growth can be prudently expected to produce those "future budget surpluses," only if spending is disciplined much more strictly than is indicated here.

---

[From the Rochester Times-Union, Jan. 17, 1963]

PRESIDENT'S FRUGAL BUDGET THREATENS FISCAL DISASTER

In Monday's state of the Union message, President Kennedy promised a fiscally responsible program which would cut nondefense spending, reduce taxes and limit the budget deficit to manageable size.

Details of his budget today show that he actually proposes, in our view, to plunge the Nation into a bottomless pool of red ink.

His array of budgets under various names all ask the highest Federal spending ever, in war or peace. He proposed a piddling slice of $300 million in nondefense spending which makes up close to half of the $99 billion expenditure total. His estimated deficit of nearly $12 billion is about as manageable as a tidal wave.

To grasp the dangerous trend of Federal spending, compare the proposed fiscal 1964 budget with its highest predecessor, in fiscal 1945. Then, major national security spending totaled $81 billion and nondefense spending ran to $17 billion. Next year, the President estimates national security spending of $56 billion and a nondefense total of $43 billion.

Even taking restricted wartime civilian activities into account, it is obvious that the Federal Government has pulled the cork on welfare spending.

Expenditure increases for programs ranging from scientific research (already provided with more money than can be spent responsibly) to pork-barrel projects (dear to Congressmen's hearts) again prove that old Federal programs never die, they don't even fade away—they just go on."

The President tries to justify the enormous deficit on two grounds—(1) rising national defense and space costs and (2) proposed tax cuts, which he asserts will spur a business boom and eventually bring budget surpluses.

These arguments don't tell the whole story. If Kennedy really meant what he said about the need to slash nondefense spending, he'd have slashed enough to counter any needed rise in national security expenditures.

Further, the net estimated revenue loss from the President's tax proposals, still to be detailed, is set at only $2.7 billion. He even predicts total tax receipts $1.4 billion higher than the Government is taking in this year—yet the estimated deficit will go up some $4 billion in the same period.

And what if Kennedy is guessing too low on spending and too high on revenue? That's what happened this year, and his small predicted surplus has turned into an $8-billion deficit. If experience repeats itself in fiscal 1964, that $12-billion estimated deficit will zoom out of sight.

The President's failure to bring Federal spending under sharp rein in nondefense areas imperils the tax cuts which everybody agrees are long overdue. His deliberatly planned deficit, raising the national debt to at least $316 billion, threatens inflation and assures sharply increased interest costs.

"This budget presents a financial plan for the efficient and frugal conduct of the public business," Kennedy said. To us, it presents anything but that. If Congress doesn't finally put the brake on the President's profligacy, the Nation will be fully embarked toward fiscal disorder.

---

## Successful Fight To Save Historic Fort Davis Described by Author Barry Scobee

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, January 21, 1963*

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a distinguished Texas author, Barry Scobee, has written a special article for the San Angelo Standard-Times concerning 30 years of effort to make Old Fort Davis a national historic site.

This was successfully accomplished in 1961 when Congress passed enabling legislation, of which I was the Senate sponsor.

Barry Scobee is author of "The Story of Fort Davis, Jeff County, and the Davis Mountains," published by M. Hunter, Jr., of Fort Davis; and of "Old Fort Davis," published by Naylor Co., of San Antonio. Both are valuable historical works on a significant area of the frontier West.

I ask unanimous consent that the newspaper article from the San Angelo Standard-Times of January 10, 1963, captioned "Fort Davis War of 30 Years Ends," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORT DAVIS WAR OF 30 YEARS ENDS

(By Barry Scobee)

FORT DAVIS.—This town is almost dancing in the streets with elation over having won a "war" of 30 years duration to save the old frontier army post from total vanquishment by time, weather and vandals. It has been taken over as a national historic site.

The deed to the property, signed by the owners, Mr. and Mrs. John C. Jackson, of Houston, has been recorded here. It conveys to the United States full title to 447 acres, with all buildings thereon, all now in the hands of the National Park Service.

Local citizens through the years turned up a dozen schemes to raise funds for the

purchase of the property, and every one fell flat on its tummy. Then in 1960 Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH and Representative J. T. Rutherford, both having personal acquaintance with the crumbling old post, took up their guns to save the historic fort.

In 1961 Congress passed the enabling bill and appropriated $115,000 for the purchase price, to buy no more than 460 acres, which was about the supposed area. In the autumn four men in new jeeps and expensive sweat shirts came here a-surveying. They were not National Park Service men—that much was learned. They sighted their transits and dragged their steel tapes (survey chains) all around the neighborhood, and told nobody anything except that they were "working for the fort," a shut-mouth attitude that irritated the curious population no end.

Two of the men were Americans, two were said to be citizens of Mexico. At least they spoke no English that anyone heard. It may be that the pair was brought in to investigate old Spanish land grant surveys measured in veras rather than feet. It is understood that they examined ancient original records in the State land office at Austin, though this may be a mere guess. It is known that when the United States buys land it really combs the landscape to make certain that the title is sound.

At any rate, it was found that the fort property did not have 460, or 454 acres as had been set out, for the deed shows less than that and that the Government paid the owners $110,000 for the tract.

To supply more music for the victory dancing, last Friday the man arrived here, with his household goods, one wife and three children, who is the first superintendent of the national site. He is Michael J. Becker, a native of Maryland who says "you all" and who was a lieutenant, junior grade, in World War II, in the South Pacific. He has been 16 years with the National Park Service. His first job was at Lake Texhoma in Texas. He came here from 4 years as superintendent of the Tumacacori National Monument, an old mission, in Arizona.

Fort Davis folks just have to find out about people and things—though they took a licking from those four surveyors. Sometimes they find out through a nosey reporter. So now they know that Becker is called Mike for short, that Mrs. Becker's given name is Ruth, that she is a native of Indiana, and that the children are Donna Rose and Joe, in high school; and Kathleen, in the grades. The Beckers have no dog.

Other towns that want Congress to donate 'em a national historic site or such, wonder how in—under the sun this town got the old fort promoted. In the war citizens went from here and the area and blythely told Senate and House subcommittees in Washington exactly what virtues the post had that should be saved for posterity. Here's a few of the highlights:

That the fort was established in 1854 and soon became the most important anti-Indian setup on the (capitalized) Great Military Road between San Antonio and El Paso and points west.

That it is the cradle of the present U.S. Signal Corps, because a young New York doctor by the name of Albert S. Myer arrived here in 1855 to be the post surgeon and saw the Apaches using talkie-talkies among themselves by fires on the mountains at night, smoke in daytime, and by waving their arms or anything else handy.

Dr. Myer scratched his noggin thoughtfully and asked why our soldiers couldn't communicate in some similar manner. Result: He got Congress to establish a signal corps, of which he was the first officer—and and Fort Myer, Va., in plain sight of the Washington monument, is named for him.

Also Congress was told that both Federal soldiers and Confederate troops in the Civil War garrisoned this post, that Fort Davis was the terminal three times on tryouts of the camels that Jeff Davis imported to America for army pack-animals in the Southwest and that eventually Fort Davis troops closed the book on Indian scalping parties and horse stealing in this area.

But where the Fort Davis talkers to Congress really went to town was in their heartwarming sentimentality about how the old post soon became an oasis, a coveted stopover spot on the Great Road where dusty and weary wagon travelers going farther west could relax, wash themselves in the limpid waters of Limpia Creek, get their wheels retired, the harness mended, buy corn at a buck a bushel from Government cribs for their mules and oxen—or get it for nothing if they were broke—obtain fresh supplies of dress goods, flour, sowbelly and Arbuckle; have their hurt and sick doctored by the post surgeons, and their lovelorn pacified by the chaplains.

That almost brought cheers and tears to the hardhearted Congressmen. So that, towns, is the clever way to win a national historic site.

Oh, yes, one thing more. It was pointed out also that Fort Davis is the halfway point between the Big Bend National Park and Carlsbad Cavern. That was a telling ringer, for it indicated brisk business for the historic site.

And also the Congressmen were told that when the post was inactivated in 1891 people coming here to find plentiful grass and water for their "caows" lived in the vacated houses on officers line on the post and were called squatters. Further, that today it is a social distinction for descendants of those early families to say, "My pa and ma were once squatters on the post." That got a Washington smile.

Now what does Supt. Mike Becker think of it all? He phrases his and the National Park Service objective for the site as being:

"To create an interpretive picture of the fort in its aspects as an outpost on the old, wild frontier in opening new land for settlement and civilization a hundred years ago."

If you keep asking questions he will tell you: "When the job is finished 3 or 4 years from now we want the country's youth to see and absorb the meaning of those buildings in relation to bold and earnest soldiers, adventurers, and trailbreaking, homeseeking men and women of a hundred years ago."

In speaking of just what will be done, Becker uses the words "restore" and "reconstruct." It is considered likely that four buildings will be put back to what they originally were and that the many others will be preserved by methods known by the National Park Service, against further deterioration by wind and dust and rain and old daddy time.

---

## County Revenues and the U.S. Forest Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 21, 1963*

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago, the National Association of Counties held a grazing, water, and revenue conference at which the question of county revenues and the U.S. Forest Service was discussed by Mr. Hamilton K. Pyles, Deputy Chief of the Forest Service.

This statement is an excellent presentation of the positive partnership approach which is required by the local county government and the U.S. Forest Service to accomplish their mutual goals of full conservation and utilization of our national forest resources.

Under unanimous consent, I include this presentation in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY HAMILTON K. PYLES AT THE WESTERN REGIONAL DISTRICT MEETING OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTY OFFICIALS, LAS VEGAS, NEV., DECEMBER 13, 1962

It is a pleasure for me to be here, not only to take part in this meeting, but to visit again with people with whom I work more than 10 years ago as a national forest supervisor in California.

The theme of this meeting, which emphasizes a positive partnership approach to mutual problems and opportunities, is most appropriate and timely. A common goal, clear communication, and a good understanding are basic to a productive partnership.

The common goal to which we all subscribe is the achievement of a sound and suitable economic resource base to produce the most in goods and services that the land is capable of. This, in broadest terms, is the goal of the national forest enterprise which I want to talk about here today.

Successful partnership also requires a mutual trust founded on good understanding and frankness. My purpose today is to promote that understanding as frankly as I can.

First, I would like to briefly review the extent and meaning of the National Forest System in the counties of the Western States; the trend in receipts for use of these national forest resources; and other benefits which we believe accrue to local economies through the protection, development, and management of national forest resources.

Second, I would like to discuss some of the difficulties and problems which are causing concern to county governments under the present system of sharing revenues from sale of national forest products and other uses of its resources.

Third, I would like to discuss some avenues of cooperative effort which should result in reasonable progress toward reducing these difficulties and furthering the good relationship which we have enjoyed over the years.

First, the current situation as we see it; about 80 percent of the area in Western States is in private, State, or Federal ownerships other than national forests, yet national forests occupy over four-fifths of some western counties. One-fourth of all the counties in the United States contain at least 1,000 acres of national forest land, and almost two-thirds of these counties are in the West.

The most productive land, both for agricultural use and commercial timber growing, is in private ownership. This is as it should be and testifies to the astuteness of the early settlers who took up land under the various settlement acts including the Timber and Stone Act. The national forests were by and large the residual areas of public domain with much of the area considered to be chiefly valuable for watershed purposes. Less than half of the national forest acreage in the West is usable for commercial timber production.

In spite of much low-value land, management of the national forests has become big business by any standard. These forests are the source of some 15 percent of all of the

timber products used in the country. More than half of the usable water in the West originates on the national forests; and this is a priceless commodity. Ever increasing numbers of people are looking to the national forests for their outdoor recreation. National forest rangeland supplements the requirements of local ranch operations, and national forests comprise one of the greatest natural habitats for big game, other wildlife, and fish under a system of management anywhere in the world. In addition, they have great potential for mineral production and hydroelectric power development. These benefits derived from the protection and multiple-use management of these forests are an essential base in the economy of the country.

The direct financial revenues to counties from national forest receipts have tripled in the last decade reaching a high of about $35.2 million in 1960. The counties' share of receipts dropped to $24.8 million in 1961, and show a slight rise last year to $27 million. The drop in 1961 and slow recovery reflects the severe drop in the lumber market which still requires considerable improvement before we regain the high level of receipts of 1960. This reduction in stumpage prices and reduction in timber volume harvested has a major impact on most county receipts because the sale of timber accounts for more than 90 percent of the dollar revenue from national forest management.

Twenty-five percent of total national forest receipts is the only direct payment through the States to the county. These payments are often used in making comparisons between revenue to county governments from national forest lands against taxes from lands under other ownerships. Tabulations of these payments alone do not tell the whole story for there are other benefits to counties accruing from the existence of national forests within their borders.

National forest roads within a county and used by the public for various purposes are developed and maintained from the return of 10 percent of all receipts. This source of road funds is in addition to the regularly appropriated funds for forest development roads and roads built and originally maintained by the purchasers of national forest timber.

The existence and maintenance of thousands of miles of public forest roads, including the construction of forest highways, aids in the development of the country economy and should relieve counties of a substantial burden in maintaining roads for intracounty travel. These roads add to the capital improvement within a county and under sustained yield management eventually mean higher returns for timber sold and more use of the forest resources.

Protection of national forests benefit a number of county governments which under other circumstances would be required to bear a significant share of the costs.

Indirectly, national forest protection and development activities such as reforestation, erosion control, range rehabilitation, construction of recreational facilities, and improvement of the wildlife habitat have both immediate and long-range benefit to the local economy.

The Forest Service maintains about 750 offices in the Western States. These offices employ several thousand people and the majority of them own their own homes, many in sparsely settled rural areas. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under Public Law 874 provides school funds to counties where children of Forest Service people working on national forests create a burden on the school system. The payrolls of these employees and thousands of local residents hired on a part-time basis and other program expenditure including research and capital total nearly $200 million annually.

Impressive as these figures are, they are dwarfed by the payrolls and local income generated by the use of national forest timber, recreation, and other forest use. And many communities and their industries are directly dependent upon the national forest watersheds for their water supply and protection from floods. Recreation use of national forests, currently well over 100 million visits annually, is fast becoming a major segment of the rural economy in many western counties. Winter resorts, motels, restaurants, shops of all kinds, service stations, and many other enterprises owe their existence to visitors attracted to the national forests throughout the year. The tax base and income generated by this public use alone is already decisive in some counties and continued increase in recreational visits and tourist trade are clearly indicated.

This, in brief, outlines the wide variety of benefits from having a national forest in a county, as we see it. However, it is always difficult to combine dollars with intangible benefits and get a meaningful overall measure—particularly one that may satisfy the budget and finance people in all levels of government.

So, 10 years ago a study was made by the Forest Service to determine how 25 percent fund payments compared with the taxes levied on similar lands in private ownership. We studied 135 representative counties containing 40 percent of the total national forest acreage.

It was found that the estimated tax averaged 19 cents per acre from private lands as compared with 11 cents per acre from 25 percent of the national forest receipts. However, taking into account Federal expenditures for that portion of the fire control and road construction and maintenance costs that might reasonably have been expected to have been assumed by the county had these lands been in private ownership, the total Federal contribution averaged 24 cents per acre, about 25 percent above comparable tax receipts.

Then again, in 1955, the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations made a comprehensive study of all Federal revenue-sharing arrangements with State and local governments. They concluded at that time that the present revenue-sharing arrangement regarding national forest receipts appeared to be generally fair and reasonable and should not be disturbed. The study also pointed to several problem areas involving other Federal programs and made recommendations for their solution.

These intangible benefits, long-term development programs, analytical studies, or even strong local economies do not always solve the current problems faced by a county government. This brings me to the second point of problems and difficulties of general concern to county governments.

We recognize that fluctuation in dollars returned to the county from national forest receipts is a major problem which creates difficulties in your budget planning, long-term programs, and orderly work. It becomes a most acute and pressing problem when these fluctuations are sharply downward, such as occurred in 1961. The reason for this fluctuation is simply that the value and volume of timber harvested is affected by the lumber market and the lumber market became seriously depressed in 1961 for a variety of reasons. In the eastern national forests, receipts from gas, oil, and mineral leases also fluctuate widely with consequent local impacts.

The problem is further aggravated when this drop in receipts comes as a surprise to the county officials affected. This is primarily a matter of poor communication and we in the Forest Service must assume a major share of the responsibility for correcting it.

A second problem, and one recognized by the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, was the restriction placed upon local use of these Federal payments. Use of these funds for roads and schools only is considered by some States and counties to be a handicap in meeting changing fiscal needs. The State, of course, can make adjustments between roads and schools but Federal legislation would be required to further broaden this authority.

Another continuing problem to government at all levels is the increasidng cost of doing business and meeting the needs and demands of the people for which each level is responsible. To meet these costs, counties with large areas of national forests must necessarily seek to increase their revenues from these areas as well as from lands in other ownerships.

These, I think, are the matters of common interest that are causing most concern to county officials. New Federal legislation obviously could drastically change the situation; and no doubt some of you believe that this is the path to fiscal salvation for many counties. It is a most difficult route as indicated by the fate of many such bills introduced in past sessions of Congress. However, a great deal can be done in a partnership approach to these problems without legislation. Furthermore, it would be out of order and improper for me at this time to discuss any proposals dealing with Federal legislation involving revenue from Federal lands. These matters involve the policy of the administration, the Bureau of the Budget, and other Federal land-managing agencies. And a major difficulty is to find a common denominator for any broad new legislative proposals which is fair to all.

On the matter of the fluctuating character of annual 25-percent payments to the counties, the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations recommended that the 25-percent fund payments be computed on a 5-year average of receipts instead of upon an annual basis in order to secure a greater stability in shared revenue payments. If this were considered desirable and proposed at the Federal level, it would require a change in the present law. However, it might be possible for counties to explore the possibility of a similar system within their individual States.

On the Forest Service side of this partnership, we must continue to improve those operating practices on our timber sales which tend to reduce the receipts to the Treasury and thereby the 25 percent returned to the counties. In some sales of low-value timber we are caught in the squeeze between high operating costs for roads, betterment of the timber sale area, erosion control, disposal of logging slash, fire control, and the reduced value of the timber over the last couple of years. Most of our standards for this work are at a nearly irreducible minimum now to insure continued productivity of the land; a few may not be. For example, we are taking a very critical look at application of our road standards, particularly the spur and branch roads, to determine whether or not we can further reduce the costs in these areas without sacrificing conservation needs.

On the matter of communications, we are just going to have to do a better job of keeping county officials informed of local, short-term projections of national forest revenues. I think in the great majority of cases this is being done and there is a close association and working relationship between our field units and the appropriate county officials. But, perhaps we need to do this on a more formal basis to insure that the outlook for estimated returns to the county reaches the right people in a county organization at the proper time.

We in the Forest Service also need to have a better understanding of the problems of county government. We need your help in

finding solutions that will be effective and have wide application. For example, work is now underway to restudy national forest contributions made 10 years ago. This will again compare the 25 percent fund payment to counties with taxes estimated to be payable on similar lands in private ownership in the same manner as we did before. We are attempting through this new study to determine what changes in the underlying situation may have occurred during the last decade. The study is being made on the same sampling basis as that employed before. In each sample county, the county assessors will be consulted to determine the land and timber classifications and value currently in use as a basis of assessment. The total national forest area in each sample county will then be classified and prevailing tax rates applied to find the estimated tax per acre.

Once the data from this new study have been compiled, we would like to review the results with representatives of your association. This could provide an opportunity for joint interpretation of study findings and we could explore and discuss together the desirability of any changes in our program efforts or in current revenue arrangements.

I am sure a meeting of this sort between representatives of NACO and the Forest Service would not only be fruitful in the interpretation of this current study, but in a general exchange of viewpoints aimed at working together on important mutual problems and at providing direction to national programs that affect county interests.

Now to the problem of carrying out the required responsibilities of government under increasing costs of doing business—that is, the need for more revenue. Our best solution is to do the utmost to increase production from all the products and uses of forest resources under sustained yield. We are working hard on this. The Forest Service has increased its allowable cut limitations. It has moved in other ways to stimulate timber harvesting on national forests. The additional authorization approved by the 87th Congress for stepping up the road development program on the national forests, and subsequent increases in appropriation, will probably do more to aid us in meeting our allowable cut of timber and opening the forests to other resource uses than any other single item. Your association was most effective in supporting this legislation. This was an essential forward step in developing the 10-year program for the national forests. As you know, this program blueprints the actions we plan to achieve greater benefits from these lands and consequently increased revenue to the counties.

Before too long, we expect to have a system of recreation user charges. The new Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, with the assistance of the interested departments of Government, is working to develop a uniform system of charges for the recreation use of Federal land and facilities. It is too early to predict just what this system of charges may mean to national forest receipts, and thus to the counties, but the outdoor recreation business is growing by leaps and bounds. There is no question in my mind, barring unseen catastrophes, that the national forests will continue to experience a gradual upward trend in receipts just as we have experienced in the past decade or so.

Finally, I want to reiterate the desire of the Forest Service to work closely with you toward meeting our mutual goals, problems, and opportunities. The detailed problems of revenue sharing are extremely complex. While I have attempted to cover that subject in a most general way, I believe it is quite impossible to tackle the details in a general meeting of this kind. On the other hand, I believe that meetings between a representative group of NACO and a similar Forest Service group could be productive. To be specific, I would suggest a meeting in early 1964 to review the study findings and further to discuss ways and means of overcoming difficulties that are regional or national in scope. If an earlier meeting seems profitable, we would be glad to take part. These meetings should further a positive partnership approach.

## Present and Potential Economics of Southern Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, January 21, 1963*

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, ours is the most prosperous nation in the world, and our strong and stable economy is due in large part to the natural resources with which the United States is so abundantly blessed.

Not the least of these resources are our great forests, and I am proud of the fact that the South and my State of Georgia stand at the top of the Nation's timber economy, in terms of supply, conservation and management.

F. C. Gragg, of International Paper Co., New York, N.Y., in a recent paper presented in Atlanta, Ga., noted that the South earned its position as "wood basket of the nation" through diligence and ingenuity. I commend his discerning analysis of the great forests of the Southland to Members of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this paper be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESENT AND POTENTIAL ECONOMIES OF SOUTHERN FORESTS

(By F. C. Gragg)

In 1935, there were 25 pulp and paper mills in the South, using 2½ million cords of pulpwood a year. Last year, there were 73 mills. Together, they are consuming over 24 million cords of pulpwood annually. The value of the pulpwood crop delivered to the pulp mills in the South last year was more than $482 million. Sawmill chips, once wasted, accounted for almost $63 million of this.

Today, the southern forests bring as much money to the landowner, the lumberman, the turpentine operator, and the poleman as the old forests ever did. The outlet for pulpwood has cemented the foundation of a new prosperity.

What's more important, except in time of all-out war, in which there is no time to plan ahead, these new forests need never fear another wave of destruction. They have only to look forward to continued growth and added importance.

For those who lack the "big picture," let me describe this wonderful 12-State area.

It extends from Virginia into eastern Texas and Oklahoma. It contains 193 million acres of commercial forests—more than one-third of all commercial forest land of the Nation. No other single region approaches this in forest resources.

Generally, the area is a low coastal plain, ranging from sea level to about 1,000 feet, with occasional interior mountain ranges up to 3,000 feet. The coastal area is occupied by almost pure stands of pine, interspersed in the alluvial bottoms with hardwoods and cypress. Mixed pine and hardwood cover the minor mountain areas. In the higher country, almost every species can be found, from the southern lowland trees to the northern hardwood types and into white pine and spruce.

The soil varies greatly, from poor sands and rock to rich alluvium. For every soil there is generally at least one valuable timber tree that thrives upon it. The climate is generally mild, with plenty of rain well distributed throughout the year. All in all, it is a splendid land for growing trees.

Henry Hardtner, of Urania, La., whom many consider the father of large-scale forestry in the South, enjoyed telling how impressed northern lumbermen were with his success in growing trees for the Urania Lumber Co. This was right after the turn of the century. There were no yield tables then, and most people thought it would take 60 to 100 years to grow a merchantable crop.

"When I showed visitors my success in obtaining reproduction on cut-over longleaf stands," Mr. Hardtner used to say, "the results were so marked that they accused me of 'nature faking.' "

Sixty percent of all the tree farms in the Nation are in the South. They represent 66 percent of the Nation's tree farm acreage. Nine of the top 10 tree planting States in the Nation are in the South. The South now supplies about two-thirds of the wood to feed the Nation's gigantic appetite for paper, one-third of its demand for lumber, almost all of its requirement for naval stores, plus such items as poles, pilings, and furniture stock.

In terms of net annual growth in excess of use, the South is better off today than at any time in the past 25 years.

In 1935, when the expansion of the pulp and paper industry really went into full swing, there was some concern that this added demand for raw material would soon strip the southern countryside of all of its existing timber. As a matter of fact, it served only to emphasize the South's great wood producing potential by increasing the financial return on a forest investment and by encouraging the planting of trees on marginal and submarginal farmland.

Since 1935 the forests of the South have supplied a truly phenomenal amount of raw material, not just to the paper industry, but to all the wood using industries as well. At the same time, the South has increased its reserve of growing stock by almost 10 percent.

This fact pinpoints the South as the most important section of the U.S. timber economy, not only because of its present day contribution, but also because of its probable contribution in the future.

It is a most outstanding accomplishment and the credit belongs not only to the pulp and paper industry, but also to the cooperative effort of the U.S. Forest Service, the State foresters, the Extension Service, and others.

There are those, of course, who point to this "miracle" and to current growth-drain ratios and argue that there is too much wood now and always will be. While I concede that there are areas in the South where people have more wood than they can sell at the present time, that is as far as I can go, and for several very good reasons.

In the first place, a medium projection by the U.S. Forest Service Timber Resource Review indicates that in the next 13 years, or by 1975, the demand for pulpwood in the United States will be 72 million cords, and as much as 100 million cords by the year 2000. Assuming that the South will be re-

quired to provide at least 65 percent of that volume, as it is doing now, it is obvious that we must continue building up the growing stock and improving net annual growth of the southern forests.

In the second place, timber surpluses—reserve growing stock is a better term—are not prevalent in every county of every Southern State. There are local shortages or deficits of annual commodity use over annual growth in many areas.

J. E. McCaffrey, a vice president of International Paper Co. in charge of southern woodlands, made this clear at the recent annual meeting of the Southern Pulpwood Conservation Association.

He urged those attending to think about the string of mills that now exist from West Point, Va., down the South Atlantic seaboard, along the gulf coast, and over as far as Houston, Tex. The wood drainage area available to each of these mills has been drastically curtailed by addition of new mills and expansions within the past 10 years.

Too many engineers and manufacturers, he said, think that the site for a new papermill depends only on its proximity to water, power, transportation, and labor. What's more, because it is less expensive to expand an existing mill than to build a new one, they regard expansion as a logical, competitive step. But, if this construction or expansion upsets the forest economy in their area, it weakens not only that company, but also the entire industry. At this very moment, pine timber use exceeds growth in South Carolina. North Carolina and Florida are rapidly approaching that condition.

Mr. McCaffrey's point was not that the industry should stop growing in the South, but that it should grow in the right places. It is the duty of timberland managers and forest economists to bring these facts to the attention of top management. If we fail to do so, or if they fail to listen, the time could come when the southern pulp and paper industry will no longer be competitive with mills in other sections of the country.

At this point, may I suggest that we foresters update our own terminology—that we stop using terms that may be clear to us but which are misleading to the general public. "Drain" is one of the words often misunderstood. We mean "use," of course, so let's say "use." "Surplus" is another misleading term. When we speak of a timber surplus, we are talking about reserve growing stock. A surplus connotes too much of something or something that is not needed. Reserve stock, on the other hand, is like money in the bank—earning interest on the capital while standing ready for use when needed.

Reserve growing stock is a necessity to the forest industries. It provides the freedom to meet the needs of a growing economy. It is the necessary latitude in which to expand, to improve products and to develop new products. Without this assurance, markets may gradually disappear—not because the consumer has lost interest in wood or paper, but because any question in his mind about the dependability of his source of supply could lead him to seek substitutes. Once a market is lost, it is almost impossible to regain.

So, if the markets are to be held, the industry must grow, through research and expanded manufacturing capacity. These things are possible only if sufficient reserve growing stock is available.

Instead of worrying about excess timber, we might do better to worry about the widespread and continued withdrawal of lands from timber production. In this country, it is estimated that a million and a half acres are diverted to superhighways, airports, reservoirs, recreation and defense projects each year.

We are hardly accustomed to this encroachment on private land ownership in the South. Yet, I daresay few managing sizable holdings have not experienced it.

The biggest drain—and here the use of the word is intended—on privately held forest land in the future will undoubtedly be for State and Federal recreation areas. According to President Kennedy, the increased leisure time enjoyed by our growing population and the greater mobility made possible by improved highway networks have dramatically increased the Nation's need for additional recreational areas. Already we have a new Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, and the administration is advocating and pursuing a vigorous policy of land acquisition for recreational purposes.

The wood-using industries have long been aware of this social need and have been responding actively to meet it. Almost without exception, the industry has subscribed to the multiple-use theory of forest management under which vast areas of privately managed forest land are being made available to the public for recreational use. Recently the American Forest Products Industries conducted a national survey covering some 58 million acres of industry-managed forest land. The survey shows some 92 percent of this acreage open to hunting and 97 percent open to fishing with varying amounts being made available for other public recreational purposes.

If both public and private interests continue to support the theory of multiple-use forest management—if we continue to resist attempts to set aside productive lands for unproductive single-use management which destroys the economic base on which good forestry rests and which benefits only a limited segment of our population—this Nation's forests can continue to achieve the greatest good for the greatest number.

If, on the other hand, further substantial withdrawals are made by State and Federal agencies for single-purpose uses, particularly, if lands are set aside to serve as so-called wilderness areas, we shall find the day coming closer when our forest needs exceed our means. This will be just as true in the South as in the other forest-growing areas of the country.

Moreover, the unsurpassed forest resources of the South are by no means free from fire, insects and disease. We have made such great strides in fire control in recent years that we are inclined to underestimate its continued importance. It is still our No. 1 problem and a serious deterrent to the growing of commercial timber crops. At the same time, our long summers, mild winters and abundant rainfall, are highly favorable to destructive insects and fungi. Among the more serious of these are the southern pine beetle, tip moth, fusiform rust and fomes annosus.

Fomes annosus is a particularly alarming disease. It attacks the stump and progresses through the roots like cancer, spreading to the roots of adjacent, living trees. It's quick and it's deadly, and so far we don't know how to stop it. The Southern Pulpwood Conservation Association is currently working with a group of forest products companies who are attempting to deal with some of these threats. Their efforts will tie in closely with the U.S. Forest Service, State agencies and colleges, but the successful conclusion of their work will require the concerted efforts of the entire wood-using industry.

In the meantime, we must not relax our conservation efforts on behalf of the private timberland owners. They have proved they can do the job where technical assistance is available and where enough markets exist to make it worth their time and effort to grow trees. Still, according to the TRR, only one-third of the 177 million acres held by small timberland owners in the South are today being managed for high productivity.

I do not believe that Federal subsidies will improve this situation. Instead, I recommend that we devote our attention to the economics of maintaining continuous markets where they are needed. And second, we must begin to provide for the proper regeneration of hardwood stands through research and the development of appropriate silvicultural procedures. Hardwood is now being used more and more throughout the pulp and paper industry, accounting for about 20 percent of our pulpwood requirements in 1960. Trees of little or no value 20 or 30 years ago are becoming highly valued sources of raw material today, and yet we have done little or nothing to encourage the proper management of hardwoods for future production.

In brief review, I have tried to establish that the South is, indeed, the "wood basket" of the nation, that its claim to this title is the result of hard work and perseverance. Where shortages of raw material exist, we have made them ourselves by ignoring the facts of a stable forest economy. In a sense, we have also made our own "surpluses," but these should be considered a bank account of growing stock, paying dividends as the industry expands and markets grow. And, of course, much remains to be done to conquer wildfires, insects and tree diseases, and to develop the hardwood potential that exists today.

Southern forestry needs two more things to assure its future potential. The first is better research by everyone concerned with forest management problems. The development of more reliable data on the economic results obtained from specific silvicultural procedures is a good place to start. The regeneration of pine on good land in combination with brush is an unsolved problem still.

Modern forestry's second need is for foresters who pay attention to the economics of growing timber. Right now, pulpwood accounts for about 65 percent of the cost of making wood pulp. I doubt that the cost of raw material for aluminum or even steel is as high. We need trained foresters who understand the economics of production, who will think and plan in terms of what our raw material is going to cost us 5, 10, 20, or even 50 years from now. Our schools of forestry can help us here.

Given all these things, in addition to its unsurpassed topography and climate, coupled with certain compelling economic factors, the South is destined to remain a great reservoir of highly valuable and diversified timber, upon which the Nation can depend for its future supplies.—Condensed from a paper presented before the 62d annual meeting of the Society of American Foresters, in Atlanta, Ga., October 21–24.

## Tax Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 21, 1963*

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Ways and Means Committee has before it numerous major proposals, many of which wear the magic label of "Tax Reform," or "Tax Adjustment." The Palos Regional is typical of the energetic, local newspaper of the

country, and in its Thursday, January 10, edition provides an interesting insight into the thought processes imposed on citizens for tax computation. I believe this editorial worthy of sympathetic attention, and, under unanimous consent, I insert it into the RECORD, as follows:

You should have been around the regional office last Friday morning when we were making up the weekly payroll.

It was the first week for figuring the 3⅝-percent social security deduction for employees and we had quite a time of it.

We started by multiplying the base pay by 3, then taking one-eighth, which of course, never came out even. This answer was multiplied by 5. By that time we had a long line of figures and a question as to where to put the decimal point.

The first answer came out to $48. We figured that was a little too much to deduct at a rate of 3⅝ percent. We moved the decimal point one figure forward, making it $4.80. That didn't look right either, so we moved it one more figure and came up with 48 cents.

To prove our answer, we figured it another way. We did it fraction-wise by multiplying 29 eighths by the base pay. The answer was 44 cents.

Then we got smart. We reasoned that the fraction five-eighth was 0.625 of 100 and adding 3 percent, we got a total of 0.03625, which we decided was a pretty smart way to do it. We were elated until we multiplied this figure by the base pay and came up with 46 cents.

Three different ways of figuring and three different answers, 48, 46, and 44 cents.

At this point we sat back to reflect on the whole problem. We did some mental arithmetic and decided the company would have to raise $200 to $300 more each year to pay its share of the added tax. Our contribution, plus the employees, now amounts to 7¼ percent. We also remembered that it will go up again in 1966 and 1968.

Then our thoughts switched to the increase in postal rates for the regional, and the increase of first-class mail. There will be several more hundreds of dollars which we will have to pay.

* * * * *

By the time we got back to our figures we were hopping mad, but the payroll had to be completed. We checked, and found several just plain arithmetic errors and eventually finished. We started at 8 a.m. that day and finished at 11—3 hours of time that could have been used to go out and hustle up some business.

## Kerr-Mills Improvement: A State Responsibility, Not Federal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 21, 1963*

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, one of the things I have repeatedly emphasized, when complaints have come my way about the Kerr-Mills Act, which authorized State-Federal assistance to older people in need of medical care who are not welfare cases—is the fact that the law, as passed by the Congress, is flexible and can be implemented by each State in a manner best suited to the needs of a particular State. This feature was provided for the specific reason that many Members of Congress—Republican and Democrat—feel that the State and local governments know their own problems and possible solutions better than a Federal bureaucracy could ever know them. Therefore the law was couched in terms which left it up to the States to determine how to most effectively administer the law, within just a few Federal guidelines. Retaining the self-respect, as well as the personal initiative of our citizens is of prime importance, not teaching them to rely more and more on a paternalistic Federal Government.

I, therefore, am pleased to offer for the possible guidance and inspiration of our States, one of the solutions worked out by the North Dakota State Medical Association. I am proud to see this evidence of responsibility on the part of our medical profession in North Dakota. While their suggestions may or may not become law in North Dakota, their efforts are certainly to be commended and emulated by other groups in other States.

I commend to the attention of the House of Representatives the following article from the Bismarck Tribune of January 15, 1963, written by Bill Tillottson, and entitled "Bill Will Seek To Widen Medical Care for the Aged":

BILL WILL SEEK TO WIDEN MEDICAL CARE FOR AGED

(By Bill Tillottson)

Broadening of the State's medical aid to the aged program to prevent persons aged 65 and over from falling into medical indigency is proposed in legislation being prepared by the North Dakota State Medical Association.

The bill, which will be introduced shortly into the 38th biennial legislative session here, is designed to add to income classes to the 1961 medical aid to the aged law in an effort to spread coverage beyond the present income limits.

The present law limits individual income to $100 per month and income for an elderly couple to $150 to qualify for medical aid to the aged coverage, with a further provision that the first $50 of medical care furnished in the 12-month period prior to application shall not be included in benefits.

The new legislation calls for a second income class for individuals with monthly income up to $125, and $175 for a couple with a "deductible" figure of $100, and a third class for those with incomes of $150 and $200 respectively with a $200 deductible feature.

The Federal Kerr-Mills Act, under which the North Dakota medical aid to the aged program is implemented, permits annual income of up to $2,500 for a single person and a slightly higher figure for couples.

Dr. Clifford H. Peters, Bismarck physician and a member of the medical association's legislative committee—said that while North Dakota's medical aid to the aged program is one of the best in the Nation, it is lacking in the eligibility requirements.

He said he had actuarial figures which will show that broadening the medical aid to the aged base would not push the program above the $2,660,000 appropriated for the program during the current biennium.

Based on the first 15 months of operation of the medical aid to the aged law, $502,000 of the State's appropriation was actually spent for medical aid to the aged care with 65 percent of the medical aid to the aged caseload representing transfers from old-age assistance and other programs with medical benefits.

"I think that we will find the number that fall into those new categories will be very few," Peters said.

"One reason I'm interested in upping these categories is the medical profession wants to see that the catastrophic illnesses are covered," he said.

He said the medical profession is interested in seeing that persons over 65 are able to cope with chronic or serious illness without becoming indigents seeking OAA help.

"That's what we want to prevent * * * indigency," he said.

"When we talk about Kerr-Mills or medical aid to the aged in North Dakota and we think about these increased eligibility levels, we're thinking about benefits and care for these people 365 days of the year * * * a complete program covering any eventuality," he said, not just a 90-day program as proposed under the Federal social security approach.

He said the deductible feature will discourage abuses and clearly define to the applicant and his family the self-help responsibilities.

He quoted from a statement from the American Medical Association and adopted by the State group:

"Personal medical care is primarily the responsibility of the individual. When he is unable to provide this care for himself, the responsibility should properly pass to his family, the community, the county, the State, and only when all these fail, to the Federal Government, and then only in conjunction with the other levels of government, in the above order."

Peters said the State organization will have some suggestions about the so-called means test to obtain medical-aid-to-the-aged care.

"Our contention is that a means test is necessary but it doesn't have to be to the extent that it prohibits a program," Peters said.

He said certain aspects of the test should be modified, but he said that doesn't mean to do away with a test of need entirely. He said the association would suggest changes so that the test will not be as "demeaning" as it is claimed.

Peters said that the medical profession will sponsor legislation creating a public welfare board medical advisory committee to help the State welfare board supervise the medical aid to the aged program. He said he believed the bill will call for nine doctors, all appointed by the Governor.

Peters said the welfare board has repeatedly emphasized that budget and other problems have increased because of the medical care programs.

"If such is true, and we concede a large portion of their budget goes for medical care, then it seems to us only logical that there should be close medical supervision of these programs," he said.

Peters said that the medical profession is not interested in taking part in the administration of the programs, but only in providing orientation and direction where needed.

In commenting on the medical association proposals, Leslie Ovre, director of the State public welfare board, said that the $2,660,000 budget figure for the past biennium was a shot in the dark based on 1960 census figures and was designed to cover the maximum number of persons who might qualify.

"There have been very few applications which have been denied," Ovre said, adding that the board was "surprised" that more persons did not avail themselves of the benefits.

"The rate of those applying is increasing," he said.

The board has estimated that 40 percent of the new applications are from persons who would not qualify under the old-age assistance program.

Ovre said that persons requiring medical aid have been receiving it, either under medical aid to the aged or old-age assistance.

The welfare board director raised the legal question of whether one class of persons receiving tax benefits can be treated differently from other classes.

"I don't believe any other State has set up any classification system," he said.

However, he acknowledged that the basis of need factor depends on how liberally the word "need" is defined.

"After 18 months of operation we know a little bit more about it," he said of the medical aid to the aged program.

## Goal of the Federal Prison System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EDWARD V. LONG
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, January 21, 1963*

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, in the winter issue of the George Washington University Alumni Rievew, there appears an article "Talent Scout for Alcatraz" written by Mr. James V. Bennett, Director, Federal Bureau of Prisons. The article discusses the goal sought by our Federal prison system and a number of its successes. Mr. Bennett has served our Nation well over the past 25 years, and as chairman of the Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries, I commend this article to the attention of all those who seek a more orderly and responsible society.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TALENT SCOUT FOR ALCATRAZ

(By James V. Bennett)

(NOTE.—James V. Bennett, L.L.B., 1926, this year completed 25 years as Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, supervising 31 institutions which he visits every year and in which he is responsible for many basic prison reforms. Mr. Bennett was assigned to assist a congressional committee investigating the employment program of the Federal penal system in 1926 and has worked in the Federal prison field since then. He is credited with helping promote and draft the Federal Youth Correction Act. He has served on many boards and commissions of a national and international nature. His awards include the Selective Service Civilian Award and the Exceptional Civilian Service Medal by the War Department, the Distinguished Public Service Award by Navy, the President's Award for Distinguished Federal Civilian Service. He holds the University's Alumni Achievement Award.)

With the inmate population of the Federal prison system going up every year, as it is in nearly every other penal system, there really isn't any need for me to drum up business. Yet there are those who conceive of my job in just such terms as the title of this article implies. One of them is the old-time bank robber Eddie Bentz who was one of our guests at Alcatraz several years ago.

Eddie occupied a cell off the flat known to the inmates as "Broadway." On my frequent visits to Alcatraz I always stopped by to see him and we became good friends. Our discussions often took a philosophical turn. "Just stop to think," he told me on one of these occasions, "supposing everybody in the world were honest and there were no bank robbers—"

It immediately occurred to me that if this utopian situation come to pass, there would be no Alcatraz. Like Eddie, most of his 250 colleagues at Alcatraz were serving long terms for their depredations on various and sundry banks around the country. But I sensed that this wasn't the point Eddie wanted to make, and without commenting I heard him out.

"First of all," he said, "you would be out of a job, and after you, the judges and large segments of lawyers and policemen would be out of a job, and the locksmiths and the safemakers would be out of a job, and most banks would have to close up."

He paused dramatically and then made his point. "If there were no banks, then there would be no money to loan to keep our economic wheels moving. The logical thing, since I have never robbed any bank that wasn't insured, and since I'm a sort of catalytic agent, is to let me go out and thus keep this whole scheme of yours going."

Eddie wasn't completely wrong from a sociological point of view. But in subsequent years it dawned on him that inasmuch as he and his associates had created jobs for policemen, the policemen were going to carry out their responsibilities. This meant extended terms of incarceration for Eddie. He is now awaiting release from a midwestern State prison, and I am sure that when he gets out he will make a good citizen. And put his money into banks and, like the rest of us, take a rather jaundiced attitude toward his successors in crime who try to withdraw these funds at the point of a gun.

In prison work we are not trying to perpetuate our jobs. A recent 4-year study made by the University of Illinois under the auspices of the Ford Foundation indicates that 70 percent of the persons who leave the institutions of the Federal prison system make good in their efforts to stay out of trouble with the law. On its face this statistic would imply that we are rapidly working ourselves out of a job. But unfortunately—and we choose to look upon it that way—the complexities, stresses, and ills of our society generate more than enough replacements to fill the ranks of those who have gone straight.

The challenge to those of us in prison work is therefore greater than it has even been before. And we cannot meet that challenge with the traditional prisons—the Joliets, San Quentins, and Leavenworths. It is no longer possible, and in my opinion it never was, merely to attempt to try to frighten men into conformity with the law. They must be equipped with the education and vocational skills which will permit them to assume a useful role in a highly demanding and increasingly technological society. Also, those who have become emotionally disturbed under the pressures of today must be given the psychiatric treatment and the intensive counselling that will stabilize them to the point where they can meet the responsibilities of citizenship with resolution and confidence.

We are developing new types of institutions and new types of programs which can cope with the problems of crime and delinquency in the space age. A prototype of the new institution is the famous "Prison Without Walls" at Seagoville, Tex. Here you will find none of the features that characterize the usual concept of a prison. It has no walls, no guard towers, no long lines of men marching off to work or to meals under the watchful eyes of guards. The inmates live in simply furnished rooms, and carry their own keys to these quarters. They go to their assigned jobs at the appointed time on their own initiative. On visiting days a man can take his family to church services or to lunch in the dining hall. A full program of employment, education, and vocational training, religious counseling, casework services, a wide range of recreation and leisure time activities and medical care comprise the day-to-day operations. The emphasis throughout is on self-reliance, self-respect, and trustworthiness.

A full third of the 24,000 prisoners in our Federal institutions are aged 25 and under, and the emphasis in our programs is necessarily upon youth. In 1950 the Congress, with the full support of the Federal judiciary, passed the Youth Corrections Act. This act opened up a wide range of possibilities for dealing with the problem of youthful offenders. Judges no longer had to sentence young offenders to flat terms of imprisonment; they could commit them to the control of the Attorney General for an indeterminate period of 6 years or for a period as long as the statutory penalty provided for the offense. The youths committed under this procedure could be paroled to the community at any time but in no case later than 2 years prior to the end of their term. Under the stimulus of this flexible procedure a number of our institutions were geared to focus on these offenders a particularly intensive program of treatment. The act also authorized the board of parole to set aside the convictions of those youths who followed up programs of institutional treatment with particularly fine records in the community. In effect, the act provided all the means necessary to reorganize the lives of youthful offenders and give them a fresh start.

Not many years ago we received four young men under this procedure from a midwestern court. They had kidnapped and assaulted a young woman. This was a grave offense, and the judge was under extreme public pressure to throw the book at them. But he felt that they could be salvaged and committed them for 12 years under the Youth Act. The youths responded earnestly to the chance that had been given them. They worked hard in the institution to improve their education and to learn a vocation. Eventually they earned parole.

I kept in touch with the progress of these young men. One of them entered college following his release and graduated last year. Two started businesses with the skills they had learned in the institution and are doing well. The fourth is working steadily in a vocation that he similarly acquired. Of the four, two are married and are considered solid family men in their community. Upon the recommendation of their supervising probation officer, the board of parole has set aside their convictions.

But for the new approach permitted by the Youth Act these young men would still be serving extended terms in a penitentiary. Instead of being expensive liabilities perhaps for their entire lifetimes, they are now taxpayers and productive citizens.

It was the success of the Youth Act with cases like these that led in 1958 to the enactment of a farseeing statute permitting similar flexibility in the treatment of adult offenders. It gave the judges discretion to impose indeterminate sentences on older offenders, and in the cases of particularly perplexing cases, to commit the defendants to us for a diagnostic study and sentencing recommendation. The judges have made great use of their new discretion.

One of the first cases committed for study was that of a policeman who had committed a series of robberies. Our institutional staff found that he had a bizarre fantasy life. He imagined himself as the "Black Phantom," and in the darkness of an alley, dressed in a black cloak and hat, he would often swoop down on unsuspecting drunks. Our psychiatrists concluded that he was mentally ill but still sufficiently rational to be considered responsible for his acts. Upon our recommendation the judge committed him for 20 years under the new indeterminate procedure. The policeman is responding well to psychiatric treatment, and I am sure that within a few years it will be possible to parole him to the community with safety.

We have had encouraging success in redirecting the lives of many offenders, but we are also aware that we have a responsibility to keep out of circulation as effectively as possible the dangerously perverted and psychopathic, and the thoroughly ingrained antisocial rebel who will not voluntarily accept any responsibility for himself or anyone else. For these and many others, probation or some other type of controlled supervision in the community seems unrealistic. Even the modern psychiatrist would hesitate to assure us that these distorted personalities could be transformed into attractive, acceptable members of our complex, competitive society.

These men for the most part are confined in the old-line penitentiaries where custodial security remains as tight as it has ever been, and perhaps even tighter with the refinement of our custodial methods and the application of electronics and the other products of modern technology to the problems of security. But even in these facilities we do not entirely give up on our efforts to salvage men. Except for the 2 or 3 percent who eventually die in prison, they all come out some day.

One such man was released nearly 8 years ago at the end of his term, and it was with crossed fingers that the warden saw him go. He had an extended record of offenses and imprisonment. Our psychiatrists tentatively labeled him a psychopath. Although he had taken a number of courses in prison—advertising, business administration, copywriting, and so on—there was little to indicate that he had really changed his attitude and values.

But somewhere in his last prison experience the necessary alchemy had taken place. With the assistance of his probation officer, he found a job as a copywriter in a radio advertising agency. Within a short time he was promoted to an accounts executive, and not long afterward to station manager. He continued to earn successive promotions, and within a half-dozen years of his release from prison he headed a chain of radio and television stations, with a salary several times that of the prison warden who with such trepidation had watched him leave the prison gates.

I had gotten to know this man in prison, and one day there arrived at my office a fine leather briefcase that he made for me during the long evening hours in his cell. I have carried this case home loaded with work every day for the past several years. It is battered now and somewhat the worse for wear. But I would not be without it.

It serves as a constant reminder to me that we cannot give up hope on any man. With an awareness of the amazing transformation in this man's life, I find it much easier to open the case and get to work on its formidable contents—the problems of the 24,000 men still in prison.

## Cuba: A National Orgy of Self-Congratulation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, January 21, 1963*

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Great National Orgy of Self-Congratulation," written by Gen. Thomas D. White, U.S. Air Force, retired, one of the best that this outstanding patriot of America has prepared for that publication thus far, and published in Newsweek issue of January 14, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREAT NATIONAL ORGY OF SELF-CONGRATULATION

(By Gen. Thomas D. White, U.S. Air Force, retired)

"Placebo," any harmless substance, as bread pills, given to humor a patient.—Funk and Wagnalls Practical Standard Dictionary.

Uncle Sam has long been suffering from a severe case of national apathy recently aggravated and climaxed in a high Cuban fever. His most dangerous sequela is overconfidence. As an aftermath of Cuba we may become more off-guard than ever, tranquilized by our own nostrums and the propaganda pills constantly fed to us by Dr. Khrushchev.

Our Government acted courageously in the Cuban situation. But that is exactly what I expect the Government of the United States of America to do.

What seems strange to me is that we have been engaged in a great national orgy of self-congratulations. We congratulate ourselves over the confrontation of our sworn enemy who, armed with lethal weapons aimed at the very heart of this country, marched almost openly into our own front yard. It seems to me that rather than congratulate ourselves, we should soberly recognize that Cuba is surely one of the easiest of all the areas and circumstances of possible decisive confrontation with the Soviet Union. Instead of crowing over a 12th-hour decision, we should be taking stock of our national attitudes which permitted the immediate situation to arise in the first place.

I find it especially difficult to understand why our military authorities did not raise the alarm long before October. In my opinion, and I spent many years in the intelligence business, there was enough information to be found in the daily press alone to have led to a military conclusion that the Russians in Cuba were posing a serious threat to the United States.

Surely the stream of Russian ships to Cuba which began last midsummer should have aroused deep suspicion. Could anyone in uniform really have believed that the construction in Havana Harbor was for a fishing fleet? Did the evaluators of Soviet intelligence, who should be chosen for their cynicism, actually give credence to published reports that thousands of Russian troops in Cuba were there for peaceful purpose or that the U.S.S.R. would mount such an effort merely to arm Fidel Castro with defensive missiles? Was not the sum total of indicators enough to raise the alarm long before it was raised?

I am perturbed that, whatever the current arrangement of intelligence organizations, whatever the Department of Defense policies on military expression of views, there should be such evidence of complacency among our professional military watchdogs.

There have been changes in our military intelligence setup, and the military voice has certainly been muted. Nonetheless I am confident that if our highest military authorities had stood up and spoken on this subject, the Commander in Chief would have acted promptly on their warning.

It bothers me also to know that the equipment for launching and guiding certain types of missiles can be hidden readily and that some missiles and aircraft themselves can be transported piecemeal and quickly reassembled. These factors and other clandestine capabilities of the U.S.S.R. in Cuba lead me to believe that as long as there is a Communist government in Cuba, the United States and all of Latin America are in jeopardy. Our naïveté in believing otherwise has brought us close to a major disaster.

We may have been "eyeball to eyeball" and this time the other fellow may have blinked—but maybe he only winked. In any case, we may be sure that he is already plotting a next time. He will continue to feed us propaganda pills to lull our senses and will always be set to administer us a fatal potion. Khrushchev has sworn to bury us. Presumably he would prefer to bury us alive. But if necessary he would gladly bury us dead.

"Placebo," the opening antiphon of the vespers for the dead.—Funk and Wagnalls Practical Standard Dictionary.

## Scientific Efforts To Serve Humanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. EDWARD V. LONG
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, January 21, 1963*

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, several weeks ago, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch carried a thought-provoking editorial directed to the world scientific community. However in a board context, it was directed to all mankind. We are all responsible for the end use of our efforts. It is not enough to answer that we search for knowledge only or that we follow the directions of our superiors. We must, each of us, strive to see that our efforts serve humanity. Such a path may bring adversity, but the goal is worth the endeavor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial "For Death or for Life?" be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR DEATH OR FOR LIFE?

The Nobel Prizes for physics and chemistry, we suppose, exemplify the spirit of modern scientists—or many of them. The former went to Lev Davidovic Landau of the Soviet Union whose theories for condensed matter

made possible the sputniks. The other went to Dr. John Cowdery Kendrew and Dr. Max Ferdinand Perutz for their studies of human blood. One achievement has deepened the foreshadow of destruction. The other has brightened hope in the combat against pain and death. Both are applauded equally as contributions to pure knowledge.

Scientists say that is how it should be. Knowledge is to be sought for the sake of knowledge, and the search should not be hampered by the dread of misapplications. Who can say otherwise? Having put the skull and crossbones on the bottle, the scientist may refuse responsibility for those who draw the cork to ill purpose. But is it really so simple?

Of course, one does not bid the searchers to fill their bottles only with elixirs of happiness, and it would be futile to forbid the discovery of deadly draughts. Yet more often than not, the searcher has a purpose as he follows one line of investigation rather than another. In spite of the cant about the "two languages," he also is of this world, and he must choose his work according to its needs. He is not above judgments and priorities.

Happily, great scientists accept the duty which comes with the freedom of the search. The men who gave us the bomb are among the most zealous in curbing its use. It is the ordinary man who sets the goal for the scientists. They did not create the temper of our times; they are more nearly its victims. Yet they, like the rest of us, must be concerned about the applications of their work. The danger is not in knowledge. It is in choosing it for death or for life.

## An American's Creed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. DURWARD G. HALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 21, 1963*

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, recently the Medical Society of the District of Columbia brought to my attention an editorial reprinted from Philadelphia Medicine, volume 58, No. 38, of September 21, 1962, entitled, "An American's Creed." The executive board of the society reviewed this creed and wholeheartedly endorsed the thoughts behind it and the views expressed in it. It is recognized as Dean Alfange's "Message for 1952: My Creed," which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune December 30, 1951. A framed version hangs in the office I occupy in my district as furnished by St. Clair County Republican Chairman Don Giesler, M.D. Under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I believe the creed is again deserving of consideration by the Members of the House of Representatives, due to its timeliness and as forwarded by our District of Columbia Medical Society:

I do not choose to be a common man. It is my right to be uncommon—if I can. I seek opportunity—not security. I do not wish to be a kept citizen, humbled and dulled by having the state look after me. I want to take the calculated risk; to dream and to build; to fail and to succeed. I refuse to barter incentive for a dole. I prefer the challenge of life to the guaranteed existence; the thrill of fulfillment to the stale calm, and dry rot of utopia. I will not trade my freedom for beneficence, not my dignity for a handout. I will never cower before any master nor bend to any threat. It is my heritage to stand erect, proud, and unafraid; to think and act for myself; to enjoy the benefit of my creations; and to face the world boldly saying, "This I have done with my own hand, I am a man. I am an American."

## Deserved Recognition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. BYRON G. ROGERS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 21, 1963*

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, Mme. Odette Lameignere Combs recently was paid the highest honor by her native country. During World War I she married an American soldier. Thereafter, she came to the city and county of Denver and contributed so much to the community. Victor Gares, French Consul General in Denver, presented her with the Cross of the Legion of Honor from French President Charles DeGaulle. Her accomplishments are outlined in an article by Barbara Haddad which appeared in the Denver Post, as follows:

DESERVED RECOGNITION
(By Barbara Haddad)

The most elegant calling card in Colorado probably belongs to a silver-haired little woman who has the privilege of listing two major French decorations after her name. And next Tuesday, Mme. Odette Lameignere Combs will add a third: the Legion of Honor. It's enough to make Molly Brown sink with envy.

Mme. Combs admits she burst into tears when she heard of her nomination for the medal.

"I think I am just a sissy," she said in delicately accented English, "but I shall be most proud to receive it."

Napoleon Bonaparte founded the Legion of Honor to reward valor in battle. Mme. Combs' battlefield has been the classrooms of Denver, ever since she started teaching 2 months after her arrival as a war bride in 1919.

"I was born in Bordeaux," she said, "and came here with my husband right after the war. There were only three of us French brides in Denver, and the mistaken ideas people here had about France * * *." The mistaken ideas leave her almost speechless. But—she's French and female—not quite.

She believes communications have done wonders in providing bridges of understanding. "You always knew about Lafayette and the Huguenots," she said. "And you knew Paris was the fashion center. But if one just mentioned wine or garlic, one was thought to be a low-down renegade. Today Americans are well informed and eager to learn. Civilization is on the march."

Mme. Combs does her part to urge civilization ahead by taking students from South High School, where she teaches French, to her homeland every other year.

"I've done it regularly since 1935, except during the war," she said. "And the students always learn something."

The learning starts even before they leave. The group meets monthly to discuss travel plans. Last Saturday, Neustetr's presented a style show of what to wear where, with the six girls and four boys scheduled for the 1963 trips as models.

The group will sail on the *France*, one of the sleekest ships afloat.

"My brother is a naval officer and so was my father," Mme. Combs said, "so the officers are often friends of the family. They treat us like royalty."

Both her brother and her father also received the Legion of Honor, her brother winning distinction for service in the Indochina war and in the underground during World War II.

"I feel we should all serve our country, in war or peace," Mme. Combs said earnestly. "This is something American young people are not sufficiently encouraged to do. These trips—preparing them for responsible citizenship through understanding—are one way I feel I can serve both my countries."

Mr. Speaker, Mr. William C. Wise, a student at the University of Colorado, had this to say about Mme. Combs:

Having been privileged to sit as a former student of Mme. Combs, I know that I echo the sentiments of thousands of other students and friends when I say that she is an example of that rare class of educator that taught with complete dedication. She fostered the intangible element of enlightened discipline in more than one generation of Denverites and so deserves the thanks of the country she loves.

## Late Speaker Sam Rayburn Honored in Many Ways—In His Hometown, Flag Flown on Birthday—A College Building Named for Him

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 21, 1963*

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, more than a year has passed since the death of the late beloved Speaker Sam Rayburn, and each passing day his name becomes engraved more deeply into the history of our country. New honors continue to come to Mr. Sam.

On January 6, 1963, the day Sam Rayburn would have been 81 years old, a move was started in his hometown of Bonham, Tex., for the residents there to fly the American flag each January 6 as a reminder to the world that the homefolks have not forgotten.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a front-page editorial from the Bonham Daily Favorite of Sunday, January 6, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY IS MR. SAM'S 81ST BIRTHDAY

Today, January 6, is a day on the calendar Bonham should always pause to remember. It is the birthday of Speaker Sam Rayburn.

Mr. Sam would have been 81 years of age today.

Time seems to slip by rapidly, but memories remain with us, and for this great man, the memory will linger forever. His birthday should become an observance date

here in his hometown, it should be celebrated each year in some dignified manner so we, his homefolks, could always remind the world that we have not forgotten.

Few Americans achieved his greatness as statesman or the depth of love and respect in the hearts of millions of Americans.

Out of respect to his memory we think it would be well for as many homes as have them to fly the American flag Sunday for Mr. Sam on his birthday.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in the same edition of the Bonham Daily Favorite an article entitled "Tribute Paid to Late Sam Rayburn" was published, written by a distinguished Texan who was a long time close friend of Sam Rayburn, Mr. H. E. Perry, of Flag Springs, Tex. I know H. E. Perry from personal experience in campaigns in Texas as one of my State's ablest and most dedicated campaigners for good government.

In his article, H. E. Perry described Sam Rayburn as a man whose "tribute to his fellow man was a life of honest service dedicated to their highest and best interest." Mr. President, the same might well be said of my friend, H. E. Perry.

Mr. Perry was once a neighbor of Sam Rayburn. He lives in the blackland farm country of Flag Springs in Fannin County. Now 61 years of age, he continues to operate a farm and to maintain an active interest in government despite a serious accident while working with a tractor 10 years ago.

I ask unanimous consent that his article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE PAID TO LATE SAM RAYBURN

(By H. E. Perry, Flag Springs community)

On this January 6, we all pause in grateful remembrance of the birthday of the beloved Sam Rayburn.

God was good to the freedom-loving people in this and other lands when he gave mankind Sam Rayburn.

As this January 6 is the second birthday memorial since Mr. Sam passed from this life, every true American should be thankful for his life and should have equal cause to mourn his passing.

We have suffered from his death on November 16, 1961, which left a void in American life which can never be filled. No greater statesman or finer public servant ever served a free government than Mr. Sam.

In early life on a farm in the Flag Springs community he heard his country's call.

He answered it with complete devotion to Christian ideals and the democratic concept of government. Mr. Sam has done more than any man of his generation to make this America a better country in which to live.

Whether at work on a farm at Flag Springs, in a schoolroom at study, teaching in a small school or in the halls of the Texas Legislature, he put forth his best efforts.

From the Texas Legislature to the Halls of Congress, Mr. Sam lived and served in the highest and best way his State and Nation—always with great credit to his country and honor to himself.

This country has produced no equal. Mr. Sam's place in history is secure and will shine with lustrous beauty each passing day.

Mr. Sam has made so much history for America and the free world as he belonged not alone to the United States but to the world.

In his knowledge and devotion to democratic ideals, Mr. Sam was the equal of Thomas Jefferson, the father of democracy.

His high concept of legislation from the time he entered public life as a member of the Texas Legislature in 1907 won for him the love and respect of all the people.

In looking at any piece of legislation, Mr. Sam would seek to determine if the bill was fair and just to everyone, would it strengthen the free enterprise system, and did it contain any provision that would give some group special privileges at the expense of others.

He believed in equal and exact justice for all men and special privileges to none. Mr. Sam loved and served the people—not the interests.

His sincerity and honesty won for him the love and respect of his colleagues in the Texas Legislature, his district, his State, and his Nation. That is why he was returned to office every 2 years after his first election in 1906.

He loved his Maker, his fellow man. His tribute to womanhood was a living tribute—a life of devotion to his sainted mother. His tribute to his fellow man was a life of honest service dedicated to their highest and best interest.

Mr. Sam wielded the gavel in the greatest and finest lawmaking body ever assembled. There will be successors to his office, but there will never be another Sam Rayburn.

His life was well lived. He was great, yet so humble, sweet, and kind. He never lost the common touch. He walked the good earth erect with a heart attuned to his Maker, with the upreach to Him who holds the destiny of us all and the friendly outreach to mankind.

We honor his name and memory on this January 6, 1963.

His hands wielded the gavel
And signed so many good bills
This Nation will never see his like
Again yonder on Capitol Hill.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, another honor which has come to the late Mr. Speaker is reported in the January 9, 1963, edition of the East Texan, student publication of East State College in Commerce, Tex. The student union building at East Texas State College will be named in honor of Sam Rayburn, a graduate of that college. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD at this point, entitled "S. C. Named for Rayburn."

There being no objection, the article was ordere to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STUDENT CENTER NAMED FOR RAYBURN

The student union building under construction at East Texas was named the Sam Rayburn Memorial Student Center at the November 9 meeting of the board of regents, according to the official minutes of the board.

The naming came in the form of a resolution while the board was in executive session, the minutes of which are not published until weeks after the meeting.

## Deplorable Action in Katanga

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 21, 1963*

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I have persistently protested the deplorable action under the banner of freedom in the Congo. The United States has participated in the invasion of a free and sovereign country, Katanga. I believe that people are waking up around the country in regards to this unjustifiable action.

Recently, the Mansfield News-Journal, one of the fine independent newspapers in my district, carried an excellent editorial which asked the question that is on the lips of many Americans today "Why? Why?" One of their syndicated columnists, Robert Ruark, had an excellent column on January 8, 1963, which I am including in these remarks. These two prophetic articles are worthy of the attention of all Members of this body and I include them at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Mansfield (Ohio) News-Journal, Jan. 8, 1963]

U.N. HEISTS TSHOMBE'S BANK

(By Robert Ruark)

The most shockingly immoral action by a mealymouthed nation—the United States of America—employing a sanctimonious weapon, the United Nations—just transpired.

We hadn't seen the like of it since Russia took over Hungary; in fact, there is really no parallel for the United Nations' commercial attack on Katanga, unless you want to consider it in the same class as a TV rendition of "The Untouchables."

It was fitting that the Irish, Indian and Ethiopian mercenaries employed on American money by the United Nations knocked over the bank in Katanga's capital, Elisabethville, since the whole plot was based on hijackery anyhow. Katanga has money. The highbinders of a so-called Central Congolese Government wanted Katanga's loot. So the hired gunmen obviously knocked off Moise Tshombe's bank.

I know this sounds like bad fiction, but it unfortunately is a truth of our times. The United Nations has been on the prod for Katanga ever since Tshombe seceded and expressed a disinclination to share Katanga's copper and cobalt revenues with that bunch of low-comedy politicians in Léopoldville—a minstrel show that we have subsidized even when it had two prime ministers . . . two separate governments in office at the same time.

Adlai Stevenson shows himself as a faker of the purest persuasion when he maintains, as he did the other day, that "Katanga is as much a part of the Congo as separate States are part of the United States." Katanga is no more a part of the Congo than is Angola or Rhodesia or Uganda or Gabon or the French Congo across the river in Brazzaville.

There is no central government. There is only a pack of clowns playing at being adults in Leopoldville, on our time and our money. If the current clown falls we get another one, and our leaders are bringing up the old bogey of Russian intervention to provide us with a diversionary crisis for 1963.

Nothing really has changed in the Congo situation since the Belgians freed it for disaster 2½ years ago. There is no more Red menace now than there was then. I doubt seriously if the Russians want such an expensive mess on their hands—in any case, the Russians have stoutly refused to pay their whack of the United Nations bill.

The only thing really worth stealing in the Congo is what the United Nations just stole. That is Katanga, a reasonably civilized business, not a state, that is run by the shareholders in the Union Miniere du Haut Katanga, a subsidiary of the international octopus, the Societe Generale Belgique. Katanga produces annually millions of dollars worth of minerals. Katangan money is something of value; Central Congo money isn't much better than scrip.

But I swear I didn't think that even the United Nations, which made no murmur when India knocked off Goa, or Russia went into Hungary, would be brazen enough to stick up the bank.

---

[From the Mansfield News-Journal, Jan. 11, 1963]

WHY? WHY?

Slowly, the conscience of the world seems to be awakening to the U.N.'s moral debacle in the Congo.

Thousands of words have been written about this vicious action, ordered by U.N. Secretary U Thant and backed by the United States, in which mercenary troops moved in to deny independence to Katanga Province.

But one news picture seems to have told the story far more graphically than all the words.

It shows a Belgian resident of Katanga on his knees beside his little car. Blood streams down his face from a wound in the head. In his car his wife is dead. They were attacked for no reason by U.N. mercenaries while driving along the road.

On the man's lips are the words "Why? Why?"

That is the question the world is asking.

Why should the Province of Katanga which asked only its independence have been bombed and strafed and invaded?

Katanga had been the most anti-Communist of the newly liberated African areas. Yet the United States backed the U.N. in its drive to crush Katangan independence and to force the big state to become a part of the disarrayed, chaotic Congo.

Why? Why?

Did our own State Department goof again?

In the background is this. The U.N. is facing bankruptcy. The Congo was its most costly operation. Observers in Washington said weeks ago that our Government would back a U.N. move to end the Congo venture quickly by crushing Katangan opposition to being forced into the Central Congo Government.

That is what happened. A phony crisis was created and ballyhooed at the meeting of President Kennedy and Prime Minister Macmillan in Nassau. A U.S. military mission was ordered into the Congo. The U.N. sent Ralph Bunche there and he held a news conference that must have left as bad a taste in African mouths as the recent performance of Senator ELLENDER.

Bunche, smirking with self-satisfaction, gave flippant answers to questions of deepest seriousness to the people of Katanga and Africa. He announced that as soon as possible he was going back to New York where he had something of importance to do.

The way he said it implied that what was happening in the Congo was really of no importance, just a minor nuisance.

He was speaking for the United Nations.

The most patriotic American cannot help feeling secretly ashamed that his Government on one side of the world pays $53 million ransom to a filthy dictator while on the other side of the Atlantic the rulers of "the land of the free" support the ruthless suppression of a free and anti-Communist people, the Katangans.

Why Why?

---

## Inexcusable Ignorance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 21, 1963*

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the paramount crisis facing the world is acceptance of the false dogma of communism or acceptance, approval and implementation of some governmental and economic principles of nondictatorial nations. Numerous leaders have pointed to the lack of deep understanding that the public has often manifested toward communism. This fact is very effectively illustrated by an editorial in the La Grange Citizen, La Grange, Ill., of January 10, which I ask to insert into the RECORD at this point:

INEXCUSABLE IGNORANCE

Two recently published items indicate widespread ignorance of what communism does, and is. It is difficult to comprehend that people exposed to millions of words in newspapers and magazines, to news films, to television and radio still lack basic information about what happens when communism takes over.

"It is amazing how widespread this idea still is among Americans—no matter what descent—who cannot imagine that under communism a citizen is powerless and the government is almighty; that one day a citizen owns a store or a farm and the next day has nothing; that he may be imprisoned for no reason." This is a comment in the American Bulletin a publication by the Czechoslovak National Council of America.

The author made the comment after telling about opinions and remarks made by people who call the council, mistaking it for the Czechoslovak consulate. Trying to tell people that the council is different than the consulate and that it has nothing to do with the latter because it represents a communistic government gets the retort:

"So what if they are Communists? What difference does that make? Why can't my aunt visit me in the United States if I invite her? There can't be an iron curtain, as you say, because I know lots of people who went to Czechoslovakia."

The article reports: "One young lady was quite irritated by our stupidity when we tried to explain that people in Czechoslovakia no longer own their shops, business, farms, etc. That the Red regime has taken away their land, cattle and machinery without compensation to the owners. 'The farmers wouldn't give their farms if they didn't want to: they must get a lot for their property' was the reply."

The author remarks further: "Incredible as it may seem to some of us, many Americans have no idea what communism is in practice; how it operates; what the dangers are to the free world."

An editorial in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch confirms what the Czech writer stated. It comments:

FIFTY PERCENT FLUNKED

"The hardest thing about teaching young Americans what communism and capitalism stand for may turn out to be the long prevailing attitude that it isn't necessary for them to learn it—that they get it by a kind of osmosis that comes of being Americans. That, at any rate, is a possible conclusion from the results of the first year of a 6-week course in the subject required by State law for high school seniors in Florida."

Only half the Jacksonville students who took the final test scored a passing grade of more than 70 percent.

"Furthermore, a third of them failed to pick out as false the statement 'It is possible to be at the same time a loyal citizen of this country and a true Communist.' which was what the State legislature had been most particular they should learn. The course says the law, shall lay special emphasis on the false doctrines, evils and dangers of communism, and ways to fight it.

"Some of the seniors had only the most confused notion of what Communists and capitalists are even after taking the course. One said capitalists are 'anti-Communists' another that they are 'the haves, and the proletariat the have-nots.'

"As for the other system, a graduate of the course described it by saying that 'whenever you have a thesis and antithesis you always have a synthesis which is communism.'"

All of which means that despite the volumes written on the subject much of the message fails to penetrate. The basic information, about what actually happens to people when communism takes over seems to get lost.

---

## Hatch Act Eclipse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 21, 1963*

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the brazen solicitation of Federal employees for Democrat political campaign funds continues to outrage many of the newspapers of this country.

Not even the Washington Post, which usually carries the banner high for the New Frontier administration, can swallow the tactics that have been used in this political fund-raising drive.

The Post calls it "shabby business" and "subtle coercion." It places the blame right where it belongs when it says "the President could have warned his subordinates that no coercion or pressure would be tolerated."

Mr. Speaker, I offer herewith the Washington Post editorial of Friday, January 18, 1963, for reprinting in the RECORD:

HATCH ACT ECLIPSE

However one looks at it, the pressure that has been applied to Government employees to buy tickets for the Democratic fundraising affair tonight is a shabby business. The Hatch Act tells Federal employees that they may not participate in partisan activities. The civil service system holds out to them assurance that they will be compensated and promoted on the basis of merit. Yet many of them are being pressured to give $100 to the Democratic cause—in installments if they cannot afford to buy a ticket to the gala outright—by their supervising officials who should be the first to respect the spirit and letter of the law.

The law on the subject is unequivocal. It provides:

"Any executive officer or employee of the United States not appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall request, give to, or receive from, any other officer or employee of the Government any money or property or other thing of value for political purposes shall be at once discharged from the service of the United States."

Probably most officials have avoided outright violation of the law which forbids them to solicit funds for partisan purposes from other Federal employees. But no one can fail to recognize that, when the head of any agency invites all those who are going to the gala to attend a preliminary party at his home or elsewhere, he is applying indirect pressure to buy a gala ticket. The Hatch Act and the Corrupt Practices Act are designed to protect employees from precisely this kind of subtle coercion.

It may be taken for granted that most of the steam behind this venture comes from the Democratic National Committee. Party officials are always eager to bring in new

recruits and replenish the party's treasury. The chief fault lies in the failure of many high officials, the Civil Service Commission and the President to offer employees any protection against the demands of the politicians.

A very different atmosphere would have prevailed if the CSC had publicly reminded officials of the provisions of the law and assured employees that refusal to make requested partisan donations would not count against them. Better still, the President could have warned his subordinates that no coercion or pressure would be tolerated. In the absence of any such protective measure, many employees are likely to feel that the Government itself is winking at violations of the law, leaving them no alternative to making a "contribution."

## The Tax Cut Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 21, 1963*

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to a timely editorial entitled "The Tax Cut Plan," which appeared in the January 16, 1963, edition of the Oxnard (Calif.) Press-Courier:

THE TAX CUT PLAN

Everybody knows taxes are too high. So people generally will be happy, we suppose, because President Kennedy, in his state of the Union message, plumped for a reduction in the income tax.

His program is one with appeal. Spaced over three years, it will blunt, somewhat, the immediate blow to balancing the budget. Mr. Kennedy believes that the lower taxes will mean more spending. More spending will help business and industry and increase employment. All of this will, by itself, produce higher tax receipts. That is his optimistic view.

He stresses the help it will be to the lower income families, by giving them more money to spend. In the lowest levels it will mean about $18 a year less paid in taxes. Of course that isn't much. But if everyone of the families goes out and cheerfully spends that money, and the $18 goes into business channels instead of into the Treasury maw, it is reasonable to think that overall, tax income may grow.

But the man who has been drawing his weekly paycheck in 1963, will look at the deduction for social security. It has been raised from 3⅛ percent to 3⅝ percent. There's an immediate increase in his tax payment, that he must balance against the chance of saving that $18. So for him there won't be much left to squander, or to spend on nylons for the wife, shirts for the kids, socks for himself.

The corporations, too, will be helped. The $25,000 income corporation—and tax help is needed badly by the little fellow just getting along—will have several hundred dollars more for payrolls and equipment, and for business promotion.

That will help. The bigger corporations, paying the 52 percent on all profits over $25,000, will have that reduced to 47 percent. This could prove even more effective in building up a stronger tax base. For the sum total will mount up. Risk capital will not be so timid about new machinery, modernizing plants, seeking new markets.

That invitation to risk capital could hold real promise for a growing prosperity. But it is hard to explain that. All that many persons would see in a tax saving for their boss would be a chance to grab a bigger paycheck. Those come, too, but they come from expanding businesses in our competitive system.

Mr. Kennedy recognized, albeit in a somewhat perfunctory manner, the obligation to reduce spending if taxes are cut. He held out some hope of reducing the budget outlays in various fields of domestic legislation. He is completely vague about that. He is not vague about the certainty that more money would be spent for paying the interest on the national debt—and that keeps growing; more money for defense needs—and there is no early thrift in sight in that area; and in spending for space achievement—and that means the ventures toward the moon and out-of-space travel will take more, much more money, if we ever do beat the Russians.

Now the President proposes, but Congress disposes. There is no assurance whatsoever that the tax cuts, and the suggested tax reforms, will get to first base with a critical, informed, and independent Congress.

"Tax loopholes" are to be closed. That is a meaningless term. For example, there is talk about reducing the depletion allowance for those who venture into oil and mineral prospecting.

This particular item is not a loophole. It is the law of the land. It is a law based upon the entirely reasonable proposition that if companies are to be encouraged to drill oil wells, even though 9 out of 10 fail to produce oil, they should be given some tax benefit if they are to keep on drilling. Tax loophole, in this respect, is a misnomer. If the law is to be changed, will wildcatting in the oilfield be done despite the heavy risk? No one knows for sure. But there will be a strong fight in Congress, led by those in such oil-producing States as California.

That is only one example. Every Congressman is going to translate the President's specific proposals for closing loopholes, into what that would mean for business and employment in his district.

Mr. Kennedy spoke of the need for reforming the tax structure. Every economist recognizes that need—and it has been a need for a long, long time. When the Congress gets the specific recommendations for reform, there will be a chance to weigh them up and discover whether reform can be accomplished, or whether only a few face-saving gestures will be made.

The tax structure of the Nation, right now is a tax upon production and enterprise. Those fields need encouragement Will they get it through future tax legislation?

The chances are doubtful. It is much easier to apply a cut, tell the voter his saving, and seek reelection.

But the voter is becoming wise. He is going to look beyond the surface appearance of things. He has yet to be heard from.

## Steel Price Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 21, 1963*

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune of June 16, 1963:

MR. BLOUGH ATTEMPTS TO KILL A MYTH

Roger M. Blough, chairman of the United States Steel Corp., who was the most prominent victim of President Kennedy's tantrum over a proposed rise in steel prices last April, tells his side of the story in the current issue of Look magazine. He tries to correct certain "publicly held misconceptions" about the episode, among them that he purposely lulled the President into the false impression that United States Steel would not raise prices, and then raised them.

This, says Mr. Blough, "is absolutely contrary to the facts."

It will be hard to set the record straight. Mr. Blough is up against an administration which tries to manage the news and often succeeds. The administration's claque of commentators and columnists has spread the story that wicked steel magnates double-crossed the valiant young President by raising prices after he had managed to persuade the noble steelworkers to accept a new contract without a strike.

Mr. Blough makes it clear that the steel companies never made a commitment about prices before the labor agreement. For one reason, they could not do so without being hit by the Department of Justice for violating the antitrust laws. Months before the wage settlement Mr. Blough himself explained to the President and to the secretary of labor [then Arthur J. Goldberg] that nobody could speak for the industry about prices. Mr. Goldberg was advised emphatically that United States Steel had not raised prices for almost 4 years and was being squeezed by the soaring costs of wages and benefits for workers.

After the new labor contracts were agreed upon, President Kennedy telephoned the negotiators on both sides, congratulating them on the settlement which, he said, "should provide a solid base for continued price stability." At this point the steel companies made a mistake which they now recognize. They should have reemphasized immediately that they had made no promises about prices and that a price increase was overdue.

Their failure to do so opened the way for the administration to peddle its myth that United States Steel's move to raise prices was a doublecross. The myth was an excuse to threaten the industry with court action and investigations under the antitrust laws. The President addressed the Nation on television, accusing the steel industry of "utter contempt for the interests of 185 million Americans." The New York Times reported that he had summoned his closest aids to his private office and let go as follows: "My father always told me that all businessmen were sons-of-bitches, but I never believed it till now."

Later, at a press conference, the President denied that he had intended to refer to all businessmen, but he continued to pretend that he was misled by Mr. Blough and other steel executives. He said: "I felt at that time that we had not been treated with frankness, and therefore I thought that his [Papa Kennedy's] view had merit."

Mr. Blough's article in Look shows that he learned a lot from the ruckus last April. He now concludes that Mr. Kennedy's vehement reaction to the news of the proposed price rise was not because he expected an inflationary spiral to result from it, but because he wanted to placate the labor unions. Mr. Blough notes that the President's earlier stand against a 35-hour week had displeased the unions.

"I believe that he and Secretary Golberg felt that an increase in steel prices, following the early wage negotiations, would be viewed as evidence that the administration's

policies were adverse to labor's interests," Mr. Blough writes.

It is a polite way of saying that the administration will do anything, regardless of truth or the general public welfare, to keep on good terms with the labor bosses.

## Medical Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 21, 1963*

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, these are indeed awesome times for a newcomer to take his seat in this Chamber.

Abroad we are beset with the menace of communism, the need for arming and strengthening our allies, the constant threat of further crises which we may have to meet at any time at any of half a dozen points on the globe.

At home we are faced with the unending problems of our growing population, the provision of adequate, normal services for our citizens at all levels of government, and the ever-growing costs incident thereto. Military spending is to be increased in the aftermath of the Cuban crises. Our race into space continues to cost billions. The expense of welfare programs already on the books is rising steadily.

To meet these tremendous obligations, we are carrying an income tax load which many competent authorities insist is a drag on our entire economy. At the same time, we are struggling under a mounting burden of State and local taxes.

Against this background, as the time drew near for me to take my oath, I was disturbed by the administration's determination to revive its ill-conceived program to federalize hospital care for the aged under social security.

The program is bad enough; the strange "business as usual" attitude on the New Frontier is past understanding. This is a period of grave national concern over problems affecting our very prospects of survival. It is not a time for power-hungry bureaucrats and irresponsible crusaders to be running wild, bent on rescuing a segment of the population from an artificial difficulty which only they can see. As usual, of course, they expect to accomplish their wonders with other people's money and other people's liberties.

With debate already contemplated over an income tax cut—and the question in some circles already having become whether the cut shall be $13 billion or more or less—it makes no sense to talk at the same time of a new tax levy which will move in the opposite direction and siphon off added billions from the resources of American workers and their employers in the years ahead.

I am not discussing the merits or demerits of a tax cut at this time. That issue will be before us later. We will then have the benefit of the views of the Ways and Means Committee on the wisdom of such a step when Federal spending remains at the highest point in our peacetime history.

What I am saying today is simply that if the economy is lagging, as the administration claims—and if a reduction in personal and corporate income taxes is a valid means for increasing business activity by putting more money in circulation—then a program to increase taxes and take more money away from wage earners and employers is insupportable. The administration cannot have it both ways.

By the same token, it is equally unreasonable to project a new and fantastically wasteful spending scheme in the face of the soaring Federal deficit. Yet that is what the administration proposes in this instance.

No one knows what the ultimate cost of an adventure into Government medicine would be. We do know that no nation which has tried compulsory, government-controlled health care has ever been able to anticipate the cost correctly. England's program now costs five times the original estimates.

The administration's estimate of the cost of its plan was $1 billion at the last session. But that was when, in its infinite wisdom, the administration was ignoring the 4 million Americans over 65 who are not on social security, an anomaly which never has been explained. For among these older citizens are the most needy in the Nation.

Adding them to the program would increase the cost still further. Many actuaries believe, and have produced figures to show, that the $1 billion estimate was merely the beginning. They have computed the cost at $2.2 billion the first year and a steadily increasing load as more and more citizens reach retirement age.

There is only one answer to this—constantly growing payroll deductions lowering the income of American workers, or more deficit spending and a staggering new addition to the national debt.

Moreover, it does not square with the President's pledge last month before the Economic Club of New York as he spoke eloquently of the need for a tax cut to spur the Nation's economic growth. He used the words of our own Ways and Means Committee chairman when he acknowledged that a tax reduction must be accompanied by "increased control of the rise in expenditures."

Said the President:

> That is precisely the course we intend to follow.

Saddling the Treasury with a new burden of spending, the end of which no one can see, to provide federalized hospital care for millions of the aged who are self-reliant and can take care of themselves, hardly seems to be following a sensible course of controlling rises in expenditures.

For the current fiscal year, according to the administration's own estimate in November, we face a budget deficit of $7.8 billion. It will be the 28th deficit in 34 years, during which the national debt has risen from $16 billion to $300 billion. A probable deficit of $11 billion or more is foreseen next year, not all of which is because of defense and space expenditures deemed vital to the national security. If there is a tax cut of $13 billion, the deficit could be $15 billion or more, the largest in peacetime. The overall budget next year will be the highest in history, exceeding the peak spending of World War II.

I say it is folly for the administration to promote extravagant new social spending schemes in the situation confronting us today. But more than this, I say it is folly beyond description for any administration to tamper at any time with a system of medicine that has become one of the wonders of the modern world.

Let me make myself clear. I am not here to defend the medical profession. It has demonstrated that it can take care of itself in the arena of public affairs.

Rather, I am speaking on fundamental principles that lie at the heart of our system. It is wrong, for example, to compel one segment of the population to underwrite a program of health care for another regardless of need. But that is exactly what has been proposed. The measure before Congress in the last session called for young wage earners to pay a double increase in payroll taxes—a one-quarter of 1 percent higher rate for employees and employers, alike, and a broadening of the tax base from $4,800 to $5,200. The rate for the self-employed would have been three-eighths of 1 percent on the first $5,200 of income.

Administration spokesmen quote these small and harmless sounding fractions in their efforts to show how little is involved here. Surely, they argue, anyone who would object to one-quarter of 1 percent to take care of a segment of the population which they portray as being uniformly sick and impoverished must be stingy and unfeeling. To hear them tell it, you would think they have a monopoly on sympathy and goodwill in this country.

What is involved, actually, is a 17-percent increase in the amount of the tax with the burden falling entirely on the small wage earner. The $5,200 clerk would pay as much as the $50,000 corporation executive. At least 40 percent of all taxable income in the United States would escape any responsibility whatever to help defray the cost of medical care for the aged, including the income of 9 million workers not on social security.

We are aware that an automatic increase in the social security payroll deduction went into effect January 1. This is the ninth such increase since the social security program was adopted in 1937. Two more increases by 1968 are already scheduled by law. Without any other increases, the rate then will be 9¼ percent, or within a fraction of the 10 percent which many experts believe is the limit taxpayers will stand.

Had the compulsory hospital care tax also been adopted, employees and employers would now be paying 40 percent more social security taxes than they were in 1961. By 1968, they would have been paying 87 percent more. And these fig-

ures are based on the administration's outdated estimate that the cost of the program will not exceed $1 billion. That was the amount when only older citizens on social security were to be covered. If the cost reaches $3 billion by 1968, which has been forecast, wage earners and their employers would be paying 94 percent more social security taxes than they were in 1961.

But, I repeat, nobody actually knows what the ultimate cost of the program will be. Yet, this uncertainty notwithstanding, Congress is asked to accept the program, and at the same time take away liberties of older people, impose a new tax on younger people, and clear the way for the Washington bureaucracy to fasten its grip on hospitals and physicians in this country for the first time.

This is not all. Passage of the legislation would immediately impose an unbelievable liability of $35 billion on the social security system, already staggering under a mounting excess of outgo to pay benefits beyond income from payroll taxes. This sum is the amount necessary to cover the expected lifetime hospital expenditures of those who would be eligible for care at once without ever having contributed a dime to the program. The money, of course, would have to come from the contributions of younger workers. They would be paying their family medical expenses out of their pockets while they pay increased taxes for the care of the elderly, millions of whom are completely solvent and able to handle their own needs.

Meanwhile, the entire social security system would be subjected to a new and possibly ruinous strain. Most of today's workers are relying on social security for some support in their retirement years. As originally conceived, the system was intended to place a "floor of protection" under the elderly with cash dollars to spend as they see fit, to buy the things they want or need, when their income falls below a certain level. Now something drastically different is proposed. Federal control of hospitalization for the aged would be a program of services, not cash benefits. Instead of trusting people to decide how they want to spend their health care dollars, the Government would spend their money for them through a new system directed from Washington.

Before wage earners join in a move to take social security on this alien venture, they should pause and reflect on the fact that the social security fund went $1,248 million deeper "into the red" in the last fiscal year. An automatic tax increase on January 1, 1962, did not halt the drain on the reserve fund to pay retirement benefits. Even with the new tax rise this month, the Treasury has reported that it sees no hope of getting the fund's current disbursements in the black this year. The total fund is already about $300 billion in arrears in cash to meet retirement obligations to all who have paid into it since its inception, or an amount equal to the national debt.

Surely, this is not the time to be playing fast and loose with a national institution which people are depending upon to permit them to live in dignity and security in their older years.

I have dealt with some of the basic fiscal objections to this unworkable, ill-founded proposal. There is more, much more, that can and will be said on the question in the months ahead. For there is a deeper, graver meaning to this controversy than the surface arguments that have been advanced by the proponents of government control of hospitalization for the elderly.

This is not, as they loudly proclaim, a holy crusade to bring help to a pathetic group of Americans.

If the legislation known as the King-Anderson bill had passed the last session of Congress, it would not have become effective until 1964. What of the ailing older people in the meantime, if the emergency is as great—if the need is as imperative—as the administration says it is? Where were they going to get help for more than a year?

When the program did become operative, according to responsible authorities, it would have covered only about 25 percent of an individual's normal medical expenses. It would not have paid for doctors' bills, or surgery, or prescription drugs outside a hospital. Even the most needy would have been required to pay the first $90 of their hospital bills.

How would the needy sick raise the 75 percent of their illness cost not covered by the program?

How can an indigent sick person pay as much as $90 of a hospital bill?

The questions answer themselves. This program would solve nothing. The need is not present—has never been present in the exaggerated terms employed by the administration in its drive to pressure Congress to adopt the program.

I believe it is well established by now that this is simply a matter of playing politics with human need and not the appealing humanitarian cause claimed for it. It is a bold bid to buy the votes of the Nation's older citizens by taking credit for offering them tax-supported hospital care whether they need it or not. At the same time, there is an appeal to sons and daughters by giving them the opportunity to shift responsibility for their aging parents on to the back of the Government. I do not buy that kind of thinking and I am proud to acknowledge here and now that most Americans have demonstrated they do not buy it either.

Last March, according to the Gallup poll, a majority of voters—55 per cent—favored Federal control of old age hospitalization. By July, those favoring the administration's program had slipped to 48 percent. By August Dr. Gallup reported, public support had fallen another four points to 44 percent—from a majority to a clear minority in the space of a few months as the Nation learned more and more the plan's details and implications.

All of us here are familiar with the gigantic propaganda circus that has been staged by the administration and certain so-called labor leaders to whip up a crisis atmosphere over the health problems of the aged. In the last campaign, many of us had to meet the tide of misrepresenations, untruths and slippery statistics which have marked the calculated efforts to stir the Nation's sympathies for the elderly people. They are portrayed as a mass of helpless, sick human beings, unable to cope with the problems of their later years.

The opposite is true. Today, 55 percent of all Americans over 65, or 9,550,000, have private insurance plans to protect them from the costs of illness. They have demonstrated their self-reliance. They do not need Government paternalism to free them from risk and individual responsibility. In a few years, the figure is expected to reach 90 percent.

For those who are in need, and those generally self-supporting but unable to meet the cost of serious illness, the Kerr-Mills law provides for State-Federal matching funds to help them secure much more complete medical care than under the limited benefits offered a federally controlled hospital program. Administration of the Kerr-Mills law is left where it belongs, at the local level. Tax funds are not squandered on the nonneedy. The self-supporting and the well-to-do cannot get a free ride at the expense of the small wage earner.

But the Kerr-Mills law has never been liked by those, including labor union bosses, who want the Federal Government to assume total charge of medical care. It is not a gravy train or a gigantic handout. It will not produce millions of votes. These forces are most interested in creating a political issue on false grounds than they are in existing law which will do the job now for those requiring assistance. They would substitute compulsion for free choice in financing medical care. This must not happen.

For passage of the administration program in any form whatever would mark the first step down the road toward complete socialization of medicine in this country. This is the fundamental peril that confronts us. The greatest system of medicine ever enjoyed by any people anywhere has unjustifiably been placed on trial in the political arena. Here it must be safeguarded and protected. We cannot afford to retreat to a form of mass medicine, cafeteria style, under Government controls. We cannot permit the quality of medicine to deteriorate or allow the standards of practice to be corrupted under bureaucratic interference.

These are basic considerations. We all know that a healthy nation is a strong nation and at no time in our history has it been more vital that our Nation be strong.

---

## President Kennedy's Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. RAY J. MADDEN**
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 21, 1963*

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Gary Post-

Tribune, Gary, Ind., seems to be a rather fair analysis of the important budget problem which will be confronting the Congress this session. These comments coming from a Republican newspaper seem to be nonpolitical and rather sensible.

WILL CONGRESS CUT BUDGET?

President Kennedy has presented some cogent arguments in behalf of his proposed Federal tax cut. A larger immediate deficit is of slight concern if lower rates stimulate the economy and soon bring sizable increases in revenue. The arguments may sound better to our ears, of course, because a tax cut would be a pleasing thing to practically everyone.

At the same time, most of us would agree that there should be a reduction in Federal spending, of at least some degree, at the same time that Federal taxes are trimmed down. We had hoped for efforts to minimize the deficit increase by curtailing the Federal budget.

So it is a shock to learn that Kennedy has proposed a budget for fiscal 1964 of nearly $99 billion, the largest in the national history. Republicans in Congress call it incredible and cynical. Some Democrats are fully as outspoken in criticism. The chairman of the House Appropriations Committee says the budget is unbalanced because "we are spending money we do not have on things we could get along without."

The outcries against the monstrous budget are so shrill that a newcomer in the congressional press gallery might well conclude that the President's program was in deep trouble, and that the budget would have to be reduced considerably if the tax cut proposal were to have any chance of getting passed.

A look at the breakdown of the spending proposals will convince otherwise, however. Out of the budget dollar, 62 cents is set aside for national defense, international activities, and the space program. Veterans' programs will get 6 cents; interest on the public debt takes 10 cents; and agriculture is down for 6 cents. All other Federal activities are budgeted for 16 cents.

Nothing can be done about the interest charges, and practically the same thing can be said about funds for the veterans. Does anyone seriously believe a further cut can be made in farm aid, budgeted at about a billion less than this year? Or that much might be cut from the "all other" funds, up about a billion in the new budget?

So we turn to the major item, 62 cents out of every dollar for defense, world activities, and outer space. Is there any chance of important savings being made here? If we are honest about it, the answer will be in the negative.

On purely military budgets, Congress has been inclined to vote more, not less, than the administration has requested. Defense Secretary Robert McNamara has said economies are possible, but if any are realized he will have to make them directly, and despite strong local and State pressures to the contrary. These pressures, plus Pentagon lobbying, may be expected to hold the budget fully up to the President's request.

Request is made for larger space funds, to keep the Apollo lunar program on track. Some still question the urgency of going to the moon. However, Congress has been firmly behind the President's decision and we believe most of the people are also.

Through the whole budget, savings of a million here or a hundred million there are undoubtedly possible, and they could add up to an impressive figure. But when the President himself is willing to propose a $10 billion deficit, Congressmen may show little concern for sums that are piddling by comparison, especially when a vocal lobby can be mustered in behalf of almost any spending project.

There will be one massive endeavor to trim the budget, however—an effort directed against foreign aid. The $3.75 billion foreign aid program undoubtedly will be made the whipping boy, although it is one of the most defensible items in the whole $98.8 billion budget.

## What Next From TVA?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROSS BASS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 21, 1963*

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, the Tennessee Valley Authority has been doing an outstanding job with its fertilizer program. This program, however, needs to be better publicized. I, therefore, commend to my colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the publication, Farm Chemicals, and which reflects the growing acceptance of the TVA's fertilizer program.

WHAT NEXT FROM TVA?

Amid all the cries of "too much government" one agency stands out as one of the most useful services an industry can possibly have at its beck and call. We're speaking of the TVA, of course.

True, there have been criticisms leveled at its system of using farmer-owned cooperatives to distribute its high analysis fertilizer to farmer-cooperators. And that's expected. The fertilizer industry has a history of great dislike for cooperatives, because of their tax-free status. But no technologists are more welcome anywhere (including abroad) than TVA fertilizer experts.

Everytime we read about some new innovation in fertilizer technology, we wonder what next from TVA? The way they work, you'd think they'd work themselves right out of a job sooner or later.

The answer to that is: TVA may eventually be this country's answer to increasing foreign competition.

Phosphate manufacturers in particular have benefitted directly or indirectly from TVA's research. As Jesse W. Markham reported in his book, "The Fertilizer Industry," at least 16 companies have obtained designs or detailed operating information, or both, on TVA installations and processes; 5 have employed TVA personnel to assist them with initial plant operations; 5 other phosphate manufacturers and several engineering and construction companies have sent representatives and operators to Wilson Dam for training in TVA plants; and 2 fertilizer producers have built plants using one of TVA's nitric-phosphate processes."

Mind you, that was the report as of 1958. The record since then is equally impressive. In fiscal 1962, for example, TVA issued 43 licenses for use of its chemical developments.

This month we're proud to bring you an exclusive report on a fertilizer material which will have a tremendous influence on liquid fertilizer, indeed the entire fertilizer industry—ammonium polyphosphate. It's the highest of the high analysis fertilizers—even higher than diammonium phosphate.

Boasting 77 percent plant food (16 percent nitrogen and 61 percent $P_2O_5$), it's primarily a mixture of ammonium orthophosphate and ammonium pyrophosphate. Another factor in ammonium polyphosphate's favor is ease of handling; it is less costly to handle, ship and store than many other fertilizer materials. Diammonium phosphate has 74 percent plant food.

Ammonium polyphosphate can be used conventionally as a fertilizer and it can be used to make highly concentrated solutions. Dissolved in water it gives a liquid fertilizer containing as much as 44 percent plant food—about 10 percent nitrogen and 34 percent $P_2O_5$—or about the same concentration as made directly with superphosphate acid and ammonia. One of the great possibilities of this material is that it makes possible the preparation of a liquid fertilizer from wet progress acid instead of the more expensive furnace acid.

And herein lies quite a tale, too. Wet process acid, another product of TVA, was considered to be the key to the future expansion of the entire liquid industry back in 1959 when FC brought you a special report the complete liquids field. Now it is being used extensively by liquid operators—and it is also brought the price of white acid down to a competitive level.

We think TVA's biggest challenges lie ahead. As T. P. Hignett reported following a visit to 20 fertilizer companies in seven European countries 2 years ago:

"The quality of granular fertilizer in Europe is probably better than the average in the United States in some cases, 75 percent of the superphosphate granules are on-size."

Continuous operation and limitation of the number of grades, he believed, help producers attain good granulation in Europe.

By way of comparison, in the United States a mixed fertilizer plant's average annual production may consist of 50 or more grades while a European company with more than 5 times the tonnage may produce no more than 5 grades. (Most of the companies he visited had capacities in the range of 100,000 to 500,000 tons.)

Hignett made it clear why European fertilizer manufacturers can compete in the world market, despite the high prices they have to pay for raw materials. They select economical processes and build large-scale, integrated operations.

If we are to continue to maintain our position in the world fertilizer market, it's obvious that the TVA will be needed like never before.

## Operation Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most effective and impressive programs devoted to the training of young people in the values of freedom, initiative, and responsibility is junior achievement.

Many of our colleagues, I am sure, are familiar with the work of junior achievement in their own areas, especially the leadership it has taken in conjunction with business, industrial, civic and professional leaders in furthering an understanding and appreciation of the American free enterprise system among those to whom we look for future leadership.

In Union County, N.J., I have followed very closely the progress of what is certainly one of the most successful junior

achievement programs in the country. Its 1962–63 project, Operation Free Enterprise, seems to me to surpass anything Junior Achievement of Union County, Inc., has previously accomplished, and I believe a description of the project would be of great interest to our colleagues.

This is the kind of work, Mr. Speaker, which is effective with young people because it is practical, realistic and worthwhile. By engaging in actual business operations, for which they accept full responsibility, boys and girls of high school age learn the meaning and value of private enterprise in the free American tradition. Junior Achievers and their parents, their adult advisers and industrial sponsors deserve great credit for their energy, imagination and genuine contribution to the strength of the free enterprise system.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a memorandum prepared by J. Kenneth Roden, the very able executive vice president of Junior Achievement of Union County, Inc., which describes the project in detail:

JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT OF
UNION COUNTY, INC.,
*Elizabeth, N.J., March 15, 1962.*

To: Junior Achievement advisers.
From: J. Kenneth Roden, executive vice president.
Subject: Operation Free Enterprise.

Operation Free Enterprise is a three-pronged youth incentive public relations and youth educational project planned and developed by the board of directors of Junior Achievement of Union County, Inc. in cooperation with Junior Achievements of Essex-West Hudson, Inc., Junior Achievement of New York, Inc., Junior Achievement of Hartford, Inc., and Junior Achievement of Delaware Valley, Inc. (Other junior achievement areas will be invited to participate.)

Operation Free Enterprise will start in September 1962 as a dynamic youth incentive and educational program which will continue throughout the junior achievement program year. It will be climaxed with a week-long visit of about 100 Junior Achievers from the Union County, and other participating junior achievement areas, to West Germany. There the Junior Achievers, winners in the youth incentive competition, will have an opportunity to obtain a personal view and impression of the Berlin situation which is creating so much tension and so many world problems which they, as leaders of tomorrow, will have to face and solve. They will come face to face with the Communist wall, evidence of the failure and inhumanity of the Communist philosophy which they will compare with the industrial, educational, scientific and cultural growth and development and general prosperity of the Federal Republic of Germany under its free, democratic government in cooperation with other nations of the free world.

It is contemplated that the group of student-achievers will meet with American and German Government officials both here and abroad, including the U.S. Ambassador and other high-ranking American officials, and the German Chancellor and other top German officials.

An important phase of the visit in Germany will be meetings with industrialists who will discuss with the group Germany's postwar economic development and its effect on the future of the free world. It will be demonstrated to them that the German system is in many ways a replica of our own; its institutions are similar and its policies are based on the same fundamentals: private enterprise and competition free from state and monopolistic interference.

There will be visits to industrial installations, cultural and religious centers. Arrangements will be made for the junior achievers to attend classes at an American school in Germany.

Extensive press, radio, and television coverage will be planned for both the United States and Germany. A publicity factsheet will be made available soon.

A program and itinerary will be distributed at a later date.

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

There will be extensive community participation in Operation Free Enterprise. In order to give the American people an opportunity to rededicate themselves to the principles of free enterprise which this Nation followed, in achieving its present position of world leadership, individuals will be able to purchase shares of stock in Operation Free Enterprise at a cost of $1 per share. Their return on this investment will not be monetary, but will be considerable in terms of a more enlightened younger generation dedicated to the task of strengthening and expanding the free-enterprise economy through cooperative good will throughout the world.

Operation Free Enterprise will provide all people of the participating communities with a constructive outlet for demonstrating that the American free enterprise system is not just a system for carrying on business but is much more; it is the best system for promoting human progress while preserving individual freedom.

OBJECTIVES OF OPERATION FREE ENTERPRISE

(1) To provide junior achievers and advisers with a positive, effective incentive program designed to stimulate a clear, complete understanding of the principles and the benefits and rewards of the American free enterprise system and to make young people good salesmen of free enterprise.

Operation Free Enterprise will demonstrate that every individual, whether employee or manager or community leader, must always be aware that the vigor of the free enterprise system in America depends on a heritage that attaches prime importance to liberty, equality of opportunity, individual rights and dignity as well as personal initiative, creative thinking, responsible leadership and teamwork with each individual carrying his share of the load and discharging his responsibilities to the best of his ability. Operation Free Enterprise will demonstrate that each individual's contribution, if properly utilized, will result in a profit to himself, to the employer, to the community, and to the Nation. It will further demonstrate that corporate profits will assure continued growth, prosperity, and stability, all of which are more valuable and desirable than security through handout or a welfare-state economy.

(2) To give Junior Achievers an opportunity to become good-will ambassadors and to enable them to feel firsthand the pulsebeat of international relations, especially industrial, governmental, and educational, between the United States and West Germany.

The Junior Achievers will develop a keener understanding of the importance of sincere cooperation in international relations in all areas: human relations, government, and particularly in business and industry. The Achievers will be introduced to the cultural, educational, and esthetic aspects of German life through visits and association with German businessmen and their families, and German officials. German industrialists will have an opportunity to meet personally with representatives of the junior achievement companies sponsored by their American affiliates.

(3) To reverse the emphasis teenagers are placing on benefits and security in employment.

The project will demonstrate that such attitudes contribute to a preference for a welfare-state economy and fail to develop the full potential of the individual as an employee, manager, and community leader.

(4) To maintain the high standards of performance, productivity, and prestige of the junior-achievement program.

Special emphasis will be placed on stimulating and developing personal initiative, creative thinking, responsible leadership, high attendance, punctuality on the individual and total company level, improved production techniques to result in reduction of operating costs, and aggressive and continuing safety and sales programs.

(5) To expand the learn-by-doing principle of junior achievement.

The experience of international jet air travel will demonstrate to the Junior Achievers how, under the free enterprise system, research and development in the transportation industry, and aggressive promotion, have aided international trade and communications and generally narrowed the world's horizons. Discussions with German industrialists and visits to German industries will further enhance the Achievers' understanding of international trade.

(6) To demonstrate to Junior Achievers, parents, educators, and the community at large the degree of interest which local businessmen have in our young people.

The program will demonstrate to the community that local business and industrial organizations are good neighbors, willing to help prepare young people for the day when they must accept responsibilities of business and professional leadership at home and abroad.

INCENTIVE PROGRAM COMMITTEE

The board of directors of Junior Achievement of Union County has delegated responsibility for the planning and execution of Operation Free Enterprise to Mr. J. Kenneth Roden, executive vice president. He will be responsible for liaison with junior achievement areas and other participating organizations.

The board of directors has named a committee to advise and assist Mr. Roden, who will also serve on the committee. Members of the Incentive Program Committee are: William M. Bristol, III, president, Bristol-Myers Products Division; John J. Conlon, vice president, Phelps Dodge Copper Products Corp.; Harry P. Frank, publisher, the Daily Journal; James L. Macwithey, president, New Jersey chapter, Public Relations Society of America, Inc.; Judge Richard R. O'Connor, general counsel, Junior Achievement of Union County, Inc.; J. Kenneth Roden, executive vice president, Junior Achievement of Union County, Inc.; W. J. Sheridan, manager, Humble Oil & Refining Co.

PLANNING BY JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT ADVISERS

Operation Free Enterprise is an incentive program to encourage each junior achievement company, as well as each individual junior achiever, to maintain high standards in all phases of operations. Only junior achievement companies which meet or exceed the performance standards outlined below will qualify to nominate company members for participation in Operation Free Enterprise.

Advisers should prepare now to maintain standards in company operations which will assure that their companies will qualify, and also prepare to select outstanding junior achievers for nomination to participate in Operation Free Enterprise.

PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

(1) Attendance: Each junior achievement company must maintain a monthly attendance rating of not less than 85 percent. In order to be counted present, each achiever must have punched his timecard and reported to his company work area no later

than 7 p.m. Attendance record sheets signed by the company secretary and an adviser must be turned in to the program director at the end of each company meeting. In the case of those companies which do not meet at the Elizabeth Business Center, attendance forms must be mailed to Junior Achievement Headquarters in Elizabeth the day following the company meeting. Reports received by mail will be checked as to the time and date stamped on the envelope at the post office.

Achievers who fail to attend the first company meeting will be contacted by telephone. If the notice of the first meeting was received, and unless the achiever was ill, the absent achiever will be dropped from the company and a replacement assigned by junior achievement.

In the event of dropouts, and if the junior company wishes to maintain its total membership at its beginning number, replacements will be made by junior achievement up until December 1, 1962.

(2) Company meeting schedules: Each company must meet one night a week from 7 to 9 p.m. The first company meeting should be scheduled as soon as possible after junior achievement issues the membership list.

There will be no company meeting on November 22, Thanksgiving Day. Companies which wish to make up lost production and sales time may request an extra work night by contacting the program director.

There will be no official company meetings December 24 through January 1, 1963. Regular company meetings will be held starting January 2. It is strongly recommended that advisers stress the need for achievers to continue to sell their products and to maintain high individual and company sales during this Christmas vacation period.

Official company meetings cannot be canceled because of special school events such as shows, athletic tournaments, etc., or for any operating reasons such as lack of raw materials, low production schedules, or other difficulties which reflect poor planning or lack of achiever interest.

In the event of extremely bad weather, cancellation of a company meeting must be cleared with junior achievement headquarters in Elizabeth.

(3) Production: The junior company must be in production not later than the fourth company meeting.

(4) Operating plan and budget: The company must submit to junior achievement headquarters, not later than the eighth company meeting, a copy of its operating budget and profit plan which must provide for fixed company payments as outlined in the bulletin dated September 15, 1961, entitled, "Operating Procedures—Fiscal Practices."

(5) Special credits for outstanding performance: Special consideration will be given to nominees of junior achievement companies which have shown evidence of outstanding performance in any of the following areas:

(a) Exceptional improvement in any phase of company performance, through increased efficiency, cost reduction programs, sales incentive plans, safety programs, 100 percent attendance, punctuality, good housekeeping, etc.

(b) Originality of junior achievement product.

(c) Originality in any phase of company operations.

(d) Outstanding teamwork among company members.

(e) Unusually good management by company officers.

(f) High individual and company sales.

(g) High sale of stock in Operation Free Enterprise.

(6) Penalties: Although it is not anticipated that there will be any reason for imposing a penalty upon any junior achievement company, it must be emphasized that a severe penalty will be imposed upon a company in the event of an accident caused by carelessness or horseplay. Failure to pay bills, to maintain cleanup and good housekeeping requirements, may also subject a company to penalty.

NOMINATION OF ACHIEVERS

Each junior achievement company which qualified will have the privilege of nominating two members, one boy and one girl, for participation in Operation Free Enterprise. Consideration should be given only to outstanding junior achievers.

Advisers should take into consideration qualities of leadership, personal initiative, appearance, poise, ability to get along with young people and with adults. Junior achievement attendance, punctuality, attitude toward safety regulations, knowledge of junior achievement company operations, and general knowledge of the sponsoring company's operations. Also, consideration should be given to interest in and knowledge of the industrial growth and development of the countries within the European Common Market.

Advisers must bear in mind that junior achievers who are selected to participate in Operation Free Enterprise will be good-will ambassadors of our industrial and educational community, and will be guests of German businessmen and governmental leaders.

SELECTION OF ACHIEVERS

Nominations will be made on a nomination form provided by junior achievement. Four signed copies must be returned to junior achievement headquarters prior to a deadline date which will be specified by junior achievement.

All nominees will be interviewed by a panel of junior achievement officials and members of the junior achievement board of directors. They will be notified by junior achievement of the time and place of the interview.

Selection of achievers who will participate will be announced several weeks in advance of the trip date. At that time instructions will be issued on procedures to follow to obtain passports, public health certificates, etc., and writen permission of parents or guardians to make the trip to Germany.

TRANSPORTATION

Transportation to Europe will be arranged by junior achievement. Advisers will be requested to assist in making satisfactory arrangements for transportation of achievers to and from the Junior Achievement Business Center. The Elizabeth Daily Journal will furnish transportation to and from Idlewild Airport.

PREPARATION OF ACHIEVERS

If a Junior Achiever from your company is selected to participate in Operation Free Enterprise, you should take full responsibility for his or her preparation to participate actively in all phases of the program.

Remember: The impression our Junior Achievers make upon radio, television and press representatives, German and American officials, and businessmen will reflect upon Junior Achievement of Union County, and our advisers, and upon our sponsoring industries.

The following points are essential. You will think of others.

(1) Be sure your achiever is thoroughly prepared to discuss the operation of his junior achievement company and, in a general way, the sponsoring company.

(2) Explain carefully to the Achiever that he will be the guest of German Government and business leaders, and will have a unique opportunity to leave with those he meets a fine impression of the American people, especially American youth.

(3) Review the questions which have been prepared for the guidance of the Achievers.

(4) Impress upon the achiever that it is common courtesy to show a sincere interest in his host's community and activities. The Achiever should ask questions.

(5) Explain the importance of good grooming. Advise the Achiever to follow instructions which will be given to him in writing with regard to dress.

(6) Explain the importance of courtesy and punctuality. Ask the Achiever to keep in mind that press, magazine, newsreel and television photographers and cameramen will be invited to take photographs throughout the trip. The Achievers must remember that these men and women have a job to do and should help them by being cooperative, punctual, and courteous.

OPERATION FREE ENTERPRISE COMMITTEE

Henry Beers, chairman of the board, Aetna Affiliated Cos., Hartford, Conn.; William M. Bristol, III, president, Bristol-Myers Products Division, New York, N.Y.; Edwin Broden, president, SKF Industries, Philadelphia, Pa.; John J. Conlon, vice president, Phelps Dodge Copper Products Corp., New York, N.Y.; Edward R. N. Douglass, president, New Jersey chapter, Public Relations Society of America, Inc., Elizabeth, N.J.; Frank L. Driver, president, Driver-Harris Co., Harrison, N.J.; Harry P. Frank, publisher, the Daily Journal, Elizabeth, N.J.; Alfred C. Fuller, chairman of the board, Fuller Brush Co., East Hartford, Conn.; William P. Gwinn, president, United Aircraft Corp., East Hartford, Conn.; James L. Macwithey, director of public relations, Bristol-Myers Co., New York, N.Y.; F. W. Norcross, treasurer, the Budd Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; Hon. Richard R. O'Connor, general counsel, Junior Achievement of Union County, Inc., Elizabeth, N.J.; E. Leslie Peter, international director, Tung Sol, Inc., Newark, N.J.; J. Kenneth Roden, executive vice president, Junior Achievement of Union County, Inc., Elizabeth, N.J.; William J. Sheridan, manager, Humble Oil & Refining Co., Linden, N.J.

SPONSORS OF JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT COMPANIES 1962-63 PROGRAM YEAR

Air Reduction Sales Co., Equipment Manufacturing Division; American Cyanamid Co.; Bristol-Myers Products Division, Bristol-Myers Co.; California Oil Co.; E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Inc.; General Aniline & Film Corp.; Buick-Oldsmobile-Pontiac Assembly Division, General Motors Corp.; Humble Oil & Refining Co., Bayway Refinery; Humble Oil & Refining Co., New Jersey sales area; Hyatt Bearings Division, General Motors Corp.; Inorganic Chemicals Division, FMC Corp.; International Business Machines Corp.; the Lionel Corp.; Merck & Co., Inc.; Metal & Thermit Corp.; New Jersey Bell Telephone Co.; Phelps Dodge Copper Products Corp.; Purolator Products, Inc.; Radio Corp. of America; Regina Corp.; Schering Corp.; Simmons Co.; the Singer Manufacturing Co.; the Thomas & Betts Co., Inc.; S.E. & M. Vernon, Inc.; Weston Instruments Division, Daystrom, Inc.

## A Cotton Farmer Proposes Important Changes in Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 21, 1963*

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the cotton industry is vitally important to Arizona and to the Nation. While cotton is now

reasonably healthy, there are storm clouds on the horizon and important legislative decisions will face the 88th Congress. Mr. R. Keith Walden, president of Farmers Investment Co., Tucson, Ariz., is an exceptionally intelligent and responsible cottongrower who is recognized in the industry as an independent, thoughtful student of cotton problems. I recently asked Mr. Walden to give me a memorandum outlining his proposals for future legislation and administrative action. His response is so thought-provoking, and his suggestions so interesting that I would like to share them with my colleagues. I commend this letter especially to the attention of the members of the Committee on Agriculture:

JANUARY 16, 1963.

Hon. MORRIS K. UDALL,
*Congress of the United States,*
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN UDALL: As you requested, I will endeavor to recapitulate my comments made in your office last week with reference to the raw cotton industry. First, I would like to refer to some historical background, because it is important in order to understand the cotton problem.

In 1950, the United States experienced a short crop of cotton. This was also true in other cotton-producing countries. Furthermore, world stocks of cotton had not been built up to normal figures since their depletion during the war, and demand was high. These factors resulted in a rapid rise in the price of cotton. During the year, the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture issued two orders from which it took the American cotton industry a long time to recover. The orders were (1) an embargo on exports of American cotton to foreign countries and (2) establishment of a ceiling price on U.S. cotton at 45 cents per pound. The world price for about 2 years was more than 90 cents per pound.

In 1951, acreage controls were eliminated, but the world price was still high, and the shortage of supply had triggered the development of cotton production in many foreign countries. Expansion of production continued; and, in 1954, acreage controls were again imposed on the U.S. crop. By this time, the world price was substantially below the U.S. support price, and the United States had become a residual supplier. Our exports had dwindled to slightly over 2 million bales.

In 1956, American cotton was again made competitive in the world markets by an export subsidy. Exports climbed to over 7 million bales in one year. By 1960, the domestic support price had been reduced from some 34 cents to less than 30 cents per pound. Domestic consumption was expanding, synthetic fiber plants were running at 70 percent of capacity, and the future of cotton was bright in the fall of 1960.

Many interests in the old southern Cotton Belt were unhappy with cotton's new outlook. Allotments had been built up in the low-cost producing areas of the Mississippi River Delta and the irrigated West. The newly elected President did not carry the Cotton Belt of the Deep South in the presidential election of 1960. In February of 1961, the newly appointed Secretary of Agriculture, notwithstanding strong testimony by leaders of the cotton industry, who pleaded for no increase in price support, increased the price support by more than 3 cents per pound.

After the increase in the domestic price support, Congress authorized a similar increase in the export subsidy. Notwithstanding the increase in the subsidy, the position of American cotton has continued to disintegrate, both at home and abroad, and the rate of deterioration has been accelerated in the last 12 months. Exports last year were off more than a million bales. They will be off another million bales in 1963. Domestic consumption is also off about a million bales.

U.S. textile mills are turning to synthetic fibers wherever they can, and U.S. cottongrowers have had their allotment cut 11 percent for 1963. In spite of the cut, disappearance will likely be 1½ million bales less than production in 1963. One of the principal reasons for the decline in raw cotton consumption by domestic mills has been the price disparity of 8½ cents per pound between the world price and our domestic supported price. It means that American textile mills are required to pay $42.50 more for a bale of cotton than do foreign mills. Both the cotton industry and the textile industry actively encouraged the Tariff Commission to establish an offsetting equalization fee on imported cotton goods to represent the difference in the cost of raw cotton. In September of 1962, the Tariff Commission turned down the request of the industry. On the same day, the President stated that, in view of the Tariff Commission's decision, he had instructed the Secretary of Agriculture to take steps to remedy the unfair competitive situation faced by the domestic textile industry. The cotton industry, represented by the National Cotton Council, immediately notified the President that it stood ready to cooperate with him to find a proper solution to the problem. The solution to the problem could be as follows:

1. Immediately reduce the support price on all American-grown cotton by 3 cents per pound.

2. Adopt an equalization payment system to the American textile mill to offset the difference between the support price and the world price, enabling both foreign mills and domestic mills to buy cotton at the same price.

3. Reduce the price support by 1 cent per pound per year until such time as the payment is eliminated.

4. Appropriate $15 million per year for the next 5 years for an expanded research program over and above what the industry is now doing, in order to enable the industry to: (a) lower its costs; and (b) improve its quality.

Simple arithmetic with regard to comparative costs to the Federal Government of the above program for the remainder of this decade, as opposed to the present program, are as follows:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Cost of present export subsidy program per year: | | |
| (a) 5,000,000 bales at $42.50 per bale | | $212,500,000 |
| (b) Total cost next 7 years | | 1,487,500,000 |
| 2. Cost of proposed program to make cotton competitive: | | |
| (a) Since domestic support price reduced 3 cents per pound, equalization payment on all production at $27.50 per bale times 13,500,000 bales estimated production | $371,250,000 | |
| Research | 15,000,000 | |
| | | 386,250,000 |
| (b) 2d year: Estimated consumption and production up to 14,500,000. Equalization payment at $22.50 per bale | 326,250,000 | |
| Research | 15,000,000 | |
| | | 341,250,000 |
| (c) 3d year: Estimated consumption and production up to 15,500,000. Equalization payment at $17.50 per bale | 269,250,000 | |
| Research | 15,000,000 | |
| | | 284,250,000 |
| (d) 4th year: Estimated consumption and production up to 16,000,000. Equalization payment at $12.50 per bale | 200,000,000 | |
| Research | 15,000,000 | |
| | | 215,000,000 |
| (e) 5th year: Estimated consumption and production up to 16,500,000. Equalization payment at $7.50 per bale | 123,750,000 | |
| Research | 15,000,000 | |
| | | 138,750,000 |
| (f) 6th year: Estimated consumption and production up to 17,000,000. Equalization payment at $2.50 per bale | 42,500,000 | |
| Research (discontinued) | 0 | |
| | | 42,500,000 |
| (g) 7th year: Estimated consumption and production up to 17,500,000 | (1) | |
| Total cost next 7 years | | 1,408,000,000 |

[1] No equalization payment.

To the Federal Government, the cost of the declining support price program is indicated at some $80 million less than a continued high support program with an export subsidy for the remainder of this decade. Announcement of a long-range declining support price program would discourage further expansion of production in other countries. Cotton exports would increase, providing, anually, more than half a billion dollars of additional foreign exchange, so badly needed in our balance-of-payments problem.

The alternative is a continually declining domestic consumption and a permanently subsidized export of cotton. Textile people predict that, by the end of this decade, annual domestic cotton consumption would have declined to 5 million bales or less. Acreage allotments would have been cut another 20 percent or more. To Arizona, this would mean a minimum reduction of $65 million in the gross product income to the State. Given an average multiplication of 5, the effect on the Arizona economy would be something in the order of a $325 million overall decline. Needless to say, this would be a terrible depressant on the entire Arizona economy.

The future of American-grown cotton is indeed bright, if we can solve its current problem. If we fail to do so—if we fail to make it competitive—it will likely become just a curiosity product within the next 15 years. I well realize that one of the jobs of the Secretary of Agriculture is to deliver the votes to the administration from voting citizens in the farm belt. In order to do this in the Deep South, perhaps a necessary adjunct to the declining support program outlined herein would be some sort of limited direct subsidy to producers of 10 bales or less. If so, I suggest that we do it, but I trust we will be courageous enough to do it without signing the death warrant of a great American industry.

Sincerely,

R. KEITH WALDEN.

## The Fruits of 2 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI**
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 21, 1963*

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week we heard the expected reassuring

description of foreign policy progress of the administration as the President presented his state of the Union message. Actually, the conditions existing throughout the world now, as compared to problems inherited by the New Frontier, are considerably different than described by administration propaganda.

The Chicago Sunday Tribune, January 13, contained an editorial discussing our current relations with 23 different nations. I feel it is a timely commentary on the actual relationship of the United States to these nations.

It is my hope that Members of the House will study these editorial observations, and contrast them to the explanations emanating from administration sources:

THE FRUITS OF 2 YEARS

Mr. Kennedy entered the White House 2 years ago on a tide of complaint that the image of the United States had deteriorated vastly under the Eisenhower administration and that he was going to set everything to rights in our relations with the rest of the world. The halfway point in his administration provides an appropriate opportunity to look around and see how well the prospectus has been fulfilled. A map on the front page of our "Spotlight on the World" section shows how America's troubles range across the globe.

Among the neuralgic spots, these may be noticed:

1. Cuba. After the disaster of the Kennedy supported invasion of April 1961, the President came awake in time to discover boatloads of Soviet missiles, jet bombers, and troops in Cuba. He professes to believe that Khrushchev removed the weapons. The Russian military contingents and Castro's communism remain.

2. Laos: Here Mr. Kennedy adopted the Soviet formula of ending civil war by establishing a coalition neutralist government. Today, instead of the old pro-American regime, we have a hybrid whose Communist faction curtly notifies us that even our mercy food flights to Lao mountain tribesmen will be continued at our own risk, because the Reds have not authorized the operation and will not do so until their own followers are cut in on the food.

3. South Vietnam: American military advisers have found it impossible to get South Vietnam troops to fight effectively against the Communists, and concede that Red guerrillas could win the war for the country with captured American weapons and communications equipment.

4. Cambodia: This country in southeast Asia is angry at the United States because it contends that its border is repeatedly violated by South Vietnam forces armed with American weapons.

5. Thailand: Cambodia's neighbor is equally angry because Dean Acheson, former Democratic Secretary of State, represented Cambodia in a successful action before the World Court to get possession of a disputed border temple. Thailand interpreted Acheson's activity as a sign of American hostility, because the former Secretary still sits in councils of the Kennedy administration.

6. Red China: Keeps snarling that the United States is a paper tiger and a push-over and derides Khrushchev's reminder that the paper tiger still possess nuclear teeth.

7. Korea: No resolution here of a cease-fire now 9 years old which was supposed to lead to the unification of Korea through free elections. North Korean Communists have repeatedly violated the armistice terms and created border incidents.

8. Jordan: King Hussein of this American subsidized country has recently attacked the United States for recognizing the Yemen rebel republic established with help from Russia and the United Arab Republic. Hussein charged that America was alienating her old friends in the Middle East by supporting subversive movements seeking the overthrow of established governments.

9. Morocco: The United States has lost airbases upon which it expended hundreds of millions of dollars in this country, which has proved increasingly receptive to Soviet overtures.

10. Algeria: Ben Bella, the boss, received with open arms at the White House, promptly went to Cuba, embraced Castro, and pinned a medal on him, declaring that Algeria would always be grateful for the Cuban revolutionary example and Castro's support in its own rebellion. The new Algeria has moved far to the left, toward Moscow.

11. Britain: Angry at the United States over the scrapping of the Skybolt missile which was to provide Britain's air force with nuclear striking power. At odds with the United States over its support of United Nations policy in Katanga. Also opposed to American policy in Yemen and other parts of the Middle East.

12. Belgium: Angry with the United States over the Congo, a former Belgian territory, with anti-American demonstrations in Brussels.

13. Holland: Angry that the United States provided the motive force in compelling the Netherlands to hand over West New Guinea to Indonesia in a bloodless surrender after reneging on a declaration by the late Secretary of State Dulles that America would not permit President Sukarno to achieve this steal.

14. Indonesia: Despite American appeasement at the expense of Holland, mobs wrecked the American consulate, the consul's residence, and the United States Information Agency office in Surabaya. The Indonesia Foreign Minister described the violence as a protest against United States policy toward Cuba.

15. France: President De Gaulle continued to be scornful of the U.N., standoffish about NATO, persistent in his intention to make France an independent nuclear power, and antagonistic toward the Congo policy supported in the U.N. by the United States.

16. Spain: Difficulties were developing in negotiations over the continuance of American bases in this country.

17. Portugal: The Lisbon government was angry over America's policy in the Congo, its support of anti-colonialist activities in U.N. against Angola and other Portuguese-African possessions, and was backing away from extension of existing agreements governing American air bases in the Azores.

18. Canada: During the Cuban crisis, when a full alert against attack was declared by the North American Air Defense Command, Canada refused to honor its commitments to arm planes with nuclear weapons and send them to forward bases. It continues to trade with Cuba and to ship great quantities of grain to Red China and other Communist countries, ignoring Washingtons embargoes.

19. Mexico: Is tepid about the American hard line toward Cuba and protects open Communist activities to win over the landless and to infiltrate and propagandize Latin neighbors.

20. Brazil: President Goulart, despite economic bribes by Robert Kennedy, brother of the President, has expropriated American investments, obtained a mandate for virtual dictatorial rule, made trade deals with the Communists, supported Castro in the Organization of American States, and is angry that the United States has not handed over blank checks through the Alliance for Progress, Mr. Kennedy's creation to bring progress and reform to Latin America.

21. Guatemala: Angered over American refusal to support a more forceful policy against Cuba, this country now announces a new policy toward Castro and has ordered the arrest of an anti-Castro leader.

22. Pakistan: Angry with the United States because of arms aid to India in its border war with Red China, fearful that these arms will be turned against Pakistan, but mollified in part by America's action to persuade India to reopen discussions on disputed Kashmir.

23. India: Still nonalined in the cold war despite the Communist Chinese border invasion and American military and economic aid to Nehru. After 1 day of negotiations on Kashmir, Nehru remained as recalcitrant as ever, announcing there was nothing to negotiate.

If we have come anywhere in Mr. Kennedy's first 2 years, the progress is all but invisible. The world is in a muddle, the threats remain, and we are nowhere greatly loved.

## California Defense Dollars Go National

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, six of the larger California defense contractors recently reported to the California Defense Industries Committee of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce procurement data covering the national pattern of their relations with suppliers and vendors for articles, materials, and services.

This compilation of the data is on an annual basis for the various corporate fiscal patterns ending in the 1961–62 period, the most recently available data in each case. Each reporting corporation carries on an intensive procurement and contracting program aimed at the widest possible participation nationally, and in each case a main facet of the total program is the determination that small business receive an equitable opportunity to compete for subcontracts for articles, materials, and services of all kinds.

California defense contractors are doing business in 49 States with all kinds of enterprises from the local hardware store to the giants of industry. Truly, California defense dollars go national.

The six reporting California defense contractors listed $1,608,646,403 in dollars expended in 49 States and the District of Columbia to suppliers and vendors of articles, materials, and services.

Principal States receiving the impact of the California national procurement effort are:

| | Percent of total | California dollars |
|---|---|---|
| New York | 7.976 | $128,310,653 |
| Connecticut | 6.679 | 107,441,173 |
| New Jersey | 5.555 | 89,301,969 |
| Ohio | 5.252 | 84,492,287 |
| Massachusetts | 3.476 | 55,919,997 |
| Illinois | 2.775 | 44,645,064 |
| Pennsylvania | 2.627 | 42,263,470 |

In reporting for this study the companies that reported small business data revealed 37 percent of California procurement dollars to small business; 63 percent of California procurement dollars to large business. By comparison, only 17.7 percent was the national average to small business for fiscal 1962.

The accompanying table shows a percentage breakdown by State of the total procurements reported expended in each State. Truly, California defense dollars go national.

*California defense dollars go national—50-State breakdown*

| | California dollars | Percent of total [1] |
|---|---|---|
| Alabama | $1,344,433 | 0.0835 |
| Alaska | | |
| Arizona | 23,716,037 | 1.4743 |
| Arkansas | 395,811 | .0246 |
| California | 797,918,465 | 49.6018 |
| Colorado | 3,962,904 | .2463 |
| Connecticut | 107,441,173 | 6.6789 |
| Delaware | 1,496,125 | .0929 |
| District of Columbia | 1,305,904 | .0811 |
| Florida | 4,967,319 | .3087 |
| Georgia | 551,727 | .0343 |
| Hawaii | 3,517 | .0002 |
| Idaho | 604,963 | .0376 |
| Illinois | 44,645,064 | 2.7753 |
| Indiana | 19,648,982 | 1.2214 |
| Iowa | 17,970,482 | 1.1170 |
| Kansas | 211,286 | .0131 |
| Kentucky | 809,603 | .0503 |
| Louisiana | 108,463 | .0067 |
| Maine | 226,251 | .0140 |
| Maryland | 14,535,760 | .9036 |
| Massachusetts | 55,919,997 | 3.4762 |
| Michigan | 20,097,718 | 1.2493 |
| Minnesota | 26,262,741 | 1.6326 |
| Mississippi | 431,108 | .0267 |
| Missouri | 6,978,319 | .4337 |
| Montana | 8,715 | .0005 |
| Nebraska | 1,336,837 | .0831 |
| Nevada | 754,349 | .0468 |
| New Hampshire | 1,848,212 | .1148 |
| New Jersey | 89,301,969 | 5.5513 |
| New Mexico | 61,613 | .0038 |
| New York | 128,310,653 | 7.9762 |
| North Carolina | 1,659,208 | .1031 |
| North Dakota | 13 | |
| Ohio | 84,492,287 | 5.2523 |
| Oklahoma | 3,113,109 | .1935 |
| Oregon | 6,161,125 | .3829 |
| Pennsylvania | 42,263,470 | 2.6272 |
| Rhode Island | 1,318,214 | .0819 |
| South Carolina | 1,004,239 | .0624 |
| South Dakota | 7,820 | .0004 |
| Tennessee | 3,158,943 | .1960 |
| Texas | 41,356,271 | 2.5708 |
| Utah | 496,782 | .0308 |
| Vermont | 2,208,153 | .1372 |
| Virginia | 21,325,616 | 1.3257 |
| Washington | 8,919,560 | .5545 |
| West Virginia | 1,654,813 | .1028 |
| Wisconsin | 16,270,490 | 1.0114 |
| Wyoming | 58,900 | .0036 |
| Total | 1,608,646,403 | |

[1] Will not total 100 percent because of rounding.

## Statement in Support of the Establishment of Federal Mutual Savings Banks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 21, 1963*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 9 I introduced a bill (H.R. 258) to authorize the establishment of Federal mutual savings banks. During the past few Congresses I have been joined by several of my distinguished colleagues on the Committee on Banking and Currency in introducing similar legislation. In the past these bills have been introduced for the purpose of allowing study of their provisions. This year the bill is being introduced for consideration and, hopefully, early action.

The basic idea of the proposed legislation is to authorize the granting of Federal charters to mutual savings banks. At present this fine thrift system operates solely under charters granted by 18 of our States. It is most appropriate that this legislation be considered during the current year that marks the centennial of the establishment of the dual banking system for commercial banks. Savings and loan associations also have the opportunity to obtain either Federal or State charters. So do credit unions. The passage of this legislation would bring the mutual savings banking industry with its $45 billion of assets into the fold of dual banking.

Mutual savings banks have a long and honored history of stability in this country. The first such banks in the United States were established in the early 1800's in Philadelphia and Boston. They provided a useful facility to encourage people of moderate means to open and maintain savings accounts. Their savings in turn have been invested by the bank in useful community projects in order to earn income adequate to pay an attractive rate of interest return to the savers.

I shall not at this time go into detail but it is a matter of interest that where mutual savings banks exist, the per capita rate of savings has been higher than in places that lack mutual savings bank facilities. It is also interesting to note that in the areas where mutual savings banks are located, the interest rates charged for lending money on home mortgages and other investments are among the lowest in the Nation. Mutual savings banks exist today in 18 States and one possession. Yet their benefits extend far beyond the borders of the States in which they are located because they invest in out-of-State mortgages and other obligations. The passage of the proposed legislation will enable all sections of the country to enjoy to a fuller extent the many benefits that flow from mutual savings bank operations.

Previous bills on this subject matter have received favorable comment from the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans' Administration. The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in the past has stated that the proposal deserves careful consideration. The Commission on Money and Credit, a private group of financial experts, has also recommended that Federal charters be authorized for mutual savings banks. It is understood that this position is also being adopted by the Committee on Financial Institutions, a Presidential group appointed to study the recommendations of the Commission on Money and Credit. The National Association of Home Builders, an organization with understandable interest in the increase of home construction, has added its endorsement to the proposed legislation.

The study of this proposal is also underway in several Federal agencies in addition to those named above. Their reports on the legislation may be expected to be received at an appropriate time. Many leaders in the savings and loan industry have expressed their support of the proposal to grant Federal charters to mutual savings banks. Last session, immediately following instruction of the bill, leading savings and loan executives commented favorably on the bill. I would like at this point to reinsert those remarks in the RECORD.

In the Midwest, Mr. A. D. Theobald, president of the First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Peoria, Ill., made the following observations on October 3:

> For the past year or so, several other savings and loan industry representatives and I have had an opportunity to work closely with mutual savings banking leaders in the preparation of proposed legislation to authorize the establishment of Federal mutual savings banks. Many of the ideas suggested by savings and loan leaders, arising from their intimate experience with the field of thrift and home financing, have found expression in the Federal mutual savings bank bill being introduced in both Houses of Congress today. I believe that upon careful study, others in the savings and loan industry will find this proposed law to be of interest to them as well as advancing the public interest. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues in the savings and loan industry.

In the South, Mr. Wallace O. DuVall, president of the Atlanta Federal Savings & Loan Association of Atlanta, Ga., stated:

> I am pleased to note that a revised Federal mutual savings bank bill has been introduced in Congress. As one always interested in making the thrift institution I serve more useful to the community, I have watched closely the development of the plan for Federal charters for mutual savings banks, because of the opportunity it offers for increased service for mutual thrift institutions. Many savings and loan leaders have outlined suggestions for building an extremely strong institutional system for savings through the combined patronage of savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks. These ideas have been incorporated in the bill introduced today. It is my hope that serious study will be given to this proposal.

In the New England area, Mr. James E. Bent, president of the Hartford Federal Savings & Loan Association in Hartford, Conn., and former president of the National League of Insured Savings Associations, recalled that in 1960 he had encouraged then Senator Prescott Bush, Republican of Connecticut, to support legislation authorizing Federal charters for mutual savings banks. Said Mr. Bent:

> I am happy to see a revised version of a Federal mutual savings bank bill introduced at this time. The savings and loan industry will now have an opportunity to study the proposed legislation before it is reintroduced with the prospect of early Congressional hearings in 1963.

From the far south, Mr. Oscar R. Kreutz, chairman of the board and president of the First Federal Savings & Loan Association of St. Petersburg, Fla., and past president of the National League of Insured Savings Associations, and chair-

man of its legislative committee, asserted that the new Federal mutual savings bank bill offers a fine opportunity to those interested in the mutual thrift industry to give some deep thought to the future of that industry. Mr. Kreutz said:

This new bill contains many ideas combining the best features of the savings and loan and mutual savings bank industries. It should serve as an excellent vehicle to prompt thrift and home finance leaders to consider the best means of developing mutual thrift institutions in a way that will best serve their communities.

I would also like to insert at this point recent speeches on this subject delivered by Mr. A. D. Theobald, president of the First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Peoria, Ill., and Mr. Morris D. Crawford, Jr., president, the Bowery Savings Bank, New York, N.Y.:

PARTNERS IN PROGRESS

(Address by A. D. Theobald, president, First Federal Savings & Loan Association, Peoria, Ill., at the 16th midyear meeting, National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, December 4, 1962, New York City)

BUSINESSMAN, AUTHOR, TEACHER, SCHOLAR

Excerpts from the introduction of Mr. Theobald by John W. Kress, president, National Association of Mutual Savings Banks: "Our guest speaker is a businessman, author, teacher and scholar—a combination hard to beat. He holds degrees from the University of Akron and from Northwestern University. He has taught economics and real estate financing for more than three decades. He is the author of basic textbooks on the savings and loan and the real estate industries. For 8 years he was director of education and research for the American Savings & Loan Institute. From 1935 to 1946 he was on the executive staff of the United States Savings & Loan League—first as assistant vice president and later as vice president. In 1934 he put his academic theories into practice by becoming vice president of the First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Chicago. In 1946 he became president of the First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Peoria, Ill.[1] He is presently a member of the legislative committee of the United States Savings & Loan League and he serves on the task force of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. Also, he has worked with representatives of both savings and loan and our savings bank industry to develop a sound legislative basis for a united and nationwide thrift system."

I want to visit with you about some things that are close to my heart, and which I think maybe are close to your hearts.

I'd like for a moment to stroke my long gray beard and take a throwback some 31 years to the summer of 1931, and my first contact—actually the first time I was really conscious of the fact that there was such a thing as a mutual savings bank.

In July of that year, I had been hired to work for the American Savings and Loan Institute—actually for the United States Savings & Loan League. I went to work for them because I had to eat. Nineteen hundred and thirty-one, the year in which I had been awarded a master's degree, was not an easy time to get a job. My intention then was to work only during the summer and continue work on a Ph. D. that fall and eventually wind up teaching at the collegiate level.

Well, that was changed in about 2 months for two reasons: One of them, I found the work fascinating; the other was, I got married, and continuing to hold a regular salaried job became of real importance.

In August of that year, the United States Savings & Loan League convention was held in Philadelphia. Several things stand out in connection with that convention. One of them was that the secretary treasurer of the league, who kept whatever statistics there were, was able to announce that in the year 1930 (and the figures were just out in the summer of 1931), the total assets of the savings and loan business had increased. And the second one, pertinent to the savings bank business, was that in the year 1930 the total assets of the savings and loan business had for the first time passed the total assets of the mutual savings bank business.

Well, I was on the staff of the national organization, and we corrected that whole situation real quickly. The total assets of the savings and loan business decreased for approximately 8 years until they got down to something under $6 billion. They stayed under the total assets of the mutual savings bank business for some 15 years beyond that period.

The next occasion that I had to look at the mutual savings bank business was in 1934. John Kress has referred to the fact that I became vice president of the First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Chicago in that year. That was a newly chartered Federal savings and loan association, organized primarily by Morton Bodfish, the executive vice president of the United States Savings & Loan League. I recall that in rounding up a group of outstanding citizens in Chicago to be directors of that association, he received a letter from one gentleman whose name many of you, I'm sure, would recall, asking what are the prospects for this sort of operation—savings and loan association—in Chicago. Morton asked me to prepare a reply for him. I prepared a rather long reply, and I said it seemed to me very probable that the total assets of that institution would in our lifetime pass a hundred million dollars.

SAVINGS BANK BASIS FOR FORECAST

The reasoning I applied to it was first the record of the mutual savings banks in the major mutual savings banking cities. That record suggested that this type of institution could have that sort of performance. So also did the record of the building societies in Great Britain, where they had long been substantial organizations.

I know Morton didn't believe that, but he was busy, and he didn't have time to argue with me—and he sent the letter out. It wasn't a very good guess because although I expect to have a further lifetime, the assets of the First Federal of Chicago are now around $400 million.

I bring this out because in 1933 it seemed to me that there was such a close relationship between the operation of mutual savings banks and mutual savings and loan associations that the performance of one could well be a pattern for the performance of the other.

TWO PERIODS COMPARED

I'd like to take you back to 1931–34 for reasons other than my own personal recollection of them. It seems to me that the period that we are now in, the period, let's say, of 1962 through 1964, in many, many ways resembles that crisis period in the middle part of the depression. That was a period of flux, crisis, danger, change—but the thing to emphasize is that it was also a period of opportunity; a period of opportunity missed in some cases, seized and taken advantage of in others. To a very substantial extent, the question of whether or not opportunity in the changing world of the financial systems of that time was seized or missed rested on the dynamics of trade association leadership.

By trade association leadership, I don't mean just the typical service that we all expect from a trade association, but the leadership which is inherent in the staff of the association itself: developing ideas, concepts, programs—and carrying them through. There are dynamics to that sort of leadership which I see at the present time and which seem to me very significant.

Let's start first with the Federal Home Loan Bank System, which grew out of the President's Conference on Home Ownership called by President Hoover in October of 1931.

As nearly as I can recall, the savings bank industry took very little part in the legislative struggle which took place with regard to the Federal home loan bank system. Among other things, mutual savings banks were integral parts of the American Bankers Association; the ABA opposed the Federal home loan bank idea. The bankers were not too popular, and they were not very effective. The most effective opposition came from the insurance companies using the Mortgage Bankers Association as their particular vehicle.

The push that carried it forward in the private industry field was the United States Savings and Loan League. Now I want to point out to you something that very few people know, because there are not too many of us left who had an active part at that time: at this same United States League convention in Philadelphia in the fall of 1931, a committee report which had been the result of a good many years' study, advocating a Federal home loan bank system of some kind, and advocating a system of Federal savings and loan associations, was rejected by the convention membership by a rather substantial majority. The savings and loan business was not, in itself, pushing for a Federal home loan bank system. But within 6 months, the development of a Federal home loan bank system was a principal activity of its trade association.

SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE STRATEGY

Let's carry on for 1 more year, the year in which the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corp. was created. At the executive committee, which was the broad policy group of our national trade association, the leadership of the organization never permitted a vote on the question of whether we should or should not have a system of insurance of accounts for savings and loan associations. The discussion was pointed entirely toward the question of what, if we had to have one, the nature of the system would be. After all, the FDIC already had been enacted. The question discussed was what would be the nature of the savings account insurance corporation that might be set up.

Mutual savings banks, of course, had little interest in the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. So far as they felt that insurance of accounts was useful, they found it through the FDIC, and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation became entirely a savings and loan vehicle.

One year later there came the opportunity to develop a Federal system of savings and loan associations. By this time, while there was some real difference of opinion as to the advisability, that difference of opinion was not so effective as to be found in any official position. The development of a system of Federal savings and loan associations was definitely a part of the program of the United States Savings and Loan League.

Now, How many of you know what follows? It was not widely discussed anywhere in the industry. The home mortgage system of the country was prostrate. It became a matter of administration direction to the Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board that something should be done about it; some vehicle should be created to revive the home

[1] First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Peoria, Ill., has assets of $93,006,332.

mortgage market throughout the country. The mutual savings bank industry was first approached to see whether it would be interested and would sponsor the development of a system of Federal mutual savings and mortgage institutions.

SAVINGS BANKS MISSED OPPORTUNITY

They were not interested. Then the savings and loan associations had their opportunity. Up to that time, the idea of a dual system in financial systems was, of course, confined to the commercial banking system. We now had a dual system of financial institutions in the savings and loan field also.

Here I think that some of the things that a dual system—and I emphasize first the Federal part of it because it was the new part—did for our business.

Let me say that, prior to that time, operating under different laws in 48 States, it was hard to say that there was a system of savings and loan associations. There was terrific diversity in name, in practice—in almost anything that you could use to describe a savings and loan association.

The federal system gave us an opportunity to develop common terminology, to borrow from the practices and the laws of the most advanced States—and for the first time in a way that would not have been possible in any other way—to develop a modern savings and loan association; at least modern in its time.

It brought compulsory insurance of accounts to those institutions that chose to and could operate under Federal charter, and insurance of accounts was vital to the restoration of confidence in our business. It brought full time operation of thrift institutions to many States where part time operation had been characteristic before.

And I think it brought the full advantage of the dual charter system to all savings and loan associations throughout the country. From that time on there wasn't exactly competition between them, the State-chartered system and the Federal-chartered system, but there was constant progress, first on the one side and then on the other. In some States a modernizing factor would be followed by the Federals, then followed by other States—all the very real advantages, including continual modern community service, that the dual system is supposed to bring.

POSTWAR GROWTH OF INDUSTRY

Since the war, all financial institutions have grown fantastically. Commercial banks have grown, dollar-wise, more than any other type of financial institution. But by, I suppose, 1955, the end of that period of growth, insofar as it came from the commercial or demand deposit side of the business, was in sight. After all, the growth of a demand deposit, money-creating system is limited by the monetary needs of the country, and we had had an adequate development of the strictly commercial banking, money-creating side of our financial system.

Insurance companies grew. Mutual savings banks grew, and very substantially. I'm willing to bet that few of you 15 years ago could have forecast within even a reasonable percentage the amount of your growth during the past 15 years. Savings and loan associations grew, and they grew much more rapidly than did the mutual savings banks.

Part of this faster growth was due to the fact that they were operating all over the United States, in a much broader field. Sometimes we like to attribute at least a part of that growth to the fact that we felt that we had pretty vigorous, aggressive management. But basically, it seems to me that the savings and loan associations grew because they were fulfilling a fundamental national need.

The tremendous increase in home building and home ownership after the war necessitated the development of vast amounts of capital. I don't think anyone foresaw how much, immediately after the war. The institutions that were set up and specialized in that field had to grow, and if they hadn't, some other type of setup to do the same sort of job would have had to be created.

We have a busy time, and I really didn't have much time to pay attention to the mutual savings bank business until about 3 years ago. I think my attitude toward your great industry at that time would have been fairly typical of that of a great many savings and loan managers. It was something like this: I didn't even realize that John deLaittre had a big mutual savings bank in Minneapolis. I was barely conscious that there was a substantial mutual savings bank in Cleveland. But basically I thought the nearest mutual savings bank to my city of Peoria was 500 miles to the east and 2,000 miles to the west, and that was a real good place for them.

THRIFT INDUSTRIES BEGIN TO CONVERGE

As I did think of them and began to see how closely our two types of institutions were growing together, I still liked our emphasis on purpose, mainly of home financing, as contrasted to what I conceived to be your emphasis on purpose, mainly the development of thrift. And I concluded rationally, whether correctly or not, that our emphasis on purpose in home financing was more likely to survive than an emphasis on the development of thrift because there were so many places where people could save money, and there were not so many places that really specialized in this growing demand for home financing.

For some reason, however, about that time—3 or 4 years ago—I subscribed to your national publication and started reading it. One of the first articles that I read, and it is still very much in my mind, was an analysis by a student of your field of the extent to which a mutual savings bank could take advantage of membership in the Federal Home Loan Bank system and could take advantage of the advance powers—the securing of money and the repayment of that money—from and to Federal home loan banks. The thing that impressed me was, that was exactly what the First Federal of Peoria had been doing for more than 10 years.

If that sort of financial policy seemed reasonable to a student in your business, it seemed to me that mutual savings banks might be much more like what I was doing than I had previously supposed.

TAX FIGHT UNITES THRIFT INDUSTRIES

About that time some disturbing elements started entering into all of our pictures. Mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations became very conscious of the fact that we had a real common enemy—an enemy which, using the taxing power of the Federal Government, had set out to, if not destroy us, certainly to clip our wings. I felt then, and I feel now, that the tax fight which was concluded this year was never an end in itself, at least in the minds of a great many of the people in the commercial banking business, but rather a means to a more basic objective. It became apparent that you and I had a lot of things in common if we were going to see anything like a reasonably satisfactory settlement of that issue.

Another disturbing fact was that it became apparent that there were some pretty slippery customers in the savings and loan business and that more and more we were receiving publicity of a type which was certainly not desirable from the point of view of a good many of us.

With that background, about 3 years ago, I happened to be one of the rather small group of savings and loan managers on whom this idea of a Federal charter for mutual savings banks was tried out. I'll be frank to say my first reaction was a very hostile one.

However, I was exposed to about as effective a group of salesmen as I have ever encountered anywhere. You will agree when I identify them. Those salesmen were Rusty Crawford, John deLaittre, and Grover Ensley. They were so effective that they made me and some other savings and loan managers examine this whole question carefully, as much as possible away from our original prejudice. We learned some things.

We learned, for example, that there were substantial degrees of difference in the operations and concepts of some mutual savings banks, that they were not nearly identical in concept and type of organization. We knew that that was true of the savings and loan business—that there were real differences in the point of view and the operation of the different savings and loans.

DIFFERENCES IN INSTITUTIONS

We learned that there are some savings and loan associations more like some mutual savings banks than they are like some other savings and loan associations, and that the same thing was true on the mutual savings bank side of the picture. This ran through a great many things, including your relations with your depositors or our members; your concept of trusteeship as related to what many of us feel is the fiduciary relationship of the directors and management of a savings and loan association. I became convinced that I could operate First Federal of Peoria under the mutual savings bank charter of a good many States and not really tell very much difference, and that a good many of your managers could operate their institutions under a Federal savings and loan charter and not really tell a lot of difference; and that both of us could operate under a Federal mutual savings bank charter, as it is conceived in the law now introduced, and not tell very much difference in day-to-day operations—that the only real difference on both sides would be a wider concept of services.

So it seems to me that, as in 1931, we have in 1962 an opportunity, a great opportunity for modernization, for renewed development, for redirection in expanded service under the Federal savings bank law as we in the savings and loan business had under the Federal savings and loan law 31 years ago.

OPPORTUNITY FOR PARTNERSHIP

It isn't often that we get an opportunity as I have had in one generation to have two chances like that. I believe that the mutual savings bank business and at least a substantial portion of the savings and loan business does have a situation in which it can and should be partners in progress, and that we also run the risk of being partners in liquidation.

There are some great forces operating in the financial systems of our country which affect that conclusion, which I'll grant is a personal one on my part. Rusty Crawford mentioned some of them. But some others occur to me.

One of them is the emphasis on national economic growth. That is not a partisan matter. It is not confined to either Republicans or Democrats. A great many people in this country—I suppose all—feel that it would be desirable if the rate of economic development in this country were more rapid. We are distressed by unemployment. We are distressed by the fact that we are not making maximum use of our economic resources.

We are convinced that there are going to continue to be efforts to do something about that, and that they will be primarily Federal efforts. To a major extent, Federal vehicles will be used to implement them.

We are confronted with great national flows of capital, and changing demands in these flows of capital. The commercial banks can adjust to those changes much more easily, much more rapidly than can we, and it seems to me important that we do what we can to be a part of those adjustments.

We are involved in the economic forces inherent in the vast movements of people on a regional basis and into urban and suburban areas within regions. They create capital demands far beyond what we have ever experienced before. This requires constant adjustment on the part of the institutions that are to serve them.

Again I return to the dynamics of trade association activity. We are confronted—and possibly the nation is assisted—by the dynamics of the American Bankers Association. That organization is a vastly different one than it was 8 or 10 years ago. You know that it is a tremendously more dynamic one represented by dynamic personalities and dynamic programs.

INFLUENCE OF THE COMPTROLLER

We see the Comptroller of the Currency taking an active part in the program for the development of the commercial banking system, more active, it seems to me, than any other supervisory authority that I have yet seen, and active in the development of the national banking system.

The Saxon report can develop a great many differences of opinion, but it's going to be referred to, and it's going to have influence. The Committee for Economic Development and its Monetary Commission have recognized the fact of change and have made recommendations as to very basic changes. Those we cannot ignore.

In connection with these changes, where they affect our system, where they affect the commercial banking system, we have a responsibility to present our concept of the public interest and to present it as effectively as we possibly can.

We see changing attitudes with regard to the merger of financial institutions. We see changing attitudes with regard to branch policies. There is no part of the financial system at which you can look without being conscious that we are being swept along by some real fundamental changes in thinking.

The question is: Will we see these changes as an opportunity, or will we be swept along blindly by them? Will we help direct them?

Part of this picture, it seems to me, lies in the nature of the commercial banking system. My opinion is that the commercial banking system is a deadly enemy of the thrift institutions, although only in part as the result of a conscious purpose of some individuals. Of course, it's perfectly obvious that some individuals in the commercial banking business seek the elimination of your type of institution and of my type of institution.

COMMERCIAL BANK HISTORY CITED

But beyond that, it is the nature of the commercial banking business to engulf and submerge and eventually get rid of other types of institutions in the fields of activity in which that system takes an important interest. May I remind you that trust companies, beginning in the 1870's, were very important as independent types of institutions; that the national banks were not permitted to have trust departments until as recently as 1913; that very few State banks were permitted to have trust departments until after that time.

Since the enactment of that legislation in 1913, the independent trust business is no longer of any significance; it is a part of the commercial banking system.

Industrial banks, designed specifically for true consumer financing, began to be significant around 1911. Commercial banks were uninterested in the field. Subsequently they became interested and the independent industrial bank is almost gone. The possibilities of very much the same sort of development are inherent in our type of institutions emphasizing thrift and home financing.

This whole situation creates a great mutual interest between your industry and mine. We must find some more effective means of working together to take advantage of opportunities on the one hand and to protect the mutual thrift and home financing idea to which we are all dedicated on the other hand.

We can work together. The tax fight indicated that we can and that we have worked together effectively. However, it seemed to me that on a number of occasions during the past 2 years, it was really a nip-and-tuck proposition as to whether we could keep that unity of interest. To a very great extent the fact that we were able to maintain it rested on the broad and compatible personalities of a rather limited number of people on the staffs of our two great national organizations.

I hope that that will continue. But it does seem to me that it is something on which we should not wholly rely. We must be thinking of how we can make more certain that, in the great fields in which we do have completely mutual interests, we will have a vehicle—some type of organization for working together.

LOCAL COOPERATION IMPORTANT

That question goes to other levels; it goes to the State level and it goes to the city level where there are both of our types of institutions operating together. As an old pro in the trade association field, I know that at that level the problems of working together are more difficult. You are really close to the individual, competitive problem. But I submit to you what I think is the case, that in a given city or a given State, the competition between mutual savings banks on the one hand is more vigorous than their competition with savings and loan associations, and that the competition between savings and loan associations—between themselves—is more vigorous, frequently more personal, than is the competition between the mutual savings banks and the savings and loan associations.

We find ways of having competitive institutions work together for common purposes under the same type of charter in our city and State organizations. I wonder if we can't be giving some thought to a more effective way of having those under different if similar charters work together at city, State, and National levels. Convinced as I am of the importance of dynamic trade association leadership, it seems imperative that we start evolving some way of doing that.

The last thing I'd like to visit with you about is the importance of membership in the Federal Home Loan Bank System. Not very many mutual savings banks belong. I can tell you that for every reason that mutual savings banks have for not joining the system, many savings and loan associations have had exactly the same reasons. However, over a period of time economic forces have brought membership in the Federal Home Loan Bank System almost universally, so far as savings and loan associations are concerned. I think that this might very well be true so far as mutual savings banks go.

BANKS STAKE IN FHLB SYSTEM MEMBERSHIP

It has been suggested that you join the system to show how interested you are in the Federal charter idea. I think that's important. But I'd like to submit that there are other reasons, maybe more important, that go to the heart of the welfare of your bank and of its depositors; that go really to the immediate interests of your institutions.

All of you, like all of us in the savings and loan business, have a responsibility of providing liquidity to take care of the needs and maybe merely the willful demands of our depositors or savings account holders. All of us have, as a part of our liquidity policies, some assets which could be earning at a higher rate, except that we have to make provision for this unknown emergency.

Membership in the Federal home loan bank is not going to take that responsibility from you, but I think it can help your planning, and therefore the administration of your portfolio assets, if you do have this access to emergency liquidity. Certainly pooled access to the capital markets in an emergency is likely to be much more effective than that of the individual institution.

You, like us, have seasonal flows of money. You, like us, have times when the savings are coming in more rapidly just for seasonal reasons than the outward flow of funds in connection with your lending and investment opportunities. We, in the savings and loan business, have learned to use the Federal Home Loan Bank System to make adjustments to those facts.

You, like us, have cyclical flows. Your net inflow of deposits or savings is relatively low at a period of high mortgage and other loan demands; you must necessarily restrict the amount that you can put into earning assets at a higher earning rate than you will find at any other phase of the cycle because that's the period in which relatively your savings are down. Like us, you've witnessed the other part of that picture. When your mortgage demand and other loan demands are relatively down, and rates are relatively low, you have the most money to invest.

And you can't very well adjust it through the security portfolio because in the period when you need the money your bond accounts are selling at the lowest figures and at the period when you don't need the money, when you are investing, they are at the highest figures. That is an automatic loss situation.

This is the sort of analysis which I encountered in one of your publications some years ago. It points to the way in which we at First Federal Savings of Peoria have been using the Home Loan Bank system for a long time. It helped us to have a more productive policy in connection with our entire investment, mortgage, and security portfolios.

Membership in the bank system would make you somewhat less dependent on the commercial banking system, and I think that generally is desirable.

BROAD APPEAL OF FEDERAL CHARTERS

Now, may I refer for a moment to the Federal charter idea. I don't know whether I have indicated strongly enough my belief that this idea is vital to the development of your business. I think it is vital to the continued development of the mutual thrift idea—either savings and loan or savings banks.

I think it is a vehicle which many of you could use. I think it is a vehicle which many savings and loan associations could use. The strength of my convictions goes to this: If the Federal charter law is adopted in approximately its present form, the First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Peoria will convert to a Federal mutual savings bank charter. That is not merely the irresponsible opinion of its president. It is the considered judgment of its board of directors, who have been kept rather constantly informed of the developments in this area; and it seems to me the benefits to the whole central Illinois area, to our members, as we call them now, our depositors as we would call them then, are so obvious that there would be no question about our members concurring in that decision should the opportunity come.

Maybe there has been some reason why the president of a little savings and loan

association in the Midwest should visit with you. I know that my contact and experience with your business has been a most enlightening one to me. It has, I think, made me a better president of a savings and loan association, and—if, as the result of this conversation, I never see you again—it's been nice knowing you.

---

FEDERAL CHARTERS NOW

(Address by Morris D. Crawford, Jr., president, the Bowery Savings Bank, New York City, at the 16th midyear meeting, National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, December 4, 1962, New York City)

MORRIS D. CRAWFORD, JR.

(Mr. Crawford, who is now in his 4th year as chairman of the committee on Federal legislation of NAMSB, has been in the forefront of activity on behalf of Federal charters for mutual savings banks since the current legislative effort got underway in the summer of 1958. He serves on the Federal Home Loan Bank Board Task Force, composed of both savings and loan and savings bank leaders, and he has worked with representatives of both industries to develop a sound legislative basis for a united nationwide thrift system.)

On October 2 and 3, a Federal mutual savings bank bill was introduced in the Congress for the third successive year. I am delighted at these tangible results of our long years of effort. In previous years, we have proceeded deliberately. Our approach has been one of caution, of probing. We wanted to test the reactions of Government agencies and of the other financial industries and associations; we were always mindful of the demands of the tax struggle; we wanted to provide time for the study of this legislation; we wanted to gather our allies; and we wanted to identify our opponents.

This process, I am happy to announce, has now been largely completed. The opinions of all interested groups have been sought. Based on the results obtained, the board of directors of the association believes that we are ready to present our case to the Congress. This belief is shared by the congressional sponsors of this legislation. They have counseled us that the legislative climate is favorable and that if we are serious and determined in our purpose—the time to proceed is now.

But even absent this generous counseling—we have only to consult the evidence of our own senses. No banker today needs a seismograph to detect the rumblings of change in the entire banking industry. The commercial banking industry is making its massive presence felt in the savings and mortgage markets. The savings and loan industry, faced with this new competitive pressure, is chafing at its narrow statutory bonds. The Comptroller of the Currency and the State supervisors are confronting one another in a controversy the results of which may change the entire profile of American banking.

Gentlemen, the winds of change have blown through banking once before in our time—the early 1930's—and while they raged, the savings bank industry rode out the gale at anchor, moored in the good ship "Status Quo." That ship is now as obsolete as the *Bounty*. We cannot afford to remain immobile this time. We can and must become part of the reorganization and modernization of the Nation's financial system through achieving our goal of Federal chartering.

In our efforts we will find that we are not alone. The Commission on Money and Credit, established to review the Nation's monetary and credit structure, has completed its studies. Its position on Federal charters is one of unequivocal support. In his 1962 economic report to the Congress, the President characterized the findings and recommendations of the Commission on Money and Credit as deserving of careful consideration by the Congress, the Executive, and the public. It is important to note that the President has established a Committee on Financial Institutions composed of 11 key members of the administration to consider changes in Federal policy that will promote stability, growth, and efficiency of private financial institutions. The Federal chartering of mutual savings banks is included in the agenda of this committee. It is hoped that the committee will favor Federal chartering of mutual savings banks when it submits its recommendations to the President shortly.[1]

FEDERAL AGENCY SUPPORT

The Veterans' Administration and the Housing and Home Finance Agency are also in favor of Federal charters for mutual savings banks. During the last year the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, originally opposed to the bill, has now indicated its informal approval. Chairman Joseph P. McMurray of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board has stated that the task force which he appointed to advise him on a wide scope of issues has given its support to the idea of Federal charters for mutual savings banks. The Federal Reserve Board has agreed that the idea merits careful study.

We have received the support of that great American trade group, the National Association of Home Builders.

The findings of a study by an academic team at the University of Chicago strongly support the economic advantages of extending mutual savings banking beyond its present confines.

The National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, which has repeatedly emphasized its support of dual banking, will maintain, we would trust, a neutral position on this national issue.

Perhaps the most heartening development of the last 2 years has been the work of the savings and loan and savings bank exchange groups—unofficial committees composed of savings bankers and savings and loan executives. This group has worked hard and long, and in an atmosphere of growing understanding and alliance, to perfect a Federal mutual savings bank bill which would combine the best features of both our industries. I would like you to know that the Federal mutual savings bank bill now before the Congress represents invaluable contributions from our savings and loan friends. These men, although not official representatives of the savings and loan trade associations, are important figures in their industry, and they are men committed to the goal of a new, united thrift system through Federal mutual savings banks.

At this gathering of savings bankers, I do not believe that I need review at any length the merits of this legislation for our own industry and its depositors—the increased growth it offers, the greater access to national forums through which we may hope at last to be able to aid in determining the outlines of our future, the potential ability a Federal charter bill will give us to respond to oppressive supervisory practices and the enjoyment of 20th-century powers for 20th-century institutions.

WHY FEDERAL CHARTERS

To persons other than savings bankers, however, I would also urge the suport of this bill on the following grounds:

First. A system of Federal mutual savings banks would result in an increased and evenly distributed flow of savings, savings which will become the ultimate source of that capital expansion so necessary to meet the demands of our country and the competitive challenge of the Common Market.

Second. The increased availability of mortgage and other long-term credit with a consequent reduction in costs of borrowing and in regional mortgage yield spreads.

Third. The ending of restricted entry into financial markets for savings banks, which has led to insufficient savings facilities, inefficient allocation of resources, and limited credit availability.

Fourth. The introduction of new equality of competitive opportunity leading to progress for all competing financial institutions. Mutual savings banks may not be organized in 32 of our States. Recent efforts to have the merits of savings bank legislation considered in these States have been frustrated by short-sighted competitors at the expense of the public welfare. It is clear that extension can best be achieved through Federal charter legislation.

Fifth. The modernization of investment powers for other savings institutions. The savings and loan industry, over the past 30 years, has developed mature, progressive institutions quite capable of investment powers beyond the archaic confines they now must endure. The Federal mutual savings bank bill provides for the optional conversion of such institutions into Federal mutual savings banks—into banks capable of performing brilliantly their traditional role in home financing and at the same time enjoying the flexibility to provide capital to many new areas of the investment spectrum.

These reasons are at the heart of our Federal charter program. We believe in them and we are prepared to go before the Congress and defend them—now.

CENTENNIAL OF DUAL BANKING

No talk on banking would be complete without the mention of the centennial of dual banking: In 1963, the Nation's financial industry is honoring the 100th anniversary of dual banking, that extension to banking of the Federal concept of government found in our Constitution. Dual banking provides for a system under which banks may operate under the authority of either the State or Federal Government.

Dr. Charles E. Walker, executive vice president of the American Bankers Association, has stated this analogy between our system of government and our system of banking as follows:

"Indeed, there is in my mind a close if not inseparable relationship between the dual banking system and the concepts underlying the division of powers and responsibility between our States and the Federal Government."

Expanding on the constitutional analogy, and on the system of checks and balances so basic to this Government, Mr. Robert Myers, Jr., secretary of banking for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, has stated:

"The dual banking system is the unique feature of American banking. It comprehends two separate and distinct systems of banks, one chartered, regulated and supervised by the States, and the other chartered, regulated, and supervised under Federal law. It is the product and result of the American plan for the division of governmental responsibilities and powers between the States and the National Government. It is in harmony with American ideals and our traditional concept of government."

It is not often so easy to find such unanimity. And that is fortunate for us, for we have always wholeheartedly subscribed to dual banking, and we demonstrate this continually by our efforts to expand mutual savings banking on a State as well as a National level. This industry joined with the State of Alaska in bringing mutual savings banking to that great area. Our committee on extension con-

---

[1] On December 14, the American Banker reported approval of Federal charters in the staff report of the committee.

tinues to give its entire effort to spreading further our State system.

WHY NOT US?

In our support of dual banking and its benefits, we have often wondered: "Why not us?" Every other form of banking and savings institution enjoys dual chartering. There are National and State commercial banks, there are Federal and State savings and loans, there are Federal and State credit unions. Existing side by side, both systems have continued to flourish and to contribute to one another's progress. Mutual savings banking, alone, though it represents more than $40 billion of the deposits of Americans, does not enjoy membership in the dual banking system. We ask, for the benefit of the country as well as for mutual savings banks and their depositors, that our long exile from dual banking be ended—and that it be ended now.

The sponsors of the Federal mutual savings bank bill, Senator Sparkman, of Alabama; Representative Multer, of New York; Representative Rains, of Alabama, and Senator Bush, of Connecticut, recognize that dual banking presupposes that both the States and the Nation have a vital interest in the strength of American financial institutions. The independence of both necessarily means independent responsibility and so individual conclusions on how best to serve those responsibilities.

Thus, the decision of the States of Alaska, Massachusetts, and New York to regard mutual savings banking as crucial to their banking needs does not dictate that the Federal Government must decide, in its independent appraisal, that Federal mutual savings banks are vital nationally.

By the same token, the decision of other States that mutual savings banks are not needed in their banking structure should not prevent the Federal Government from making a different decision in pursuance of its own responsibilities.

This is the very essence of a dual system. It presupposes two independent judgments as to the best fulfillment of independent responsibilities. Some argue for maintenance at all costs of a delicate balance between State and National banks. They would apparently argue that the goal to be pursued is absolute agreement in the conclusions of 50 States and the Federal Government as to what response to make to banking needs. This kind of search for monolithic uniformity doesn't seem to be in keeping with a dual system concept nor with the basic economic fact that competitive uniformity inhibits progress. The most cogent presentation of this basic fact has come from the Comptroller of the Currency, Mr. James J. Saxon: "The only sense in which the duality of a banking system can be made truly meaningful is to regard the authority of each segment as separate and distinct, and not subordinate one to the other. Far from posing a threat to the duality of our banking system, this separation of power is the only means by which the dual banking system may be sustained. Under any other approach one authority would become predominant, and duality in any practical terms would disappear." And: "It is no threat to a dual banking system, but merely the natural expression of such a system, to allow the Federal and the individual State authority to be separately and independently exercised in full."

CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS

The congressional sponsors of the Federal mutual savings bank bill have said that they will urge hearings on this bill within the next 2 months. We must support them every step of the way in what will be a long and closely contested struggle.

I want to impress on you that what is demanded of us is action now. If our years of urging Federal mutual savings banking have been only an academic exercise, then I submit we have done a disservice to our depositors and to the Nation.

This will be an exacting process for all of us, and, as the proponents, we will have to carry the burden of proof as to the merits of the bill. That proof is now being assembled by the national association's leadership and its research and legal departments. Documents substantiating our claim that economic and other public benefits can be expected to flow from enactment of the Federal mutual savings bank bill are nearing completion. They will be of primary importance at the congressional hearings.

CALL TO ACTION

In the meantime, what can each of us do to advance the day when mutual savings banks will be permitted throughout the Nation? You have already received materials analyzing the present bill and presenting the salient arguments. The national association, in coordination with the nine State associations and with designated board members in the rest of the States, is conducting an action campaign to be certain that every Congressman and every U.S. Senator in every mutual savings bank State is well informed about our industry and its extension objectives via the Federal charter route. The materials which member banks have received furnished the basic guide lines for your communcations with your congressional representation. If you need further assistance, the national association's officers and staff are immediately available to you. We must first achieve the support of Federal legislators in the 18 mutual savings bank States before we can expect anyone else's support.

When you enlist in this campaign, there will be no jobs for generals. All of us will be on the firing line. Each of us must speak to our Congressmen, our State supervisors, our trustees, our depositors, our local civic and business groups. And this campaign must begin immediately. Gentlemen, the time is now.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed legislation presents the possibility of two-way conversions between savings and loan associations and Federal mutual savings banks. Many of the specific provisions in this bill result from suggestions made by savings and loan leaders.

The most recent legislation on this subject was introduced by several of my colleagues and me in October 1962. My bill was H.R. 13318. The present bill contains a few comparatively minor changes from the form of the bill introduced in October 1962. Basically the two bills are alike and, therefore, the study given to H.R. 13318 will produce conclusions valid with reference to the new bill. As an original sponsor of this type of legislation, I recommend it highly to my colleagues. It will represent a major stride forward toward reaching maximum economic growth by providing the country with a major source of capital to finance home purchases, industrial development, and public works.

After a reasonable period of time has been afforded for study of this proposed legislation, it is my hope that the Committee on Banking and Currency will arrange for public hearings to be held later during the present session. I fully expect that these hearings in turn will lead to the enactment of a practical piece of financial legislation that will add a substantial number of thrift facilities to the present dual banking system in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I also include a summary and section-by-section analysis of H.R. 258:

SUMMARY OF FEDERAL MUTUAL SAVINGS BANK ACT (H.R. 258)

The declaration of policy asserts that to increase the savings necessary for capital formation within the dual banking private enterprise system, Federal charters should be authorized for mutual savings banks. Thereby the vitality of State-chartered mutual savings banking will be maintained and strengthened. Home financing and business enterprise in the area where Federal mutual savings banks are located will be encouraged through new sources of long-term credit. Efficiency requires insurance of savings in federally chartered thrift institutions by a single Federal agency.

Title I provides that 5 to 21 members (who may be designated corporators or trustees) may apply to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for a charter. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board will issue a charter upon finding that the savings bank will serve a useful community purpose, have a reasonable expectation of financial success, and will not unduly injure existing savings institutions. Federal mutual savings banks must belong to the Federal Home Loan Bank System and have savings insured by the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation. Members of a Federal mutual savings bank elect the board of directors, or a board of directors may be elected by applicants for a charter in a savings bank without members. Directors manage the savings bank. Statutory restrictions control any self-dealing by directors with the savings bank.

Savings bank borrowing is controlled by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. A savings bank may issue passbooks or other evidence of savings, and provide for bonus accounts.

Investments authorized include among others Federal obligations, municipal obligations, real estate mortgages under specified restrictions, and corporate securities under the prudent man rule. A savings bank may also make consumer loans. It may establish branches to the extent that financial institutions accepting funds from savers on deposit or share accounts enjoy such privilege.

State-chartered mutual savings banks and State or federally chartered savings and loan associations may convert to Federal mutual savings banks and vice versa. Federal- or State-chartered mutual savings banks may merge or consolidate with one another. Among other general powers, a Federal mutual savings bank may exercise in its State of location all powers of a State-chartered mutual savings bank in such State. Savings banks must be examined at least annually. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board has general regulatory authority. Provisions against discriminatory State taxation are set forth. Conservators and receivers may be appointed as provided in the bill.

Title II creates the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation out of the FSLIC and constitutes the Federal Home Loan Bank Board its board of trustees. Insurance premiums are the same as for FSLIC. A State-chartered savings bank insured by FDIC shall take with it a pro rata share of FDIC insurance reserves if it should become a Federal mutual savings bank, and thereafter ceases to be insured by FDIC.

Title III requires an annual report by the supervisory board to the President for transmission to the Congress.

---

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE FEDERAL MUTUAL SAVINGS BANK ACT (H.R. 258)

Section 1. Title: Federal Mutual Savings Bank Act.

Section 2. Declaration of policy: To encourage increased savings to finance new

housing and other capital formation, privately managed, federally supervised mutual savings banks should be authorized to be chartered by a single agency of the Federal Government. Accounts in such savings banks should be insured by a Federal agency. Such savings banks will aid in executing the constitutional duty of the Federal Government to regulate the value of money and will provide a depositary for public money.

TITLE I

Section 101. Definitions: The following terms are defined: "Board," "conventional loan," "doing business," "financial institution," "first mortgage," "first deed of trust," "first lien," "savings bank," "State," "State of domicile," "domicilliary State," and "thrift institution." "Thrift institution" includes Federal- and State-chartered savings and loan associations and like organizations, and Federal- and State-chartered guarantee savings banks. "Financial institution" includes thrift institutions as so defined, commercial banks, trust companies, and insurance companies.

Section 102. Chartering: 5 signers from 21 or more individuals acting as members (usually known as corporators or trustees in the mutual savings bank system) may apply to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for a charter. The Board will issue a charter when it finds the savings bank will serve a useful community purpose, enjoy reasonable expectation of financial success, and in operation will not unduly injure thrift institutions or commercial banks accepting savings deposits. Savings banks so chartered must have the words "Federal," "savings," and "bank" in their titles. Each must become a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank System, and have deposit insurance with the new Federal Savings Insurance Corporation, successor to Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

Section 103. Members: Qualifications for members are prescribed. They serve for staggered terms of 10 years. (They elect directors.)

Section 104. Directors: Qualifications for directors, who manage and control the savings bank, are prescribed. They number from 7 to 25 and hold office for staggered terms of 3 years. Controls over self-dealing by directors with the savings bank are specified.

Section 105. Commencement of operations: Savings banks must qualify as insured banks in FSIC before commencing operations, and must maintain such status to continue operations. Before operating, a cash expense fund satisfactory to the Board must be raised by sale of transferable deferred payment certificates.

Section 106. Reserve fund: Before obtaining a charter, a savings bank must also have in cash an initial reserve fund of at least $50,000, evidenced by transferable deferred payment certificates. The reserve fund can be used only to meet losses. The savings bank may retain additional reasonable amounts for any corporate purpose.

Section 107. Borrowing: A savings bank may borrow funds subject to Board regulation.

Section 108. Deposits: A savings bank may handle usual passbook savings accounts and bonus accounts. It may decline or repay deposits at any time. Interest on savings may be paid as approved by directors. The savings bank may invoke up to a 90-day advance notice of withdrawal. The board may extend this period in an emergency. FSIC may take action necessary to make a savings bank sound and solvent either before or after closing.

Section 109. Investments: A savings bank may invest in Federal obligations, municipal securities, property improvement loans, certain Canadian obligations, World Bank obligations, Inter-American Development Bank obligations, first mortgage loans on real property under specified restrictions of dollar amounts, class and loan, maturity, loan-to-value ratio, and geographical limits. Broad participation powers are granted. Savings banks may also invest in bankers' acceptances, corporate securities under the prudent man rule plus stated restrictions, obligations of mutual savings banks, and certain promissory notes, both secured and unsecured.

Section 110. Branches: With Board approval, a savings bank may establish in-State branches only to the extent any savings institutions can. The Board must first make findings required for issuance of a charter. A savings bank resulting from conversion, consolidation or merger, may retain existing offices and unexercised branch rights.

Section 111. Conversion: With Board approval and subject to new charter provisions, any thrift institution may convert into a Federal mutual savings bank, under specified procedure, but not in contravention of the laws under which the converting institution is organized. Minimum requirements for members and directors are excused for a savings bank formed by conversion. The Board must find the converting institution can observe the duties and restrictions of Federal mutual savings banks, and conform to this act's requirements. A converted savings bank may retain and service all accounts and assets lawfully held on the date of conversion.

A Federal mutual savings bank may convert into any nonstock thrift institution, with approval of the authority regulating the resulting institution, and consent of FSIC. Any resulting savings and loan association shall have its share accounts automatically insured by FSIC.

Section 112. Merger and consolidation: Federal mutual savings banks may merge or consolidate with each other or with in-State, State-chartered mutual savings banks. State approval is required if the resulting bank is State chartered; Board approval if the resulting bank is federally chartered. The Board must consider the act's purposes, the prospects for financial success, and ability to meet the duties of and restrictions of a Federal mutual savings banks. Corporate existence of the combining institutions continues in the resulting one, and rights and obligations are transferred to it pursuant to terms of the merger or consolidation agreement.

Section 113. General powers: Express operational powers are granted to Federal mutual savings banks. Included is authority to exercise all powers of State-chartered mutual savings banks in the same State. Powers reasonably incident to express powers are also conferred.

Section 114. Examination: Annual examinations by the Board are required with expenses assessed to cover costs. The Board may conduct additional examinations.

Section 115. Regulatory authority: The Board is granted general regulatory authority and supervision over Federal mutual savings banks.

Section 116. Taxation: No State shall tax Federal mutual savings banks more than the least onerous tax on any other local financial institution. No State other than the domiciliary State shall tax such savings banks for transactions in the State that do not constitute doing business, but foreclosed properties are subject to ad valorem or income-on-receipts taxes.

Section 117. Conservators and receivers: The Board by resolution shall state any alleged violation of law or regulation and notify the Federal mutual savings bank involved. The bank has 30 days to cure the defect, else the Board shall give 20 days notice of charges and of a hearing by an examiner as provided by the Administrative Procedure Act. The Board is given subpena powers enforceable by the U.S. District Court. Appeal lies from the Board decision, with court review based on the weight of evidence.

When notice of the alleged violation is given, the Board or the savings bank may within 30 days apply to the U.S. district court for declaratory judgment and injunctive relief. The court may enforce Board orders on request. The Board is made subject to suit and may be served through any of its agents and registered mail at its District of Columbia headquarters.

On giving notice of an alleged violation, the Board may issue a cease and desist order effective until the end of the hearing and enforceable by the U.S. district court. The Board can't bring charges on an act over 2 years old or known to the Board over 1 year. Charges must be dismissed if the Board doesn't adjudicate them within 1 year after they are filed.

Grounds for conservatorship of receivership are violation of an order or injunction final because time to appeal has expired or an unappealable order or impairment of capital. On such a ground the Board shall petition the U.S. district court for a conservator or receiver. With savings bank consent, the court may name either one without notice or hearing.

In any event, the court may appoint a conservator after notice and hearing. The person appointed as temporary or permanent conservator must be a Board officer or agent.

If liquidation seems necessary, the FSIC shall be named receiver, and may liquidate the savings bank in addition to having all powers of a conservator.

A temporary conservator may operate the savings bank as in normal course of business, subject to court limitations. A conservator may also reorganize the bank or organize a new savings bank or merge the bank with another savings bank or sell its assets.

Remedies in this section are exclusive. Orders or injunctions expire within 3 years unless extended for cause. Savings banks in custody continue to make reports and the Board must give Congress detailed reports of seized savings banks and of general enforcement under this section. Savings bank officials may contest any proceeding and be reimbursed brom bank assets.

In an emergency, the U.S. district court ex parte and without notice, upon Board petition, may name a temporary conservator. The petition under oath must allege facts requiring prompt action to prevent irreparable injury. The Board must promptly proceed to correct the alleged defects or move to appoint a conservator or receiver. The temporary conservator must be removed when the defect is cured or the motion for a conservator or receiver has been adjudicated.

TITLE II

Section 201. Federal Savings Insurance Corporation: The name of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation is changed to the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board, as the board of trustees for FSIC, is given power to manage its affairs, and the chairman of the board of trustees has the same type of powers he has as Chairman of the Board. Federal- and State-chartered mutual savings banks are made eligible to apply for FSIC insurance, and shall pay the same insurance premiums as do savings and loan associations insured by FSLIC. Federal mutual savings banks cannot voluntarily withdraw from insured status with FSIC.

Section 202. Transfer of funds from Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. When a State-chartered mutual savings bank insured by FDIC becomes a Federal mutual savings bank by conversion, merger or con-

solidation and becomes insured by FSIC, it takes with it a pro rata portion of FDIC insurance reserves calculated according to a formula based on assessments the savings bank has paid to FDIC. Amounts so transferred go to the primary reserve fund in FSIC. With the transfer the savings bank ceases to be insured by FDIC, but outstanding obligations to all parties are protected. The same procedure applies to a State-chartered mutual savings bank choosing to change deposit insurance to FSIC from FDIC.

Section 203. Miscellaneous: FSIC is made subject to Budget Bureau control, as is FSLIC.

TITLE III

Section 301. Annual report: The Board must submit an annual report of its operation to the President for transmission to Congress.

Section 302. Separability: The rest of the act stays valid even though a provision or its application to any person or circumstances is held invalid.

Section 303. Right to amend: Congress reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act.

## A Lavish Lunch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Wall Street Journal carried as its lead editorial an attack on the new expense account regulations drawn by the Internal Revenue Service. Mindful that everyone's thoughts are turning toward tax reform, I submit the editorial for the attention of my colleagues:

A LAVISH LUNCH

When we were younger and had more hair we used to walk several blocks from the office to eat in the Automat.

Now that some of the younger people show an embarrassing deference to our age, we eat at a nearby restaurant where the checks are somewhat higher. The place isn't noted for the smoothness of its service or the tranquility of its amosphere, but despite the hubbub it seems luxurious beside those days of long ago.

Of course sometimes, nowadays, we get invited out to lunch and the other fellow even pays the check. Just the other day we lunched at one of the leading banking establishments of the country where half a score of economists gathered to discuss the state of the Nation's economy and such things as taxes, cut and uncut.

We had eggs Benedict, which we don't get at home, and the service was refreshingly quiet; more so than the conversation. A Rockefeller or a Kennedy wouldn't have been impressed by the lunch, but we suspect that some young fellows around our shop would have thought it lavish.

Anyway, whether it was or not has now become a matter of State. The Congress in its infinite wisdom has decided that while it's all right to entertain economists at lunch (provided they talk economics) the entertainment must be economical. Otherwise the economists, eating better than is their custom, would be getting an untaxed benefit and the solvency of the U.S. Treasury would be impaired.

And so the metaphysicians of the Internal Revenue Service, poor fellows, are now trying to lay down a rule as to just what is and isn't lavish. Apparently they are finding it no easier than the metaphysicians of the Puritan past who tried to decide how many inches of lace on a lady's petticoat constituted a lavish—or lascivious—display.

Do you measure lavishness by the size of the check; i.e., can you have roast beef at Longchamps but not at "21"? Or by the number of forks by the dinner plate? Is a restaurant with Muzak within the pale while one with its own piano is beyond it? Must the president of General Motors observe the same frugality as a poor journalist—and if not, why not?

The questions are patently ridiculous. Yet it is just such silly questions that sane men must now gravely debate. Unfortunately, however, the consequences of foolish answers are not trivial. For after everybody has laughed at all the jokes, a serious question remains.

Curiously, everyone would see it readily enough if it involved anything but "entertainment," a word that conjures up visions of wickedness. Is the Government going to decide for every businessman in the land what constitutes a good business expenditure?

Let us suppose that the XYZ company is having some trouble with its Chicago business and decides that the thing to do is to send an official there, find the trouble and cure it. Let us suppose the company decides that the easiest, quickest, and cheapest way to approach the knowledgeable people who can help is take a hotel suite, open a bar, and dine them in an informal and relaxed atmosphere. In business as in world diplomacy, sometimes more is accomplished in an hour of civilized socializing than in days of formal meetings.

Now since one man's daily fare is another man's lavishness, who is to say whether the company should buy hamburger or pheasant under glass? Or whether, like the Japanese, it should exclude the ladies from a man's world or have the company official's wife play hostess to the ladies of the guests?

The variations of this problem in business are many, and the truth is that circumstances alter cases. The IRS chief, Mr. Caplin, is well aware of this and he doubtless wants to be reasonable. Still, what is proposed is that Mr. Caplin and his conferees, not the managers of the XYZ company, decide what is "reasonable" under what circumstances.

No one would allow them that arrogance in any other aspect of business decisions. This newspaper, for example, must buy newsprint—no newsprint, no business—and newsprint comes in various qualities at different prices. No one argues that IRS agents should decide what quality is appropriate for our business needs or that they should order us to be no more extravagant in our newsprint expenditure than any other newspaper.

Yet who can be sure they won't try? What's to stop the Government from deciding the limits of extravagance for all business expenses—once it's accepted these all-wise men can tell every man what kind of a lunch is lavish?

## Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, 45 years ago there emerged in Eastern Europe a new, free and independent nation, the Ukrainian National Republic. The breath of freedom was soon squeezed out of this new nation by the tyrants from Moscow who, through subversion and outright conquest destroyed the Republic. The Communists went further than that; they made of the real Ukrainian Republic a mockery and included that name as one of the many so-called Soviet Republics.

Since 1920 the people of the Ukraine have slaved under Communist domination. Indeed, they were the first people to be conquered by the Communists, the forerunner of many millions more who have been forced into slavery and worse by the Reds.

Mr. Speaker, the date, January 22, is well worth remembering. It should be a goad to the conscience of all freemen everywhere in the world—a reminder that their freedom is precious and a noble thing. This date should serve to remind freemen of the conditions under which their brothers must now live, of the slavery which exists in the world, of the police state and of totalitarian governments.

Although the people of the Ukraine are under the domination of the Communists, I know that there still burns deep within them a spirit of freedom. This may today be only a candle flickering in a great darkness. But if those of us in the free world can act together, perhaps one day this tiny flame will spring into a roaring conflagration which will consume communism itself.

We who today can count ourselves among the fortunate few who are free must also realize that so long as there is one person alive in this world to whom freedom is denied by ruthless, lawless and Godless tyrants, some small part of our own freedom is eroded away from us. We cannot count ourselves totally free if there are those existing in the dark misery of slavery.

Mr. Speaker, the United States must dedicate itself not only to the preservation of freedom here and throughout the world, it must dedicate itself as well to the restoration of freedom for those millions who have been engulfed in communism.

We must each shoulder this responsibility and make this our goal. We cannot sit idly by while slavery continues to exist. We must take every step and follow every course that a rational man can to achieve this ultimate goal.

If as a Nation and as individuals we do dedicate ourselves to these principles, then the goal of freedom for all mankind must inevitably be reached.

## Medicare Versus Private Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 21, 1963*

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we fully understand the political nature of

the administration's so-called medicare program. We recognize that we must face this issue with unfortunate emphasis on the vote-purchasing aspects of the administration's scheme, as opposed to a solution which would provide long-range benefits to the public and produce increases in our already high medical standards.

The relationship of the Congress to the issue is very effectively discussed in an editorial of Thursday, January 3, in the Blue Island Sun-Standard, which I insert in the RECORD:

MEDICARE VERSUS PRIVATE MEDICINE

The new Congress, to say what everybody who reads the newspapers knows, will have plenty of business on its hands. Much of it, in a sense, will be unfinished business. It will consist of those major measures which the administration proposed in 1962, and which either fell by the wayside when the vote was taken, or did not reach the voting point at all.

The November elections, as always, brought about some changes in the dramatis personnae of Congress. The Democrats made small Senate gains, the Republicans did the same in the House. But party labels blur nowadays and there is rarely such a thing as a solid party phalanx for or against any particular piece of legislation. The various commentators have discussed at great length what they think—or hope—the majority in the two branches will stand for. We will know that, for sure, 8 or 10 months from now. Meanwhile the lines form and the battles are readied.

In this, we need not consider foreign policy in its principal aspect—here, by constitutional authority and general agreement, the President is supreme. In the cold war, the Nation must speak with one voice, and that voice is his. But domestic policy is an entirely different matter. For example, it is likely that the administration will throw all the weight and authority it can muster behind medicare—the plan whereby everyone drawing social security benefits would become entitled to a wide range of government-provided medical services. The medicare bill failed last session, and it is common knowledge that the President felt deep anger at the rebuff. It is also likely that the new medicare bill will be broadened, to provide the same benefits for several million people in the 65-and-over age group who are not within the social security program.

Some of the supporters of medicare—and, to look at the problem more broadly, of other possible programs which would require more and more government involvement in the national health picture—have chosen as a weapon of argument that private medicine has failed to rise to the need. The other side of this story was recently told by Dr. George M. Fister, the new president of the American Medical Association. In his words, "Hippocrates, the great Greek physician, once said, 'Strong maladies require strong medicine.' These words have special meaning for the medical profession today. * * * We must diagnose the malady and treat it with truth."

Dr. Fister then said that "medicine stands as a proud symbol of the finest achievements of our competitive enterprise system," and reviewed a few pages of the records. Here are some of those pages:

About 4.5 million Americans are alive today who would be dead if the mortality rate of 25 years ago still prevailed. For the first time in history the life expectancy of Americans has exceeded the Bible's three-score-and-ten—it is 70.2 years. Eighty percent of the drugs commonly now used were unknown a mere 10 years ago, and in the last two decades the United States has been responsible for more important drug discoveries than all the other nations of the world combined. Last year the prescription drug industry spent a record $245 million in research—triple that of the average industry. There is now a record number of hospital beds in this country, and the average hospital stay is the lowest in history. A record number of new physicians—7,168—graduated from medical schools in 1962. In that year, infant mortality rates declined to a new low of 25.3 deaths per 1,000 births. A record number of Americans—about 136 million—are covered by voluntary health insurance prepayment plans.

So the story goes. Dr Fister does not think that our medical system is anywhere near perfect. He knows better than most of us how much more needs to be done. But he is convinced, as are legions of other authorities, that it can best be done, and done most surely and effectively, under a free system, not a government-dominated system. So, he urges that the principles involved in the fight be stressed to the limit, and every legitimate means be used to acquaint the American people with the record of achievement of American medicine in all its varied phases. For, he believes, "The people will respond to the truth."

## Philadelphia Federal Executive Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 21, 1963*

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity on January 4, 1963, to attend a very interesting meeting of the Federal Government Accountants Association which was held at Kugler's Restaurant in Philadelphia. The meeting notice and newsletter, which I have attached, shows the nature of the subject of the meeting and the agencies represented in the messages which were presented to the accountants who were present. If other large civil service areas operate with Federal executive boards like this one, the future of coordination of government activities will be very successful:

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTANTS ASSOCIATION, PHILADELPHIA CHAPTER—MEETING NOTICE AND NEWSLETTER, FRIDAY, JANUARY 4, 1963

FEDERAL EXECUTIVE BOARD

Hon. HERMAN TOLL, Congressman, president, Philadelphia Federal Bar Association.

Frank Matejik, coordinator of career development activities, third U.S. Civil Service region.

"I want coordination of Government activities outside of Washington significantly strengthened." The above words are those of President Kennedy and are contained in his memorandum of November 10, 1961, to heads of all departments and agencies. He directed the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission to arrange for a board of Federal executives in each of the Commission's administrative regions. A glance at the partial composition of our Philadelphia Federal Executive Board as displayed in this notice will indicate the stature of the Philadelphia Executive Board with which we are favored. We have an outstanding program introducing us to the constructive work which this group can do.

Our social was a smashng success and particularly smashing at the conclusion when we struggled for the attention of the hat check girls. Fifty-nine members, wives and friends had a very enjoyable evening at the Latin Casino. The only sad note was the absence of Jack Barash, who has been confined to Lankenau Hospital, room 211, since about a week before the social. Altho he cannot have visitors, we understand he is coming along nicely. It is expected he will remain in the hospital for another month. We hope he will improve rapidly and that we will be seeing him at one of the meetings in the near future. You may want to send him a get-well card.

OUR FIRST MEETING IN 1963

Date: Friday evening, January 4, 1963.

Time: 5:30 p.m., FGAA conviviality; 6:30 p.m., dinner; 7:30 p.m., Sing Along With Mitch Patchell; 7:45 p.m., technical program.

Subject: "Philadelphia Federal Executive Board."

The message: Stephen P. Ryder, Director, Civil Service Commission, third region (vice chairman). Dean J. Barron, regional commissioner, Internal Revenue Service (director finance management committee). Edward N. Rosa, regional director, Small Business Administration (director, interdepartmental and community liaison committee). Sedrik W. Melidosian, manager, Veterans' Administration insurance (member, personnel management committee).

The panel: Joseph R. Hock, former Washington chapter president, Comptroller, Maritime Administration; James A. Robbins, former national president, Deputy Chief, Headquarters U.S. Army Audit Agency.

Our esteemed guests: Gordon R. Elliot, regional manager, Veterans' Administration (chairman, Philadelphia Federal Executive Board); A. S. Harzenstein, regional commissioner, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division (chairman, subcommittee government associations liaison).

OFFICERS FOR 1962 AND 1963

President, Harry Levine.
First vice president, Albert M. Greene.
Second vice president, George F. Budd, Jr.
Treasurer, Charles J. Patchell, Jr.
Assistant treasurer, Michael A. Prendergast, Jr.
Secretary, Barbara B. Wright.
Assistant secretary, Ann Lewun.

ADVISERS

Francis G. Green.
Paul N. Righter.
Milton J. Savar.

DIRECTORS

Isadore E. Axler.
Louis W. Mangene.
Arthur W. Miller.
Max Minkin.
Paul F. Peterson.
Willis T. Porch, Jr.
Leonard J. Shackleford.
Joseph Sternberg.
William D. Sullivan.

AGENCY REPRESENTATIVES

Army Audit Agency, Glorio J. DiSepio.

Auditor General, U.S. Air Force, George A. Warner.

Defense Clothing and Textile Supply Center, Charles E. Campbell.

Federal National Mortgage Association, James R. Riley.

FGAA members not in government, Leonard M. Tucker.

Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, Russel E. Vance.

Frankford Arsenal, Charles Belsterling.

General Accounting Office, Victor Antelman.

Headquarters, Air Force, Contract Management District, Edward T. Diviny.
Internal Revenue Service, Harold M. Schwartz.
Marine Corps Supply Agency, Edward J. Sweeney.
Maritime Administration, Charles J. Millard.
Navy Area Audit Office, E. A. Phillips.
Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, Charles K. Valutas.
Philadelphia Ordnance District, Mark J. Alton.
Philadelphia Veterans' Administration, Edmund Murphy.
Post office, Edward S. Evans.
Signal Supply Agency, Abraham L. Jasner.

PAST PRESIDENTS

S. C. F. Metzgar, POD, 1952–53.
L. N. Teitelbaum, AF–AG, 1953–54.
Frank G. Green, AAA, 1954–55.
Daniel L. Ryan, NAAO, 1955–56.
Scott R. Tyree, GAO, 1956–57.
E. A. Phillips, NAAO, 1956–57.
Charles W. Gissell, NAAO, 1956–57.
Harry C. Kensky, GAO, 1957–58.
Roscoe C. Doyle, PO, 1958–59.
Marshall C. Anderson, AAA, 1959–60.
Milton J. Savar, USASSA, 1960–61.
Paul N. Righter, NAAO, 1961–62.

## H.R. 2158

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 2158, to provide for recognition by law of organizations of postal and Federal employees.

This legislation is the same as I sponsored in previous sessions of Congress, and it is submitted notwithstanding the fact that it is almost precisely a year since President Kennedy, on January 17, 1962, signed Executive Order 10988 to provide for "employee-management cooperation in the Federal service."

Mr. Speaker, I am told that the postal unions are concluding a basic agreement to apply to all postal employees throughout the country. In an election which was held several months ago, the employees chose six national organizations for exclusive recognition under the terms of the President's order. Listed in alphabetical order, those six organizations are: National Association of Letter Carriers, AFL–CIO; National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees; National Association of Special Delivery Messengers, AFL–CIO; National Federation of Post Office Motor Vehicle Employees, AFL–CIO; National Rural Letter Carriers Association; and United Federation of Postal Clerks, AFL–CIO.

Spokesmen for these organizations tell me that the negotiations with the Post Office Department have in the main been very wholesome, and that an overall agreement covering grievance procedures disciplinary action, appeals from adverse action, and advisory arbitration will be signed no later than mid-February.

Even though we have no doubt of the genuineness of the Post Office Department's intentions to fulfill a farsighted Executive order, I feel that the country still needs the law which is envisioned by my legislation.

I feel for example that we may need to improve on the arbitration procedures which are allowable under the Executive order. I have very genuine doubts over whether the language of the Executive order, section 8b, on arbitration goes sufficiently far. That language specifies:

Such arbitration (1) shall be advisory in nature with any decisions or recommendations subject to the approval of the agency head; (2) shall extend only to the interpretation or application of agreements or agency policy and not to changes in or proposed changes in agreements or agency policy; and (3) shall be invoked only with the approval of the individual employee or employees concerned.

Furthermore, I feel that the Executive order does not go sufficiently far in the area of coverage for negotiation purposes. The Executive order specifies that in making rules and regulations, agencies are to be aware of their obligation to consummate agreements with employee organizations but that the obligation to bargain with employee organizations "shall not be construed to extend to such areas of discretion and policy as the mission of an agency, its budget, its organization and the assignment of its personnel, or the technology of performing its work."

In the Post Office Department expressly, I question whether the Administrators are omnipotent, and I feel that certainly the promotion policy to be followed in various post offices should be the subject of hard and fast agreements with employee organizations, thereby eliminating the multitude of complaints received each time political favoritism is shown or some other kind of special consideration is shown to a candidate for promotion to a supervisory position.

Mr. Speaker, because of considerations such as these, I decided again to reintroduce my legislation governing recognition of employee organizations and I hope that early and favorable action may be taken.

## How Taft Did It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 21, 1963*

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, since the Cuba crisis is growing more, rather than less, complicated, and the apparent victory of October appears much less realistic now, is is practical for us to turn back the pages of history to compare successful programs of the past. The Lansing Journal, did just that in a fascinating and concise editorial, which I insert in the RECORD, entitled "How Taft Did It":

HOW TAFT DID IT

Fifty years ago, President William Howard Taft ordered the U.S. Infantry to Nicaragua to protect American lives and property during a revolution in that country. He did not try to stop the revolution, but its hostile effect on the United States.

Today, that would be resented as interfering with the internal affairs of a foreign country. But it kept order even while a revolution was being fought, and without taking sides.

There is something to be said for that era.

## Bill To Assist Public and Private Nonprofit Hospitals and Nursing Homes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN E. MOSS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, similar to one I sponsored in the 87th Congress, to assist public and private nonprofit hospitals and nursing homes to undertake badly needed modernization and replacement projects. The bill provides for establishment of a combination matching grant and loan program. The need for such legislation was contained in the President's budget message.

Modernization, rather than construction of new bed capacity, is the primary health facility need of today. This situation, not generally recognized by the public, has come about because of the prolonged concentration on important hospital needs accumulated during the depression and World War II. I want to cite the particularly critical shortage of bed space in rural areas of a few years ago.

Federal aid for construction of new hospitals, through the existing Hill-Burton program, has been instrumental in helping to reduce greatly the Nation's deficiency of hospital bed space. However, in recent years there has been a growing obsolescence of the hospitals that were already in existence and, for the most part, located in urban areas, when the Hill-Burton new construction program was begun in 1946.

In 1960, a U.S. Public Health Service survey of 25 metropolitan areas and 32 sample rural-urban areas showed a projected national cost for needed modernization and replacement of $3.6 billion. That figure is almost four times the current rate of annual construction expenditures in the entire health facilities field, and only a fraction of that is spent on modernization and replacement, which does not add new bed capacity.

This, as the survey showed, is a nationwide problem. I wish to point out that my home State, California, has an estimated modernization need backlog of $513 million.

The bill would authorize the Surgeon General, acting through State Hill-Bur-

ton agencies, to make grants up to 50 percent of the cost of qualified modernization projects, or loans as a supplement to grants or in lieu thereof. The total Federal share may not exceed 80 percent of the cost of the project. Also, assistance would be provided for development of comprehensive regional health facilities plans. The amounts to be authorized are left blank in the bill pending the development in committee hearings of information on the optimum size of the proposed program. The program would be effective July 1, 1964, meaning no budgetary impact until fiscal 1965.

The program in my bill is to complement and not interfere with the existing Hill-Burton construction program. It would be administered similarly. State agencies now involved in the Hill-Burton program would process the new applications and the Surgeon General would employ administrative procedures similar to those presently in effect for the construction program. Modernization assistance funds would be eligible only for projects that would not increase bed capacity by more than 5 percent.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation deals with an important national health facility need. Under existing programs, much progress undoubtedly will be made in rapidly adding to the current number of hospital beds. However, modernization and replacement of many facilities is required to improve patient care by increasing adequacy of services, safety and efficiency, and to adapt present facilities to new hospital and related medical needs.

## Foreign Tourism for Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 21, 1963*

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I read in the Philadelphia Inquirer, of Monday morning, January 21, 1963, an editorial relating to the examination by representatives of the U.S. Travel Service of Philadelphia's tourist attractions and facilities.

The advantages of using Philadelphia as a port of entry and/or departure for most visitors from Europe are very great. I have attached the editorial to my remarks so that my colleagues can see why Philadelphia is so attractive:

FOREIGN TOURISM FOR PHILADELPHIA

Representatives of the U.S. Travel Service, a Federal agency, took a firsthand look at Philadelphia's tourist attractions and facilities over the weekend preparatory to telling prospective foreign travelers why they should come to America. We believe that Philadelphia should rank near the top of the list of must places for foreigners to visit.

Historic shrines in and around Philadelphia, together with the seashore resorts in nearby New Jersey, are made-to-order tourist attractions. This city's proximity to both New York and Washington, which most visitors want to see, is another asset.

Moreover, Philadelphia should be the port of entry and/or departure for most visitors from Europe, whether they come by sea or air. The multilingual welcome signs to be installed at International Airport is a good idea which well might be adopted by hotels, restaurants, and so forth.

It is planned to tell the prospective tourists about reasonable costs of travel in America. The information ought to be realistic. Underestimating costs may lure visitors to our shores but it won't send them home happy.

A foreigner can't see all of the United States in 10 or 15 days—any more than an American can. Let's try to inform and entertain visitors, not exhaust them. Because of time and money limitations many Europeans will need to confine their touring to the eastern part of America.

## Paul Miller Heads Associated Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANK J. HORTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 21, 1963*

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the board of directors of the Associated Press, meeting in Phoenix, Ariz., last week, elected as their president, Mr. Paul Miller, president of the Gannett Newspapers, the home office of which is in Rochester, N.Y., a city I am privileged to represent in the Congress. A source of pride for Rochesterians and a source of assurance for the Nation is to be found in Mr. Miller's election.

A free press, as guaranteed by the first amendment to the Constitution, is only as desirable as the competence of those who implement its freedom. The expression, "Associated Press, the byline of dependability," is more than a slogan; it is a way of life.

A recent editorial in the Rochester, N.Y., Democrat & Chronicle, in commenting on Mr. Miller's election, described the vital role this news service plays in the advancement of humanity.

Under unanimous consent, I insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

A NEWS NETWORK'S MIGHTY CHALLENGE

A Rochesterian, Paul Miller, president of the Gannett Newspapers, has been elected president of the Associated Press.

This is more than institutional news for the newspaper business in America.

If it were necessary to name the single factor contributing most to humanity's advancement, the selection would have to go to the growing worldwide distribution of complete, honest, factual news. For there is no way of calculating the power of the simple word to spread the details of a life-saving medical discovery, to warn of warmongers, to expose demagogs, to spread the techniques of peace, to tell of the rights of man, to report the spiritual greatness and the lunatic lapses of mankind.

In this thrilling work of news gathering and news distribution, the Associated Press is regarded as the world's greatest agency. Its multilingual reporters risk prisons and worse to cover riots in South America or savagery in Africa, to write of the wars of the earth and the antics of dictators. From No. 10 Downing Street to Israel, and from Washington to Hong Kong, Associated Press men work with skill and daring to report and to defend the people's right to know.

Today the Associated Press, a mutual, cooperative association, serves some 7,000 newspapers, radio stations and television stations in 100 nations. It laces the earth into a web of enlightenment.

To be chosen for the presidency of such an organization is almost a frightening responsibility. It is not given lightly. And before it is given, many dedicated newspapermen, the Associated Press' directors, must agree that there is not the slightest doubt as to the capacity of the man to do the job. In this case there was no slightest doubt. Of course Paul Miller's selection is a matter of pride to the Gannett group of newspapers, but more than that, it should be an item of pride to Rochesterians and to all readers of newspapers in this group.

## Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of January 19, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, January 19, 1963)

BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1964

The budget, by definition and practice, is both a financial report and a plan for the future. It is also a request for legislation, and an administrative guide to Government—all based on congressional approval. The President proposes; Congress disposes. The budget is presented to Congress each January, 6 months before the start of a new fiscal year (July 1 to June 30). The fiscal 1964 budget is approximately 1,200 pages and outlines both receipts and expenditures, also the comprehensive overall legislative program for the year of both appropriation by program and revenue by tax measures. The President's message accompanied the budget and described it, a truly amazing, unbelievable statement. Some of his statements should be remembered.

The President said: (1) "This budget presents a financial plan for the efficient and frugal conduct of the public business."

(2) "We have substantially reduced the deficit in our balance of payments."

(3) "I have felt obliged to limit severely my 1964 expenditure proposals."

(4) "The expenditure program is the minimum necessary."

(5) "The Federal deficit which will be incurred in the fiscal year 1964 should neither raise fears of inflation nor cause increased concern about our balance of international payments."

(6) "The total of administrative budget expenditures for all other programs, combined, has been held slightly below the 1963 level."

(7) "Other moderate expenditure increases being proposed * * * are offset by decreases in other administrative budget expenditures. For example, lower expenditures are estimated for the postal service, for certain housing, international and other lending programs, through substitution of private for public credit and for agricultural price supports."

(8) "Our practical choice is not between a deficit and a budgetary surplus. It is instead between two kinds of deficits; a chronic deficit of inertia due to inadequate economic growth—or a temporary deficit resulting from a tax and expenditure program designed to provide for our national security, boost the economy, increase tax revenue, and achieve future budget surpluses. The first type of deficit is a sign of waste and weakness. The second is an investment in the future."

(9) "As the tax cut becomes effective a substantial part of the revenue increases must go toward eliminating the transitional deficit."

Then an administrative digest from the Executive called the budget in brief speaks of the budget as "strengthening freedom" the debt as "our paying for the continuing costs of past war" and that "efficiency is increasing in Government," and that "payments to the public from Government are 20 percent of the gross national product."

THE FACTS

The facts and sound economic interpretation are, of course, just the opposite of the above statements. Let's examine these statements and the facts.

(1) The cash budget outlines expenditures of $122.5 billion (not $98.8 billion of the administrative budget) of expenditures and $112.2 billion receipts (not $86.9 billion of administrative budget) and no one, not even the radical-liberals will deny there is waste and extravagance. The deficit will be $10.3 billion in cash budget. Frugality? Efficiency?

(2) The balance of payments, or gold outflow and accumulating pressures are greater, not less, and the danger more acute. Devaluation of our money is now a real possibility.

(3 and 4) How can the biggest peacetime budget in history, an increase of $5.7 billion over the 1963 budget (which itself ran $8.3 billion in the hole) be called a "minimum or severe limitation in spending"?

(5) Here the President disquiets all sound economic students because he clearly recognizes though decries the two clear and present dangers directly resulting from his profligate spending—inflation and gold outflow—both calculated to destroy our currency value, the purchasing power of U.S. money.

(6) This is a flat misstatement of fact. The nondefense expenditures will soar above the 1963 level, because of (A) increases in almost every existing program, (B) new programs started:

(1) Youth Conservation Corps, (2) aid to education, (3) mass transit aid, (4) medicare, etc.

(C) Usual additions as unanticipated expenses result from domestic and foreign problems that arise. The Appropriation Committee chairman in debate specified a $2 billion increase immediately and more to come. Then he outlined the 27 percent increase in nondefense expenditures compared to 17 percent defense spending increase since 1961.

(7) The alleged decreases specified by the President are fallacious. Agriculture spending goes up, in his budget, not down as he said in his message. Postal spending goes up, not down. REA spending goes up, not down. Public works up, not down. Certain international, and housing and lending programs are mentioned as down only because the President hopes to sell for cash some of the existing Government loans. We have figure juggling, inaccurate bookkeeping methods, and wishful thinking instead of facts and truth.

(8) The choice is not between deficits. It is between profligate spending, wastefulness, Federal control, and aid on the one hand, or reduced Federal spending and a return to limited Government of freedom, incentives, and the Constitution on the other—a choice the President apparently neither recognizes nor understands.

(9) The recognition of a tax cut being a business stimulus is illusory and dangerous if not coupled with reduced Government spending. Inflation may produce more dollars later in taxes, but will destroy our whole economy. The budget in brief calling such extravagance and deficit as strengthening freedom and increased Government efficiency is worth only a laugh, if it weren't too painful a subject over which to laugh. It isn't laughable, it's tragic. We are indeed witnessing and being asked to take a path to fiscal suicide—the bankruptcy of the United States by our own hands—a prediction by the Communists years ago.

WHAT OTHERS SAY

Perhaps others in critical analysis, rather than in blind acceptance, will focus enough attention in days ahead so that Congress will compel our President to return to fiscal solvency and the balanced budget. Here are some comments: "The President's budget can only be termed a radical proposal"—Congressman JOHN BYRNES of Wisconsin. "The most inconsistent budget ever submitted by a President"—Congressman HALL. "For 40 years I have never seen or heard a budget message like this one, and neither have you, nor has anyone else"—Congressman CANNON, chairman, Appropriations Committee. "Mr. Kennedy's economic proposals are straight out of the dream book"—Chicago Daily Tribune.

CONCLUSIONS

As I see it this budget clearly shows the President and his advisers' clear lack of understanding (1) the basic economics of a private market economy, (2) the role of constitutional limited government of a free society, (3) human nature, that people will work better for themselves than they will for Government. Now, who is negative and positive? Is it negative for a Member of Congress to vote against deficit spending? Is it positive to be for a balanced budget?

*Public works and the Dallas Federal building*

Finally, are new and expanding public works justified during times of deficit financing? Of course not. Yet on page 710 of the budget are listed many new Federal buildings. The Dallas Federal building is omitted, no reasons given. This poses two problems and decisions for the people of Dallas:

(1) Are the people of Dallas willing to lead the way to sound, balanced budget economics and constitutional government, asking others to join in, or are we ready to capitulate and join liberals in the race to bankruptcy.

(2) Can we be coerced, bribed or intimidated politically by Federal leaders who do not grade the Federal projects on merit but on political dictation? To pose the questions gives the answer, which a sensible, intelligent constituency will support. The Kennedy administration should disavow the Dallas Federal building because it has not been proven meritorious, if that is the case or it should be given number one priority over all other Federal buildings approved in the current budget. Or to say it another way, in a period of deficit financing there should be no public works and Federal buildings, but if there are going to be such projects, the Kennedy administration cannot morally deny a Federal building to Dallas while approving others of less priority and merit.

Supported by the people of Dallas, who have always supported sound principles, I shall continue my efforts for fiscal solvency and sanity and constitutional government. Your views are always welcome.

## Protest Against Apartheid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, last month I received a letter from Mr. Melvin Rotblatt, president of London Lamps, of Los Angeles, in which he advised me of his communication with Falks Electrical—S.A.—Ltd. of Johannesburg, South Africa. In his letter Mr. Rotblatt refused to do business with the South African firm because of the policy of racial repression currently followed in that country.

I have commended London Lamps for their courageous action and praised them for their stand which is in full accord with the resolution of the United Nations passed during the 17th session of the General Assembly. That resolution condemned South African racial policies; asked U.N. members to break diplomatic relations with South Africa, to boycott its exports, to close their ports to shipping from South Africa, and to prohibit their ships from sending goods to South Africa.

It is not enough for us to piously condemn the racist policies of South Africa, for such declarations have done nothing to change her actions. However, if sufficient economic pressure is brought to bear, her industrial and business leaders will undoubtedly pressure the government to enact much more moderate policies, and hopefully, to grant equal rights to all the peoples of South Africa.

We have seen in our own country that sometimes pressure is the only means to bring about the vitally important right of equal service or equal access to educational facilities. Hopefully, this de facto integration will eventually result in those who oppose equal rights accepting integration as a moral good.

Therefore, the London Lamps Co.'s action, which might very well deprive it of a profitable contract, is to be commended both for its attempt to help change the racist policies of South Africa, and as an example for other American businesses to follow in refusing to support inequality, whether at home or abroad.

London Lamps has demonstrated the spirit of true Americanism in its letter, which follows:

LONDON LAMPS,
*Los Angeles, Calif., December 10, 1962.*
Mr. M. KRAMER,
*Falks Electrical (S.A.) (Pty.) Ltd., Johannesburg, South Africa.*

DEAR MR. KRAMER: It has come to our attention that there have been negotiations with your company, with your placement of an order for lamps with our company to be shipped to the Union of South Africa.

Since you are in a country whose national policy is abhorrent to our feelings of morality and common decency, we do not wish to do business with you, and, therefore, cannot accept your order.

We, in this manner, advise you of our protest against injustice, restriction of civil rights, and racial prejudice as a national

policy of your government. We consider this policy and the measures that your government has taken as illegal in the eyes of international morality and law. We agree with the United Nations in the condemnation of these activities and the necessity of making the protest effective by economic isolation.

Very truly yours,

MELVIN ROTBLATT,
*President.*
GERALD ROTBLATT,
*Chairman, Board of Directors.*

## John W. Tramburg, Devoted Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, on January 14, the cause of social work and public welfare was dealt a great loss—John W. Tramburg, former Director of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia and of the State of Wisconsin, died at the age of 49 after suffering a heart attack.

Mr. Tramburg, a native of Fall River, Wis., and graduate of Whitewater State Teachers College in 1935, taught at Norwalk, Wis., and had been recreation and athletic director of a CCC camp in northern Wisconsin. He then attended the University of Chicago, where he received a master's degree in social service. During World War II he served for 3 years in the Navy.

Mr. Tramburg was the head of the District of Columbia welfare program in 1950 when he was hired to run Wisconsin's multimillion-dollar public welfare department. He remained in this post until 1955, except for a 1-year interruption to serve as the first Federal Commissioner of Social Security under President Eisenhower in Washington, where he had charge of drafting revisions in the social security system.

In 1955 Mr. Tramburg left Madison to become New Jersey State Commissioner of Institutions and Agencies, a post he held at the time of his death.

During his service in Wisconsin, Mr. Tramburg began a widely copied series of penal reforms for both adult and youthful offenders and he continued his efforts in this field in New Jersey.

Mr. Tramburg gave unstintingly of himself in positions of leadership to the field of social work through working as chairman of the Commission on Social Policy and Action of the National Association of Social Workers. As a member of the ad hoc Committee on Public Welfare appointed by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Ribicoff, he played an important role in developing the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962.

His contributions to, and concern for, health and welfare issues were signally recognized when he was elected president of the National Conference of Social Welfare for 1963.

The dedication and service to people of Mr. Tramburg crossed party lines—a Republican, he left his Wisconsin post to serve under New Jersey Democratic Governors Meyner and Hughes. In his death, the underprivileged and forgotten people have lost a stanch friend and advocate.

## LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

## GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

## RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

## CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

## PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

## CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

# Appendix

## Harris County and Texas Lose Dedicated Leader in Death of Mayor Philpot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH**
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Tuesday, January 22, 1963*

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Texas has lost an able and distinguished citizen in the death of William J. Philpot, who served the thriving and industrious city of Galena Park, Tex., as mayor for 8 years. Mayor Philpot was my close personal friend. He was at my side in five statewide campaigns for good government in Texas. He was a leader in Harris County and in Texas for better government at all levels.

Mayor Philpot was once honored by his fellow citizens as Man of the Year in Harris County. Because of the high esteem in which he was held by all who knew him, I ask unanimous consent that the following editorial from the January 11, 1963, Houston Press, captioned "William J. Philpot," and the article from the January 11, 1963, Houston Post, captioned "Ex-Mayor Philpot's Rites Today," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Houston Press, Jan. 11, 1963]

WILLIAM J. PHILPOT

For eight terms, William J. Philpot led Galena Park as its mayor as it grew from an off-the-beaten-path north shore village crowded by World War II ship channel operations to a bustling city of 10,852 (1960 census).

Mr. Philpot managed to handle his mayoralty duties along with many other civic activities while serving full time as supervisor of plant security in the big Champion Paper & Fibre Co. installation across the channel.

It couldn't have been too easy to handle everything. Yet his remarkable energy and purpose permitted him to accomplish it.

Bill Philpot's death at 58 years of age is a grave loss not only to Galena Park which last year named him its Man of the Year but to all Harris County.

He was a wheelhorse who worked the hardest when the going was toughest.

[From the Houston Post, Jan. 11, 1963]

EX-MAYOR PHILPOT'S RITES TODAY

Funeral services will be at 2:30 p.m. Friday for William J. Philpot, 58, one of Harris County's most colorful politicians and a mayor of Galena Park for 16 years.

He vacated the mayor's office last spring and was drafted by the Harris County Mayors & Councilmen's Association to run for the State legislature under its sponsoship. He was unsuccessful in that.

The services will be held at First Baptist Church with the Reverend Ed Stewart, pastor, and the Reverend L. A. Vermillion, pastor of the Peach Creek Baptist Assembly, officiating. Burial will be in Forest Park Cemetery.

Philpot, who served as mayor of Galena Park from 1944 to 1948 and from 1950 to 1962, died of a heart attack about 1 a.m. Thursday at his home.

The present mayor, Alvin D. Baggett, said the Galena Park City Hall will be closed all day Friday in honor of Philpot and that the American flag will be flown at half mast for the second consecutive day.

He was the supervisor of plant protection for Champion Papers, Inc., and was named Man of the Year for 1962 at Galena Park by the Galena Park Chamber of Commerce at a banquet last month.

Philpot was a past president of the Harris County Mayors & Councilmen's Association and a onetime candidate for county commissioner.

He was a frequent critic of the association because he felt it did not carry enough weight with the Harris County legislative delegation.

Philpot was a member of the First Baptist Church and Masonic Lodge, A.F. & A.M., 1290. He is survived by his wife Mrs. Cornelia Philpot; a son, W. J. Jr., both of Galena Park; five daughters, all of Houston: Mrs. Lois Zinnecker, Mrs. Nelle Patton, Mrs. Inez Dickey, Mrs. Betty Anderson, and Mrs. Betty Reeder; his mother, Mrs. Sophia Philpot of Arkansas; six brothers and eight sisters.

## Defense Supply and Savings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS**
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, January 1 marked the completion of the first year of operation of the Defense Supply Agency, an innovation in defense procurement and support that has grown out of the McCormick-Curtis amendment to the Defense Reorganization Act of 1958. This Defense Supply Agency was created by the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, as the administrative body through which common supply and service functions of the military services could be handled jointly rather than being handled, as before, on a separate basis by each service.

The key to the operation of the Defense Supply Agency is savings. Its justification for existence is that it can, through centralizing the administration of these common functions, save the taxpayers many hundreds of millions of dollars each year. I believe that the DSA has shown great promise in its first year of operation in achieving the goal for which it was created. With the continued support and interest of the Congress and the people of this country, it will be able to effect substantial savings in our annual military budget.

A rundown on the first year of DSA was recently published in the Washington Star. Written by Mr. Allen Smythe, this article shows the scope and promise of the Defense Supply Agency. To help give a better understanding of the DSA, I am placing Mr. Smythe's article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

YEAR-OLD DEFENSE SUPPLY AGENCY SAVES MILLIONS AT PENTAGON

(By Allen M. Smythe)

The performance of Defense Secretary McNamara's pet project—the Defense Supply Agency—may serve him well when he goes to the new Congress to defend the military budget. The ex-president of the Ford Motor Co. has been using his executive and production talents to install some business policies in the Pentagon.

Many congressional leaders had been urging a "fourth service of supply" for the last 10 years in an effort to eliminate waste and duplication in Defense procurement. Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, and Representative CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri, sponsored an amendment to the Defense reorganization bill of 1958 which gave Mr. McNamara a free hand in unifying supply purchases and services.

The DSA—1 year old on January 1, 1963—makes modest claims of savings of $50 to $100 million. Mr. CURTIS thinks these claims are far too low and prophesies that savings in the billions will result when DSA expands to take over all noncombatant supply and related services.

Among the latter, Mr. CURTIS would include aerial surveys, photography, communications, public relations, recruiting activities, engineering efforts, and legal work.

ACTIVITIES FAR REACHING

DSA began operations January 1, 1962, taking over six existing commodity management agencies from the Army and Navy and a traffic management service which supervises the transportation of Defense freight and passengers in the United States. It also began the organization of two new activities centers, one to manage supply of electrical and electronic items, and a second to maintain the Federal Supply Catalog and administer Department of Defense material utilization and surplus property disposal programs.

By July 1, 1962, DSA had taken over two more activities, one managing industrial supplies and another managing automotive parts. Thus, after 6 months in business, DSA became responsible on a phased basis, for food, clothing, petroleum, medical, general, construction, industrial, automotive, and electronic items of military supply.

NEW RESPONSIBILITIES

New management responsibilities assigned to the agency during the year by the Secretary of Defense included:

1. Management of 6,000 items of common chemical material. Apparatus will be added to the items managed by the Defense Medical Supply Center, Brooklyn, N.Y., and chemicals, dyes, compressed gases, and coal to the items managed by the Defense Petroleum Supply Center, Washington, D.C.

2. Designing and establishing a central inventory of machine tools owned by the Department of Defense and management of $1 billion worth of this equipment which is in idle status. Records of the $2 billion of equipment in active use are handled by DSA.

3. Operation of an integrated wholesale distribution system, beginning January 1, 1963, which will involve the use of a network of depots maintained by the military services.

DSA is currently responsible for material management of 241 Federal supply categories while the military services manage the remaining 320 categories including weapons, ammunition, explosives, aircraft, ships, motor vehicles and other end items of combat equipment.

By June 30, 1963, the 21,000 employees of DSA will be responsible for 1,100,000 items of military supply with estimated inventory value of $3.1 billion and annual procurement of $2.9 billion.

## Voice of West Rarely Heard in White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Tuesday, January 22, 1963*

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, Richard Wilson's column in the January 17, Sioux Falls Argus-Leader offers constructive suggestions for the leaders of the present Democratic administration. In hopes that a word to the wise will be sufficient, I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAYS VOICE OF WEST IS RARELY HEARD IN WHITE HOUSE

(By Richard Wilson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The westward surge in the country exposes a narrowness of view in Washington unbecoming to a large central government.

Attitudes of mind and behavioristic patterns in the Capital are out of date. Left largely out of account is the westward swing, a population movement dwarfing the opening of the western lands a century ago.

The move west is often regarded in Washington as something remote, as if it were happening in another country. The East remains, it is thought, the financial and cultural heart of the country and the seat of Federal governmental authority, though comparatively less populous.

ADMINISTRATION PAROCHIALISM

This seems quite unrealistic when one returns to the Capital after extensive travels in many sections which are regarded in Washington as fairly remote. But even 3 weeks of such travel does not reveal the scope of the country to the native traveler, for, he has missed many sections and others he has seen too briefly.

The Kennedy administration—with major exceptions, of course—has in general brought to Washington the flavor of eastern parochialism. Its political methods are eastern urban. The Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, for example, ventures rarely into the West where he is not well understood.

The voice of the new West is not much heard in the White House. The Kennedy advisers in the main are oriented to the academic thought processes, and behavioristic standards of Harvard.

Where this is not literally the case, the President's advisers are classically eastern. His chief advisers, McNamara, Rusk, and Dillon, are wholly conditioned by eastern standards of thought, behavior, and even dress. This may not necessarily be bad. In fact it may be good, but it is not representative of the whole Nation.

Something more of western flavor would give the Washington government a more national character. Such reflections occur to a traveler as he idles in a jeweled western city lying immaculate under the desert sun within a protecting circlet of hills and peaks, some snowcapped, some golden glowing in the fading light of evening.

Somewhere in Washington, the traveler reflects, there ought to be room for the spirit of the new West.

THEY SEEK THE SUN

Giving the Government a more national character by the introduction of western modes of thought and behavior might have seemed a few years ago to be merely a nod to the West for political reasons. But today more is involved. The Nation has moved and is continuing to move west as the conditions of life and employment make the western areas more suitable for large urban populations.

Whether these areas are suitable or not the westward surge continues. People seek the sun. They seek also to escape the heavy pressures of eastern urban life, the abrasions of closer and closer contact with their fellow man, and the limitations and burdens of a fixed status of which they are tired or consider hopeless.

The West beckons again as it did a century ago to the jaded easterner, to the dispossessed farmer and displaced industrial worker. It has created new opportunities for the technician and the skilled worker. It has gathered a great reservoir of scientific brains around its universities to spawn and nurture the new industrial technologies.

A strange corollary of this is that in the Capital the western influence remains so feeble. Neither in Congress nor in the executive departments is the western influence strong. The sons of the Nation's most populous State, California, play no major part in the large affairs of Government in this administration. Only one holds a truly high place, the Chief Justice of the United States, and he was appointed in the previous administration.

As for the great and growing cities of the new West—Denver, Salt Lake City, Phoenix, Albuquerque, San Diego, Los Angeles, Dallas, Houston, yes, even Reno, Boise, Tucson—so little is heard that they might be in another country.

And for that matter, who would know in Washington that Sioux Falls, S. Dak., and Mount Pleasant, Iowa, offer a cultured way of life of which the average eastern urbanite is not even dimly aware?

CULTURAL DESERT

Lately there has been much emphasis on the new culture in Washington on the assumption that the Capital is a cultural desert, and that the greatest library in the world and one of the greatest art galleries are not enough. Washington must be more like London, Paris, and Rome. The Capital must duplicate cultural facilities already existing in New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, and elsewhere in this country though, in fact, Washington's overriding preoccupation is and always will be with public affairs.

It seems that no place is really cultured without a $30 million structure in which to perform the ballet, to say nothing of a $10 million aquarium in which to display fish which somehow slipped through Congress.

It would be heartening if, with all this culture, some way could be found also to invest Washington with a more nearly national flavor imported from what is soon to be, or is now, the greatest section of the country, the Golden West.

## Repeal Automobile Excise Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the Members a very gratifying expression of support for my effort to repeal the 10-percent automobile excise tax. I have received from the Flint, Mich., City Commission a resolution condemning the excise tax as a "highly discriminatory and exceedingly depressive" measure that endangers the financial welfare of all individuals and communities dependent upon automotive production for an economic base.

The city commission has reached the heart of the matter, pointing out the unfairness of continuing a tax that was designed to restrict production and consumption of new automobiles, when the need for restriction has been removed. But besides being an inequity, this tax holds back the full expansion and capacity of the economy. If the tax this resolution decries were repealed, business activity and employment in the steel, rubber, and other related industries would be stimulated by further demand for new cars. As we consider action on the President's request for tax reduction and reform to encourage economic growth, I feel this is a matter that should have our most careful attention. I submit the resolution to the consideration of the Members, and for inclusion in the RECORD:

Whereas current U.S. tax legislation requires the levy of a 10-percent excise upon every automobile sold at retail throughout the country; and

Whereas said tax was an emergency measure passed during the Korean crisis but has been given an extension by the Congress every year since that time; and

Whereas by its very nature and conception said tax is highly discriminatory and exceedingly depressive on the automobile industry and all its suppliers, constituting a direct threat to the financial welfare of all individuals and communities dependent upon automotive production for an economic base; and

Whereas previous Flint City commissions have voiced strong and continued opposition to this unfair levy and have endorsed the efforts of our Congressman, and other State representatives to the Congress, to repeal, or as a bare minimum to reduce substantially, the 10-percent excise: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That this city commission reiterate previous appeals for relief of the 10-

percent excise on automobiles as a long needed tax reform and as a stimulant to the economic vitality of the automotive industry and the diverse industries which depend wholly or partially upon it; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Congressman CHARLES CHAMBERLAIN, Congressman-elect NEIL STAEBLER, and Senators PATRICK MCNAMARA and PHILIP HART, of the State of Michigan, as a reassurance of our support of their efforts to have this odious excise repealed.

## The Reasons Why California Is First in Defense Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Tuesday, January 22, 1963*

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, in recent years, California has come under heavy attack because a substantial slice of the Nation's defense and space contracts has gone to California industries and universities. I have taken the floor several times to answer these attacks, particularly to fight back a misguided plan to divert this critical work to depressed areas unqualified for the job.

Today I wish to commend to the attention of my colleagues an editorial by the Los Angeles Times, dated December 20, 1962. The Times editorial forcefully spells out the principal reason why California has year after year earned billions of aerospace dollars; namely, California's outstanding educational system and intellectual climate. Those envious of California's share of this vital work would do well to examine the evidence at hand.

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent Los Angeles Times editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY CALIFORNIA GETS THE WORK

Anyone can get from the Pentagon a list of the Defense Department's outlays, by companies and States, to the aerospace industry. Eastern Congressmen use it when they complain that California gets much more of the money than any of the other States.

If these envious Congressmen knew the full statistical accounting their cries would ascend like a siren's. For the fact is that California eventually gets more of the work than the Defense Department's figures show. This is not because the Pentagon has tried to deceive anybody; it lists prime contractors. But it does not attempt to account for (or map) all the crosscurrents and eddies of subcontracting, which is a labor to be compared with graphing the wriggles of eels in a bucket.

This monumental work was undertaken by the magazine Aerospace Management. It found that for 1961 California did more than a quarter of all the aviation and space work in the United States ($5.2 billion of $18 billion), public and private. A California prime contractor could, and often did, subcontract for work outside of this State (and California manufacturers have often pointed this out), but the subcontractors subcontract, too, and the subsubcontract might very well come home to California to roost. This phenomenon serves to extend the argument we have made here on several occasions, that aerospace work should be done where it can be done most efficiently. That place obviously is California.

The explanation is easy, although it is not a part of the strict analysis of work done and paid for with which Aerospace Management is concerned. More than one-fourth of the money was ultimately spent in California—but California is also the dwelling place of more than one-third of the relevant experts.

These experts are in California not only because the physical climate tempts them but because the intellectual climate is one of the most salubrious in the United States and the world. California attracts some of the experts from other places, to be sure, but it grows many of them at home—and keeps them, for the greater glory and prosperity of the State.

This is a testimonial to California education, which is a regenerative, or feedback, system. If one seeks to justify a system of education by the account book, California's has surely paid off. Forty percent of State revenue goes to education at all public levels but the dividends on the investment are terrific—at least to the materialist assessor. Here are a few statistics gathered and checked by the California Bankers' Association:

California leads the Nation in elementary and secondary school enrollment. It spends more on public schools than 43 other States combined. One-fourth of the population is in school.

With its universities, its "think factories," its libraries, and laboratories, California is the center of a scientific ferment that may be unparalleled elsewhere in the world.

California has 161 private and public institutions of higher learning. Among these are five universities that confer doctorate degrees. In the fall of 1961 these institutions had 600,000 full- or part-time students—13 percent of the State population between 15 and 34.

About 47 percent of the total U.S. enrollment in junior colleges is in California.

More than one-fifth of the members of the National Academy of Sciences (137 of 643) live in California and are associated with one or another of its universities and colleges. (New York has 104.)

Twenty Nobel laureates are associated with these same institutions. The University of California alone has 11 of them, more than all those Russia has had since the Nobel awards began in 1901.

The educational statistics clearly explain the aerospace statistics. The envious eastern Congressmen need more than Federal money, they need talent—and they can't get that by voting for it or soliciting sympathetic testimonials from the President and the Vice President of the United States.

## Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 21, 1963*

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the fair and fertile Ukraine has been a borderland between East and West, between Europe and Asia, and its sturdy inhabitants have borne the brunt of all invaders in either direction throughout centuries. For more than 300 years in modern times it has been submerged in the Russian landmass, and during all that time autocratic czars and Communist tyrants have done their utmost to suppress and crush all distinctive Ukrainian national traits: their desire for freedom, their boundless love for their homeland, their undying yearning for political independence, and their willingness to sacrifice their worldly posesssions as well as their lives for the attainment of their national goals. Only once in the course of their centuries-long subjugation to alien rulers have they had the chance of attaining their freedom. That was in 1918. When the czar's decrepit autocracy was overthrown, and Austria no longer ruled over western Ukraine, they seized upon the occasion and proclaimed their national independence. That was done on January 22, 45 years ago.

That significant landmark in the recent history of the Ukrainian people has become their national holiday. They celebrate that day in due solemnity, even though the freedom which was ushered in on that day has long ceased to exist. Nearly 43 years ago they were robbed of their freedom by the Red army, and since then these sturdy and stout-hearted peasants have been subjected to the callous and cruel regime of the Kremlin.

To this day the Ukraine remains a province of the Soviet empire, and for more than four decades some 42 million Ukrainians have been living in their homeland as prisoners in a large prison camp, working there mostly for the benefit of their heartless taskmasters. They are separated from the free world by the unspeakable Iron Curtain and they are sealed off from the outside world. Of course, they cannot enjoy any of the freedoms which we in the West regard as our birthright. Under such conditions, of course, they do not and cannot celebrate their national holiday, their independence day. Fortunately hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians who live in freedom in the free world celebrate that holiday, and Ukrainian-Americans solemnly observe the anniversary of this memorable day in an effort to keep alive the undying spirit of an independent Ukraine. I am indeed glad to join them in the 45th anniversary celebration of the Ukrainian Independence Day.

## International Printing Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Tuesday, January 22, 1963*

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, last week was International Printing Week, during which we recognize the influence of printing on the course of history.

In marking the observance of the week, President Kennedy pointed out that "print is the true international currency of the modern world. The printer's art has built the vast array of secular and religious thought, of technical and scientific achievement, which knows no national frontiers and which forms the fabric of today's dangers and possibilities."

He added that printing is "a human achievement which has demonstrated far greater power to shape the world than all the force of modern weaponry."

He called it "appropriate that you have chosen the birthday of Benjamin Franklin for this celebration. That great scientist, philosopher, statesman—and printer—embodied for all time the tremendous fact that to affect the thinking of man is to influence the course of history."

Mr. President, Columnist Bill Gold, of the Washington Post, devoted a major section of a recent column to International Printing Week. I ask unanimous consent to have a portion of this column, as published in the January 14 Washington Post, printed in the RECORD.

There beng no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is fascinating to recall the evolution of communication among men. From a beginning of ideograms painted on the walls of caves we progressed to hieroglyphics on man-made structures and on tablets of clay. We developed phonetics, and languages, and papyrus on which to record these symbols.

But for thousands of years the spoken word remained the principal means of transferring an idea from one mind to another. While the scribe copied his texts laboriously by hand, reading and writing remained specialized skills reserved to an elite minority.

The average man got his ideas chiefly from the folklore of his people. Naturally, his cultural horizons were circumscribed by the limitations of oral communication. Man's memory is not always accurate, nor is his capacity for remembering adequate.

Johannes Gutenberg changed all that with the invention of movable type. He made printing easier and cheaper, and thereby enabled each new generation to distribute the fruits of man's intellectual progress among an ever-growing number of people.

The elite minority became an elite majority, and such a great flood of printed information became available that no man could keep pace with more than a fraction of it. Indices were devised to make these mountains of printed matter useful to those who sought specific information. And finally machines were built to store hundreds of thousands of printed pages on a roll of film, and to reproduce any desired page within seconds at the push of a button or the spin of a dial.

But what does it avail us to have all this knowledge at our fingertips if we have not disciplined ourselves in the wise use of it?

Franklin said: "Printers are educated in the belief that when men differ in opinions, both sides ought equally to have the advantage of being heard by the public, and then when truth and error have fairplay the former is always the overmatch for the latter."

Some 200 years have passed since then. Franklin's goal should have been realized by now. Sagas and crackpots have had their opportunity to be pamphleteers, and truth should long ago have put error to rout.

How is it, then, that there is still doubt as to which ideology will bury which?

Perhaps it is because some people learn the mechanics of reading without ever mastering the art of reading with discernment.

Many phases of communications are automatic now. A man sits in New York and operates a machine that sets type automatically in Washington. Another man touches a button that activates an information retrieval system that automatically reproduces what was printed 10 years before. Electric eyes adjust high-speed presses automatically. But none of these technological marvels becomes meaningful until human thought is brought to bear upon the end product. And thinking has not yet been automated.

It is not enough to read, and to expose ourselves to both truth and error. We must read with active and inquiring minds, alert to the blandishments of error, zealous in our pursuit of truth. We must read with the verve and intentness of a bloodhound following a scent.

Understanding does not come to a man; he attains it by going after it. And I suspect that if we could speed up our understanding as much as we have speeded up our reading pace of late, we'd all be a lot happier.

## Elks' Declaration of American Principles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Tad Wilcher, chairman of the Know Your America Week program for the Arlington-Fairfax Lodge No. 2188, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, has called to my attention a declaration of American principles of the Elks.

Because its message will be of interest to all Members and citizens, under unanimous consent, I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

A DECLARATION OF AMERICAN PRINCIPLES OF THE BENEVOLENT AND PROTECTIVE ORDER OF ELKS

The Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks is dedicated to the welfare of the United States of America. One of our order's purposes is to quicken the spirit of American patriotism. To that end our order has striven to advance the principles that guide our Nation, and has opposed all attacks upon them from whatever quarter.

Freedom, the historic goal of mankind, is our Nation's basic principle. Freedom has been under steady attack by international communism for many years. Now, freedom and communism are engaged in a struggle for survival. This struggle is not of our choosing but has been forced upon us. Free men have no choice but to accept the challenge.

The Americanism Committee of the Grand Lodge of Elks believes that freedom too long has stood on the defensive. The time has come for us who believe in freedom to take the initiative; fight for what we believe in and stand against those who are against us until freedom has defeated those who would destroy it. To rely on military power alone in this ideological struggle would be illusory and fatal. Our paramount necessity is internal strength which can come only from unity of understanding and purpose and a willingness to place our Nation's safety and welfare above personal interest.

Appealing, as did our Founding Fathers, to the Supreme Judge of the World for the rectitude of our intentions, we submit to our brothers this declaration of American principles on which we shall challenge the enemies of freedom, and to which we invite our fellow citizens to subscribe:

1. Moral values are the basis of our society, and the responsibility of each citizen to live by these moral values is fundamental to the welfare and progress of our society. These moral values include honesty of word, deed and purpose; brotherly love that requires us to be fair with our followmen and just in our relations with them; faithful performance of our labor in every honorable calling; and a recognition that each of us has the duty to contribute to the best of his ability to the advancement of the general welfare.

2. Freedom has made America. Not just political freedom, but the whole environment of freedom is responsible for the tremendous progress of our Nation since its revolutionary birth in 1776. Freedom encourages initiative, experiment, invention, enterprise. Freedom lets citizens choose their work, encourages individuals to discover their talents and make the most of them. In consequence we have a standard of living higher than any nation has enjoyed, a material abundance more widely shared among all our people than ever before, and a high level of intellectual and cultural attainment. Every citizen is the beneficiary of the freedom that has unleashed the abilities of the American people and provided the incentive for their maximum use.

3. Inherent in the American concept of freedom is the integrity of the individual. Individualism makes each person primarily responsible for himself, his welfare, his success or failure. Freedom lays upon each person the individual responsibility and duty of citizenship. A free society will emphasize individualism and individual responsibility as the sure way to produce democratic leadership and preserve freedom.

4. Self-government presupposes the duty of every citizen to obey the established government and to employ only those lawful methods of reason and persuasion that are open to all of us to achieve political action. It follows that government by the majority must be reasonable in the exercise of its authority and protect the rights and interests of the minority.

5. Our ability to change our institutions and practices, through orderly process of law, to accommodate to changing needs has helped our Nation to develop, as it will in the future. All proposals for change in our institutions should be weighed carefully by all citizens to determine whether such change will reduce or add to our freedom. Our goal should be more freedom, not less. We must guard against the growth of governmental power through surrender of civil right and individual freedom for contemporary gain at the expense of future generations.

6. The tendency of groups to seek preferential treatment from government breeds rivalries dangerous to political stability, is harmful to genuine economic growth and leads to fragmentation of society rather than to unity and strength. All groups of citizens ought to measure political and economic proposals advanced in their own interest against their effect on the whole Nation.

7. We believe that the time has come when all citizens who believe in these principles should speak up for them, and set an example by applying them fully in their daily lives. We urge those in positions of leadership and influence—clergymen, educators, business executives, holders of public office, leaders of labor, intellectuals, editors, radio and television producers, motion picture producers and all others—to assume a greater responsibility for the wider understanding of these principles and their practical application in the day-to-day lives of the people.

## Inaugural Address by Gov. William W. Scranton, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Tuesday, January 22, 1963*

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, last week I participated in the ceremonies in which the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania inaugurated a new Governor. William W. Scranton, until recently a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, was sworn in at noon on January 15 at the Farm Show Arena in Harrisburg.

The new Governor then delivered an inaugural address that was deeply moving in its simple eloquence. He spoke to all of us in urging that we look to the past for inspiration in doing what needs to be done. And he spoke for all of us in expressing the hope that we may use our latent resources, imagination, fortitude, and faith to make a better life for all our people.

Since others in the Congress will want to read this address, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF WILLIAM W. SCRANTON OF PENNSYLVANIA

My fellow Pennsylvanians, nearly 300 years ago a God-fearing man carved the first bits of civilization out of the land that lay west of the Delaware.

His name was William Penn. He had an idea. It took root in our soil. His idea was that men and women are resourceful and imaginative. He believed that, given a chance, they could turn back a wilderness, chisel out a monument to human dignity, and live in peace and prosperity.

In an age rife with human hatred, with religious bigotry, with political persecution, he had the wisdom, and the courage, to launch a holy experiment. He made Pennsylvania the bastion of freedom—the temple of tolerance, the showcase of economic enterprise. He believed freedom is more than a cliche. He believed courage is more than a slogan. He believed human will power more than a match for all the obstacles of nature or economics. He believed human ingenuity capable of solving human problems. He believed indifference and despair can be put to rout by human hope.

But, most of all he believed in himself, he believed in his fellow men, he believed in Pennsylvania.

That was three centuries ago.

Three months ago I was campaigning through a Pennsylvania town. The day was dreary. A cold rain had drizzled down all morning.

A young man with tired eyes, a sad voice, and a scared handshake told me: "Pennsylvania is no place for me."

And, a day later, I campaigned through a sun-drenched suburb. Other people with other, quite different, problems.

Another young man, this one with a kind of "I'm going places" look about him grasped my hand. He looked me in the eye. He said: "I can't for the life of me figure out why anybody would want to be Governor of this State."

And he explained, "Pennsylvania is going nowhere."

That was 3 months ago.

Three days ago I pondered what to say on the day that I became Governor of this State.

I thought of William Penn 300 years ago. But I remembered the young man of 3 months ago.

With this memory the vim and vigor of the campaign seemed to sour. The flush of election victory paled. The brave hopes of just yesterday seemed puny. The awful responsibility seemed to dwarf the high honor of the office I was about to assume.

But then more of Pennsylvania came to mind. More of what we have been taught and know of Pennsylvania. More of her heritage. More of her people, and their pride and their faith, the hands I had clasped, the warmth of their welcome.

I remembered the face of the woman. Woman of a town blasted by industrial migration. Plants closed. Gates locked. Menfolk idle. I remembered the courage in the face of the woman.

I remembered the eyes of the man. Man out of work. Tiny worry lines around those eyes. The haunting fear that self-respect might flee, but even stronger, the challenge: "Give me a chance, and you'll see what I can do." I remembered the hope in the eyes of the man.

I remembered the hands of the farmer. A sower of seeds. A cultivator of life. A man close to God. Hands flicked with soil, so the tan of the skin seemed almost one with the tan of the earth. Hands that make things grow. I remembered the pride of those hands.

I remembered the arms that swung a lunch pail. Skilled arms. Strong sinews. A cadence to his walk that said: "I do a day's work. I do it well." Perhaps the proudest boast of man. I remembered the fresh, pungent smell of independence.

I remembered the frown of the young college student. Inquisitive. Prove it or I won't believe it. Why can't Pennsylvania move ahead? Who says my only opportunities lies elsewhere? Is it wrong to care? What are you going to do about it? Yes, I remembered the anxious student.

And, I remembered the brow of a businessman. Furrowed? Yes, but perhaps even more accurately, concerned "I have a duty here. A role to perform. I want Pennsylvania to climb to the top. I'm busy and it's easy to find excuses, but point the way and I'll do my share." Yes, I remember the concern, the willingness, in that face.

And, suddenly, I knew that Pennsylvania today is not really very different than the Pennsylvania of three centuries ago.

Yes, the challenges wear different faces. Problems assume different guises. But truly, we hold the same trump cards.

Resourcefulness, imagination, fortitude. And one more—faith.

The Pennsylvania that responded to the 17th century promise of William Penn's Holy experiment.

The Pennsylvania that nurtured an 18th century Ben Franklin and became the Cradle of Liberty.

The Pennsylvania that was strengthened by a 19th century influx of brave, stout hearts from the Old World.

The Pennsylvania that in the 20th century has remained basically strong and vital, despite a buffeting from history's greatest technological revolution.

That Pennsylvania—don't tell me that Pennsylvania can't lick its problems, because I know it can.

We still have the same God-given natural resources, the same advantages for commerce and industry, the same progressive spirit that brought us greatness in other years, in other ages.

But, these things must be tapped. Resources and advantages and spirit must be put to work. Human courage and human hope must drive the motors of human effort and human toil.

Some of Pennsylvania's problems can be solved soon, others can only be solved in time. But nothing will happen, nothing will move, unless the labor begins today.

The State government has an obvious and vital role in that labor. As a Pennsylvanian, no one can convince me that our State is incapable of that labor. No one can convince me that other States and other governments are more capable.

Of course, there are those who would prefer to dwell more on our fears than on our hopes.

There are those who would prefer to curse the darkness, rather than light a candle. Blame the past, rather than work to assure the future.

There are those who would prefer to gossip of yesterday's divisions, rather than work on today's need for unity.

Show me a Democrat who was wrong or shortsighted, I will show you a Republican who was. And vice versa.

Show me a businessman who was selfish, I will show you a labor leader who was. And vice versa.

Show me a citizen in Pennsylvania who has suffered by someone's lack of concern, and I will show you another citizen who has caused suffering by his lack of concern.

But let us hope that in the showing, both you and I will grow wiser and learn that today's opportunities are far more important than yesterday's mistakes.

With these opportunities, Pennsylvania is on the march. Toward greatness for herself. Toward progress, for her people.

Our Commonwealth has the resources, the human strength, the get up and go from which greatness is made. There is work to do, lots of it, but Pennsylvanians have never shirked from that prospect.

In both the executive branch and in the legislature, all of us must vow today to do our part to bring about a new era in Pennsylvania progress. We must have the wisdom to keep what should be kept; the courage to change what should be changed.

With the help of God let us embrace the challenge, let us welcome the labor.

Let us stand tall—as Pennsylvanians.

Let us walk proudly—as Pennsylvanians.

## Comparison of Budget Deficits Under Eisenhower and Kennedy Administrations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to insert my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose a copy of a letter which I have addressed to Mr. Walter Scott, columnist for Parade magazine, and to the president and publisher, Mr. Arthur H. Motley.

I think that particularly in the context of today's events, it is essential that the American public not be hoodwinked into believing that there is anything like the comparison between the fiscal policies pursued under the Eisenhower ad-

ministration and the squandermania which is now the fixed policy of the Kennedy administration.

Mind you, Mr. Speaker, by way of comparison, during the last 3 years of the Eisenhower administration, not counting the fiscal year 1961 which was a transitional fiscal year under both Presidents, the Eisenhower administration had a total of $257.6 billion of revenue at its disposal and during this period incurred a net overall deficit of some $12.9 billion.

However, during a like period; namely, the 3 complete fiscal years under the Kennedy administration, the Kennedy administration will have had 25 percent more to spend than Eisenhower—a total of $322.3 billion, but yet with more money to spend the figures reflect a net deficit of some $27 billion for the Kennedy administration.

Mr. Speaker, my letter to Parade magazine follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D.C., January 21, 1963.*

Mr. WALTER SCOTT,
*Parade Publications,*
*New York, N.Y.*

DEAR MR. SCOTT: As usual, I read your column, "Personality Parade," which appeared in the Washington Post on January 20, 1963. The introduction to your column states that it is for readers who want the facts and want to spike rumors. It is now apparent to me that your column is more than that. It has apparently become a vehicle for those who are trying to justify the spendthrift policies of the Kennedy administration.

You published a question in the issue to which I refer from a Mr. Harrison Cutler, who asked for a comparison of the budget deficit under Kennedy and Eisenhower and then said, "Take a year like 1959." One would have to be completely naive not to assume that the author of this question knew the answer before he even asked for it, for it has been widely publicized that 1959 was the year of the largest peacetime deficit in our Nation's history. However, it should be pointed out that we were in the depths of a recession and it was because of the curtailment of Government revenues that this extraordinary deficit occurred. On the other hand, the Kennedy administration in a period which they proudly claim is one of the most prosperous in our history will show us a deficit of more than $8 billion in fiscal 1963 and they are already predicting a budget deficit of $11.9 billion for the fiscal year not yet begun. You might also inform Mr. Cutler that the Kennedy administration, during the 3 fiscal years for which it has been responsible, has achieved or will achieve budget deficits approximating $27 billion. During the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration, budget deficits totaled $23 billion.

To conclude, I certainly hate to see your column used for the very obvious purpose that it was used when you published the question by Mr. Cutler. We who constitute the loyal opposition have enough trouble already with the managed news policies of this administration. We therefore sincerely hope that editors and columnists like yourself will not become the foils of those who blandly justify anything and everything that this administration has done.

Very truly yours,

JOHN B. ANDERSON,
*Member of Congress.*

## Tribute to Mrs. C. L. Blanton, Sr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EDWARD V. LONG
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Tuesday, January 22, 1963*

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, a grand and inspiring lady—Mrs. C. L. Blanton, Sr.—whose life and works have helped shape the history of Missouri, was the special center of attention in Sikeston, Mo., last night, when scores of friends and relatives gathered to join with her in celebrating her 91st birthday.

Born in Tennessee just after the close of the Civil War, she has been a Missourian by choice since near the turn of the century. For 35 years, she and her husband, Col. C. L. Blanton, Sr., worked shoulder to shoulder in publishing the Sikeston (Mo.) Standard. Although this wonderful relationship ended with Colonel Blanton's death in 1948, Mrs. Blanton remained active in the newspaper, and is today still president of the Sikeston Publishing Co.

Mr. President, I would like to incorporate as part of my remarks, an article from the January 19 edition of the Daily Sikeston Standard, which traces the full and active life of this amazing lady, of whom it is said: "To her, each new year is another memory and another opportunity to be doing something."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MRS. C. L. BLANTON, SR., TO CELEBRATE 91ST BIRTHDAY AT DINNER MONDAY EVENING

Mrs. C. L. Blanton, Sr., of 305 Tanner Street, widow of the late Col. C. L. Blanton, Sr., editor and publisher of the Sikeston Standard from 1913 until his death in 1948, will be celebrating her 91st birthday Monday, January 21, not looking a day older than she did last year.

Mrs. Blanton's many friends here and at many points in the United States will join her children, grandchildren, and great granchildren in wishing her a most happy birthday.

Mrs. Blanton, one of Sikeston's most honored and certainly most beloved citizens, does not spend her days being idle and dreaming. She, unlike some to whom the passing years seem to age them and dull their faculties and are content to just sit, takes an active part in several activities. To her, each new year is another memory and another opportunity to be doing something.

Mrs. Blanton is the only surviving member of the group of women who organized the Woman's Club years ago who is still active. She attends most of the meetings and takes a lively interest in its activities.

She is a faithful communicant of the St. Francis Xavier Catholic Church and also of its Ladies Altar Society and the Catholic Ladies Canasta Club.

Mrs. Blanton was born Mary Agnes Cullen, January 21, 1872, in Nashville, Tenn., daughter of the late James F. and Mary Thompson Cullen. She moved with her family to Hot Springs, Ark., where her father operated a hotel until the great fire of 1876 wiped out most of the town.

When that happened three of the children—Mrs. Blanton, and a sister and brother—were sent back to Nashville to go to school and the rest of the family followed shortly after. In 1882 the Cullens moved to Washington, D.C., where Mr. Cullen was employed in the War Department.

On September 17, 1890, Mary Agnes married Charles L. Blanton, then working for his father, Benjamin Franklin Blanton, on the Monroe County Appeal at Paris, Mo., which the elder Blanton had established in 1865 immediately following his discharge from the Confederate Army.

In 1892, Mr. and Mrs. C. L. Blanton, with their first son, Harry, moved to Washington, D.C., where Mr. Blanton was employed by the Government. But, in 1909, they returned to Paris, Mo., where Colonel Blanton worked on the Appeal until 1913 when he came to Sikeston and bought the Sikeston Standard from the Naeter brothers and published it until his death in 1948.

Mrs. Blanton took over the task of handling the business affairs of the paper while her husband gained fame as a fearless editor and known far and wide for his famous "Polecat Column."

With the organization of the Sikeston Publishing Co. to continue the publication of the paper, now the Daily Sikeston Standard, the acquisition of the Sikeston Herald and the Scott County Democrat, Mrs. Blanton became president of the Sikeston Publishing Co., a position she still occupies.

During 58 years of marriage, Colonel and Mrs. Blanton became the parents of eight children. Four of the children are expected to attend a dinner to be given in Mrs. Blanton's honor at the Rustic Rock Inn, Monday evening. Host and hostess for the dinner will be Col. and Mrs. C. L. Blanton, Jr. Others who are expected are Mr. and Mrs. Harry Blanton, Mr. and Mrs. David Blanton, and Mr. and Mrs. N. C. Watkins of Benton (Mary Blanton).

Other children include Edna, now Mrs. Edna M. Payne of Arlington, Va.; Catherine, now Mrs. J. O'C. Roberts, Washington, D.C.; Milton W. Blanton of Atlanta, Ga.; and James Benjamin Blanton of Dallas, Tex.

Mrs. Blanton has 22 grandchildren and 52 great grandchildren.

Although many of her immediate family and many, many friends will not be able to attend to give their best wishes in person, there will be many messages from the absentees who will join all Sikeston in wishing one of its most respected citizens a happy birthday.

## Pensions and Employee Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, late last year I had the opportunity of addressing the American Pension Conference in its meeting in New York. At that time I reviewed the work of the 87th Congress in the field of legislative activity in this important area of interest and prospects for further developments in the 88th Congress. I am placing this speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to indicate the ways in which I believe we can move forward and improve legis-

lation in this area by a better understanding of the economic and political philosophy which lies behind the laws and proposals on pension and employee benefit programs.

The speech follows:

PENDING LEGISLATION IN THE PENSION AND EMPLOYEE BENEFIT AREA

(By Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri)

I am going to renege somewhat on the title of my address. Actually, there is no pending legislation on any subject once a Congress has adjourned its 2d session sine die, as the 87th Congress finally did on October 13, 1962. However, I shall discuss what legislation might be introduced in the 88th Congress, and I shall refer to four measures passed by the 87th Congress which will have considerable influence in the future on pension and employee benefits. Essentially, however, I would like to discuss some of the economic and political philosophy behind legislation in this area of pension and employee benefits.

The bill passed by the 87th Congress which dealt most directly with pension and employee benefits was the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act. After a rough road it finally passed the Congress in March of 1962. I am hopeful that those responsible for imposing additional regulations on the pension trustees will bear in mind the primary objectives of pension plans and not burden them with undue costs and strangling redtape. Frankly, I was opposed to this act because I thought the record was quite clear that there had been little abuse and that present law was available to take care of what abuse might exist. On the other hand, we are talking about $50 billion of investment and this fund will continue to increase with great rapidity for many years to come. A great trust has been imposed upon those charged with the care of these funds and, because the Federal Government has given tax-exempt status to payments into these funds the Government has a proper concern to see that the trust is not abused.

I authored a bill which was signed by the President after the Congress adjourned which also directly affects pension funds. My bill, unlike the previous bill, liberalizes rather than restricts pension funds. It permits funds to be accumulated for health benefits and to be included in pension plans without endangering their tax-exempt status, provided such funds are accounted for separately. The Curtis bill, after being passed out of the Ways and Means Committee unanimously, almost met an untimely death because it was heralded publicly by some of the promoters of the King-Anderson bill, which proposed to utilize the Federal social security system to pay for limited medical costs of the aged social security beneficiaries, as legislation in lieu of King-Anderson. Well, there is no question that the Curtis bill will help to alleviate whatever problem exists in older people meeting their medical costs and, to that extent, it cuts down on the political pressures that are, or might be, built up for King-Anderson-type legislation, but it was designed for a positive purpose, not a negative purpose.

I was able to divert the force of this oblique attack, only to run into problems from the promoters of H.R. 10, the Keogh bill, who were reluctant to give further latitude to corporate pension plans until something had been done for the self-employed and professional groups to bring about an equalization. I was in a vulnerable position because, although I was a strong supporter of the equalization principles embodied in the Keogh bill, as far back as the days when it was the Reed-Keogh bill, each time the issue came before the House those in charge of managing it brought it out unbudgeted. It frequently was scheduled as the first budget busting bill. As a member of the economy bloc, I was not about to bust the budget and, accordingly, I have voted against H.R. 10 in the past on several occasions. However, I was able to persuade the zealots behind the Keogh bill that the budget having been long since badly busted I was not going to stand in the way of the progress of the Keogh bill on these grounds at the tail end of the Congress. Even with these opponents satisfied, the Curtis bill ran into further difficulties. At the end of this last session of Congress I was trying to make a strong stand—largely effective, I am happy to state—against the Senate placing nongermane amendments on the House passed revenue bills. This resulted in the word being passed back to me that certain powerful Senators would provide a dire fate for the Curtis bill unless I desisted. My response was, "Then woe is me, and woe is my bill, but I will not alter my position." Incidentally, the Curtis bill remained the subject under discussion on the Senate floor for many days as we moved toward adjournment. Indeed, it may have still remained the subject on the Senate floor when the Senate finally adjourned. I have not checked to see. However, the substance of the Curtis bill was tacked on as a nongermane amendment on another House bill which passed and was sent to the President for signature. So, in this oblique fashion, it became law. I suppose this fine bit of irony was employed to teach me not to insist so strongly on the constitutional prerogatives of the House of Representatives. If so, it has been wasted. I am a humorless man.

H.R. 10 became law, as you know. However, it has been so watered down that I am watching with considerable interest to see the extent to which it is going to be used. However, the principle has now been established in the law, and I believe it is quite probable that it will be liberalized in the next session of Congress. Certainly, it will be liberalized in ensuing sessions.

Three pieces of legislation passed the last Congress which should have great impact in the area of employee benefits. The tragedy is that these three new programs are redundant and conflicting, to some degree, with each other. They have not been carefully coordinated with the existing programs established in the Federal-State unemployment insurance system. I am referring to the new laws in respect to employee training and retraining. The act which deals with the subject directly is the Manpower Training Act of 1962. This act, in my judgment, has been long needed and too long in coming. Its primary feature requires the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare to report back to the Congress within less than a year the progress made in identifying the problems with concrete recommendations of what can and should be done. Only until we receive these reports will sizable sums of money be spent, but it is my prediction that the reports will demonstrate that it is ideas rather than money which are primarily needed.

The two acts having reduntant provisions which will complicate and endanger the proper development of the Manpower Training Act are the Depressed Areas Act, passed in March of 1961, and the Trade Expansion Act, passed in October 1962. However, the Depressed Areas Act fortunately only has a limited ability to damage retraining and the unemployment insurance programs, because it gives only a lick and a promise to retraining and sets its sights primarily on public works spending to solve unemployment. It is a shame to waste money so futilely on public works in the vain hope that this kind of pump priming will solve unemployment but, at least the damage that the Depressed Areas Act can cause is limited mostly to this kind of unthinking extravagance. I wish I could say the same about the trade adjustment provisions of the Trade Expansion Act. Regretably, this act can create real mischief for both the unemployment insurance programs and the Manpower Training Act. There are real incentives in these provisions to try to establish that one's unemployment came as the result of foreign competition. I would hate to have to administer laws which set up different benefits to unemployed people based, not on the needs or future of the unemployed person, but rather, on what caused his unemployment. What difference does it make in the remedy of what was the cause?

It is my own judgment that we should do a much more effective job of getting manpower training into the Federal-State unemployment insurance system. For example, I have urged that instead of a worker going off unemployment insurance if he is being trained for a skill in demand to replace the obsolete skill he possesses, he should go off unemployment insurance if he does not train or retrain for a skill in demand. Less than 20 States have seen the wisdom of this approach, and there has been little encouragement at the Federal level for the States to take this approach. Furthermore, the States should encourage the employers who will get into this business of retraining for the new skills in demand to replace obsolete skills by giving them credit in experience ratings in the unemployment taxes and direct payments for part of the cost of retraining, if the business finds it is not going to be able to employ the worker in the skill for which he is being retrained.

Perhaps I should explain more clearly what I am talking about. An employer contemplates buying a new set of machinery which will replace, say, 100 workers. He reviews his own demand for skills to see if he can use these employees in other jobs in his employ, but finds that this is impractical. On the other hand, he has, in most cases, considerable flexibility at his command because he knows some months ahead of time what employees and how many will be laid off and that he cannot employ them in other capacities. During this terminal period it is frequently feasible to start training programs for these men in skills which are in demand by other employers. It is not reasonable to expect him to undergo the cost of retraining these employees for skills he will never utilize, but it could be made economically feasible if he received (a) credit on his experience rating for unemployment tax and (b) some of the actual cost for doing the retraining at his plant.

I might state that a great deal of understanding and cooperation is needed on the part of the labor unions to make this kind of forward looking program work. The unfilled jobs in demand are frequently in a field outside the original union's jurisdiction. The union leader is anxious to retain the employee as a dues-paying member in his union, so he encourages featherbedding or starts talking about splitting the work remaining among the same number of employees by advocating a 30-hour week.

While on the subject of unemployment insurance, I want to point out that there is active promotion going on by those who seek to eliminate the present Federal-State system and substitute in its stead a Federal system of uniform Federal standards. This might well become one of the major issues in the 88th Congress. I think the present unemployment system is excellent and only needs modification, not radical change. Aside from the modification I have mentioned of placing a new and greater emphasis on retraining, I would like to see other States follow California's example of

triggering into the system extended periods of benefit payments during the cycles of high unemployment. This is good insurance and good social economics, because it takes the energetic employee between jobs somewhat longer to get relocated in a new job during periods of high unemployment than in the three other periods of the economic cycle * * * the period of low unemployment and the two transition periods from low to high and high to low.

Essentially, we must preserve the unemployment system as an insurance system in which the premiums paid relate to the benefits paid. To have a good insurance system, we must have the tax premiums paid based upon experience rating. It is noteworthy that the attack against the present unemployment system by those who want Federal standards is directed against experience rating. The great danger arises from allowing the unemployment insurance program to be confused with welfare programs. Most of the arguments advanced attacking the unemployment insurance program are based upon arguments that relate to welfare programs.

However, one of the important ways to preserve a good unemployment insurance program is to be certain that it is backstopped by, but not confused with, a good welfare program. Employers themselves often think of unemployment insurance as welfare. They are wrong for two reasons. They support, instead of contest, the basic thesis of those who wish to convert it into a welfare program. They don't keep their eyes on those programs which really are welfare programs and take an interest as taxpayers, more than employers, in being certain that the welfare programs are adequate.

To maintain politically the position that I take, I must be able to say with truth that when unemployment insurance benefits run out we are not talking about leaving a worker and his family destitute. We are only talking about the system under which he derives his income, insurance, or welfare. So, in the last Congress we modified and, I believe, strengthened the welfare programs under the Social Security Act and so strengthened the unemployment insurance program. In the true sense of the word we liberalized these essentially illiberal programs by giving the States and local governmental units more authority in setting up their ideas of what welfare programs they wished and forbade the Federal officials from interfering with these local decisions.

The next Congress will undoubtedly see further pressure to extend the social insurance aspect of the Social Security Act to include payments for some health costs for the aged. I see two basic errors in so doing. One, this proposal radically alters the theory of social insurance which is an advancement over old-age assistance and previous welfare programs.

Parenthetically, I must stress that social insurance is not true insurance in the sense that the unemployment insurance program is or in the sense of private insurance. Social insurance does not relate benefits paid to the individual to the premiums paid in taxes by or in behalf of the individual. Social insurance is not fully funded. Social insurance is really an attempt to make welfare more like true insurance. To this extent, I think it is good, provided it is not done deceitfully. I must say there is much deceit, intentional or otherwise, in our social insurance program under the Social Security Act. The true advancement of social insurance over old age assistance was the fact that cash was given to the beneficiary, unbudgeted by a governmental bureau. The administration proposals to add health benefits under the social insurance title of the Social Security Act do not provide for cash payments to the beneficiary. Instead, it provides a budget for a limited number of health costs and requires that the Federal Social Security Administration enter into contracts with the vendors of health services in respect to their fees and the kind of health services they may provide for the older person. Under the King-Anderson bill the bundle of health service amounts to less than 25 percent of the average health costs an older person experiences. If the old people on social insurance pensions need more cash to meet their total budget, why not give them more cash, not give them cash for all items but one and budget them on this one item—health costs?

The second basic error of the King-Anderson approach is that it seeks to establish a system of prepaid health costs for the future. For the present, all people over 65 are given the benefits without paying a cent into the program. In other words, the political appeal for the social insurance health program is not insurance at all, social or otherwise, but welfare. The insurance aspect, such as it is, is only in the future.

Prepaid noncancelable health insurance is the proper and ultimate answer to the cost problem of the aged for health care. This is the essence of the Curtis bill. It permits company pension plans to move into the field of prepaid health insurance. It is the coming thing in private health insurance, group or individual policies. Why then do I regard it an error for government to get into prepaid health insurance? Here is the reason. Any insurance system which provides prepayment requires creating a fund and the longer the period of benefits is from the payments, the greater the fund. In order to make the costs of any prepayment program as low as possible, the fund must be wisely and productively invested. Government can only invest in sterile and low return investment, Government bonds—bonds which were sold to finance in the main military and related expenditures, not expenditures on economic growth. On the other hand, private pension plans, private prepayment insurance programs can and do invest their funds in the productive and growing economy—into plants, into machinery, into training manpower. These funds bring true economic return on the investment. The earnings are greater than those derived from Government bonds. It is the wise investment of these funds which make prepaid health insurance economically feasible and keep the premiums within the budget of the average American family. Furthermore, there is some opportunity through judicious equity investments to hedge against inflation.

## Texas Jewish Post Calls for Vital Community Center in Fort Worth, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Tuesday, January 22, 1963*

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a recent page 1 column in the Texas Jewish Post edition of Thursday, January 10, 1963, was written in support of a community center in Fort Worth, Tex.

The report cited the success and value of a center program in Dallas, and in many other parts of the world. Since this article speaks eloquently of the community need as well as the high civic value of such a center, which has worldwide significance, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One of the most needed and progressive types of community organizations is the Jewish Community Center. This has been recognized by community leaders in cities all over the world.

Dallas' center program is vibrant and has achieved marked success with the development of its center building and facilities in the ever expanding northern end of town.

Fort Worth Jewish leaders and many members of the community have been pressing for the construction of a center building for several years now. Many interested community members have pledged funds for this building and the Dan Danciger Foundation has pledged the considerable part of the cost for the completion of this project.

A center building in Fort Worth is within view.

In keeping with the development of a center program, the Dan Danciger Community Center Association has activated a program that has included activities for nearly all the segments of the community. For this they are to be complimented.

However, compliments are not enough.

What we'd like to see start—and soon—is a membership campaign to enlist every family who wishes to become a participant in the center's activities.

This can and should be on a nominal basis to enlist all who can possibly benefit from the center, and others who certainly can appreciate the high civic values and purpose behind a vibrant center program.

Recently, in time for Chanukah, the new Jewish Community Center of Goteborg, Sweden, was dedicated as "a symbol of the rebuilding of the Jewish community institutions of Europe which were destroyed during the Nazi years."

Herbert Katzki, assistant director-general of the joint distribution committee, made these remarks to a large audience which included M. R. Henriques, president of the Jewish community of Goteborg, and Julius Huttner, chairman of the Goteborg Center's Building Committee.

There were many others in the audience, however.

Approximately half of the 1,500 Jews now living in Goteborg were victims of the Nazis. And, since Sweden was not occupied by Hitler's madmen, these victims of Hitlerism were lucky to have found refuge in Goteborg.

Out of the 13,000 Jews in Sweden today, half came following World War II.

And, oh, the tales they could recite.

The center in Goteborg was built through the aid of JDC and the Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany. But the highlight of the story is that the Jewish community of Goteborg provided most of the funds.

Centers have been built in Athens, Brussels, Berlin, Lyons, Amsterdam, Helsinki, Barcelona, and other cities in Western Europe.

Hundreds of centers have been built in the United States.

Fort Worth will soon have its chance.

Let's join ranks and make certain that the Danciger Jewish Community Center will be a vital, living utility for all the citizens of this wonderful city.

We can do it.

We will.

## Address by the Vice President Before Democratic Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Tuesday, January 22, 1963*

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, last Saturday, January 19, I was privileged to attend a luncheon at the Sheraton-Park Hotel where the Vice President spoke.

As always, LYNDON JOHNSON captivated and inspired his audience. He outlined for a large group of Democrats from all corners of the United States the principles upon which the Democratic Party was founded, and then he showed how these principles have been practically applied through the years in successful and forward-looking foreign and domestic programs.

Mr. President, I believe the Vice President's excellent address will be of great interest to the Members of the Senate and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON AT THE DEMOCRATIC LUNCHEON, SHERATON-PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 19, 1963

I have never ceased to be amazed by the dedication of the loyal Democratic Party workers who give so freely of their time and their energies to a cause. To me, this is one of the true strengths of a free people.

You have put aside your affairs and traveled hundreds, and even thousands, of miles to strengthen the party. And you have done so only because you believe in goals which are over and beyond your own, individual interests.

A democratic form of government can exist in the modern world only if people organize themselves to make a point of view effective. Without that organization, government becomes the exclusive province of a small group of officials who have succeeded by one means or another in capturing power. And government that is exclusive is exclusive of the people.

There is a cynical view which holds that politics is the art of organizing to seize power. In our country, I believe, it is the art of organizing to achieve goals that will serve the people.

You and I have chosen the Democratic Party because we have faith in its dreams and aspirations. And, as we close out the books on the first 2 years of a Democratic administration, I feel we can conclude that our faith has been justified under the leadership of John F. Kennedy.

President Kennedy likes to trace our party's beginning back to 1791, when Thomas Jefferson and James Monroe went from Virginia to New England on what they called a "botanizing excursion." The seeds they planted on that trip blossomed almost immediately and the plant still bears fresh fruit every year in the form of new leaders, new ideas, new accomplishments, and new victories.

We are here as members of the world's third oldest political party—and we were a concern when the English Whigs and Tories were merely the political arm of a few established families.

I never tire of telling people why I think we have remained in good shape for so many years. There is a lesson in this great political success story, and the better we remember it, the more effective we will be when we leave Washington and return to our homes and the voters, the real source of our party's strength.

Franklin Roosevelt once said that the Democratic Party would be the major party as long as it belonged to the people. He went on to describe our party as one that believes "in the wisdom and efficacy of the great majority of the people, as distinguished from the judgment of a small minority."

"Our party," Roosevelt said, also "believes that, as new conditions arise beyond the power of men and women to meet as individuals, it becomes the duty of the Government itself to find new remedies with which to meet them."

These are principles of constant change—as man's needs are constantly changing. But they are firmly rooted in stable and fruitful soil.

To begin with, we Democrats are not an exclusive party. If this country was founded as a haven where all who believe in liberty could come, live together in harmony, and try to make their lives better, then it follows that a party which hopes to lead the country must believe in these things, too.

So we Democrats have always been the one great national political party, made up of people from all sections, all classes, all races, all religions. From the outset, we have been the party that has met the immigrant at the dock and helped him to become a citizen—just as it reached out a helping hand to the sharecropper, the workingman, the student, and the businessman.

But we knew that this was not enough. Jefferson said that the only healthy republic was one of educated citizens, each with a stake in his country's welfare. So we believe in educating each American to the utmost of his capacity. So we believe in the right of every American to have an equal chance to contribute his talent to our country.

Our foreign policy has been equally uncomplicated down through the years. We Democrats, of course, believe that in a world of aggressors our country can only remain free by remaining brave, by remaining strong. But we do not arm for conquest. We arm to maintain freedom and preserve peace.

But we also believe that the best way to have a good neighbor is to be one. This is the basis of our historic reciprocal trade policy, which encourages commerce among all the nations of the globe. It is the basis of our support of the United Nations in its painful quest for world order, and of our support of programs which help others to help themselves.

These principles, as you can see, are neither numerous nor hard to understand. But they have lasted, and our party has lasted with them.

When I entered politics, some 30-odd years ago, I found my natural home in the Democratic Party. It wasn't hard for me to join—I was born one.

I found it easy to remain in the Democratic Party because my deepest personal political principles were at home there.

I believed that it is the politician's first duty to hold his country together, to appeal to the forces that unite us, and to channel the forces that divide us into paths where a democratic solution is possible. It is our obligation to resolve issues—not to create them.

None of us will ever live to see our country perfect, just as we will never live to see ourselves perfect. But we can try—and if we leave the world a little better than we found it, and if we die with a little more understanding than we had when we were born, we are doing all right. I have found that being a Democrat has helped me to try to do both.

Our work is made easier because during the past 2 years, we have had a man in the White House who has dedicated his life to advancing the cause of freedom and social justice in every corner of our land and in every corner of the globe.

John F. Kennedy has taken the principles of the Democratic Party and has applied them to solving the world's problems.

Because our administration believes in strength, freedom is stronger everywhere in the world. We have pulled the fangs of the Cuban rattlesnake—and made it clear there were no limits to our determination to defend our security.

By calling the bluff in Cuba, we made freedom in Berlin and southeast Asia that much surer. And, where a few short years ago the Communist world was solid and united, its major preoccupation today is a bitter internal quarrel between its two most powerful leaders.

Because we believe in collective security and in being a good neighbor, we have supported intelligent trade, the Alliance for Progress, the Peace Corps, and the United Nations.

Because we believe in solving problems, we are seeking to bring our economy to full capacity, so that every American capable of holding a job or a place in college attains those goals; so that the senior citizens among us need no longer feel the crippling financial effects of lingering illness, and so that our great metropolitan areas are made livable for the overwhelming majority of Americans who reside in them.

The Democratic Party has grown in recent years because the people know it is the best vehicle for carrying out their hopes for a better world. We have gained this confidence for three reasons.

First is our history, our principles, and our present program.

Second is our willingness to work long and hard for what we believe in. We know that human needs change, and we must plan for the future. But also we know that current needs must be solved. We are trusted because we have the eyes to see what must be done and the courage to do it.

Third is the kind of people our party attracts. I mean more than the tens of millions of voters—a vast majority, by the way—who consider themselves Democrats. I mean the kind of people—the hundreds in this room and the millions of people to whom we will carry the message when we leave here—who hold our party together.

So I would like to thank you again, in behalf of the President and myself, for what you did for us in 1960; for what you did last year; and for what you will do next year to help elect the Democratic candidates for President and Vice President—whoever they might be.

We will meet again next year to choose those candidates. If the Democratic Party holds true to the country, and if we hold true to our party, we will have doubly earned the victory that will be ours.

## The 45th Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Tuesday, January 22, 1963*

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the 45th anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic is being marked today throughout the free world. Beginning in 1918 this free Republic endeavored to live in

peace and harmony with all nations. The struggle for survival lasted only 2 years as Soviet Russia overran and suppressed their freedom. The free people of the word celebrate this anniversary with the hope that the Ukrainians will again live in a free republic. The courage these enslaved people demonstrate and the struggle they wage is an inspiration for the thousands of people of other countries behind the Iron Curtain.

A strong group of outstanding Americans of Ukrainian descent has been organized for some time to help their relatives and friends achieve this goal of freedom. The North Dakota Branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., whose president is Dr. Anthony Zukowsky, a longstanding friend of mine, expresses the determination of these enslaved people who cannot make their desire for freedom known by public speech or printed papers. As a part of this anniversary celebration, Dr. Zukowsky has written an excellent letter in which he presents the history and development of the struggle experienced by the Ukrainian people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Zukowsky's letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC., STATE BRANCH OF NORTH DAKOTA,
*Bismarck, N. Dak., January 17, 1963.*

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG,
*U.S. Senator,*
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: On January 22, 1963, 45 years will have elapsed since the historical date of the proclamation of the full independence of the Ukraine. This date is one of the greatest in the modern history of the Ukrainian people, as on that day the historical right of the Ukrainian people to their freedom and national independence was again reaffirmed by the democratically elected Ukrainian Parliament—Central Rada—in their official proclamation. A year later, on January 22, 1919, the Act of Union was issued, uniting the Western Ukrainian National Republic and the Ukrainian National Republic, and establishing the united and sovereign State of the Ukraine.

The young and democratic Ukrainian National Republic was recognized by several European governments, including that of Soviet Russia. It endeavored to pursue its own course in harmony and peace with other nations, but Communist Russia, despite its solemn pledge not to interfere in internal affairs of the Ukraine, attacked the Ukrainian Republic and tried to impose the hateful Bolshevik regime upon the Ukrainian people. For almost 4 years the Ukrainian nation struggled gallantly to preserve its independence, but deprived of military, economic, and diplomatic support by the Western nations, it succumbed to the numerically superior military forces of Communist Russia. In 1920 the free Ukrainian State was destroyed and the puppet regime of the Ukrainian Socialist Republic was installed, which in 1923 became a member of the Soviet Union.

Although Moscow claims that Ukraine and other non-Russian Republics of the U.S.S.R. are free and sovereign states, and Ukraine and Byelorussia are even charter members of the United Nations, the fact is that the Ukraine is a colony of Communist Russia. Its human and economic resources are being exploited by the Kremlin for the purpose of spreading the communization of the world and subverting the once free nations, as is the case of Cuba, to which Khrushchev and his Communist chieftains had sent their missiles and other offensive weapons that had been manufactured from economic resources of the Ukraine and other captive non-Russian nations.

During the entire Soviet-Russian rule in the Ukraine, Moscow has tried every way to destroy the spirit of the Ukrainian people, by persecuting the Ukrainian churches, arresting their leaders and clergy, by forced collectivization, mass deportation, executions, inhuman and cruel genocide, and many other inhuman methods. However, all these efforts have failed dismally, for the Ukrainian people have never submitted to the alien rule of Moscow and continue to wage an incessant struggle for the recovery of their freedom and national independence. Also the Soviet Government sends special agents to kill Ukrainian leaders in the free world, as was the case of Stepan Baudera and Dr. Lev R. Rebet, whose killer was recently sentenced by the German Supreme Court in Karlsruhe to 8 years of hard labor.

Both the U.S. Congress and the President of the United States of America have recognized the plight of the Ukrainian people by respectively enacting and signing the Captive Nations Week resolution which listed the Ukraine as one of the captive nations held in enslavement and captivity by Moscow.

Americans of Ukrainian descent in our great State of North Dakota are planning to celebrate the forthcoming 45th anniversary of the Ukrainian independence on January 22, 1963, in a fitting and solemn manner. We firmly believe that you are fully aware of the importance of the Ukraine as an ally in the common struggle against Russian-Communist imperialism. Therefore, the U.S. Congress and U.S. Government can contribute greatly to keeping the spirits and hopes of the enslaved Ukrainian nation high, by approving Senate Concurrent Resolution 82 and House Resolution 718, by favoring action of persecuted Ukrainian Catholic and Orthodox churches, by creating a special House Committee on Captive Nations, and by issuing a special Shevchenko, Champion of Liberty, stamp in connection with the forthcoming Shevchenko memorial celebration in Washington, D.C., in 1964. A free and independent Ukraine is in the interests of the United States as well as the entire free world.

The entire world, including the enslaved Ukranian people, is looking toward the United States of America as the true citadel of freedom and hope for the oppressed people everywhere. Therefore the 45th anniversary of Ukrainian independence provides an appropriate occasion for the American people and the U.S. Government to demonstrate their sympathy with and understanding of the aspirations of the Ukrainian nation to freedom and independence.

Respectfully yours,
DR. ANTHONY ZUKOWSKY,
*President, U.S.C.A. State Branch of North Dakota.*

## Mrs. Sam Speir, of Texas, Honored as Outstanding Woman Leader in 4–H Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Tuesday, January 22, 1963*

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Mrs. Sam Speir, of Manchaca, Travis County, Tex., has been selected as the recipient of the Travis County 4–H and District 10 4–H Alumni Award for the outstanding woman leader of 1962.

The December 7 issue of the Austin American contained an excellent article about Mrs. Speir's meritorious work with 4–H youth. Mrs. Speir, a longtime employee of the U.S. Internal Revenue Service, exemplifies the outstanding community work being performed in Texas and throughout the Nation by employees of the Federal Government.

Although employed full time by the Internal Revenue Service, which has presented her with several sustained superior performance awards, she has given her own time to serve as a director of the Training Union of Marbridge Boys' Ranch, Travis County rural chairman for the Mothers' March for Polio for 3 years, a member of the Governor's committee on children and youth, a member of Delta Kappa Gamma, honorary society for outstanding women teachers, a Sunday School teacher and former president of the Women's Missionary Union of the Manchaca Baptist Church, and has held every office of the Travis County Home Demonstration Council. These are merely a few of the achievements of Mrs. Sam Speir.

I knew her late husband as a devoted fighter for clean government in Texas, and against the entrenched power structure which had so long misgoverned the State. I valued his advice, and especially his judgment of people, highly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Mrs. Sam Speir Gets 4–H Award" from the December 7 issue of the Austin American to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MRS. SAM SPEIR GETS 4–H AWARD

(By Mary Lou Rowland, assistant home demonstration agent)

Mrs. Sam Speir has received the Travis 4–H and District 10 4–H Alumni Award for the outstanding woman leader for 1962.

Leonora Elizabeth Stanford spent her childhood in Williamson and Burnet Counties where she was a 4–H Club girl for 4 years participating in the demonstrations and activities that were offered to 4–H Club members at that time.

4–H had a great influence on her adult life for it was the beginning of the training she needed to start her education away from home. She finished high school at the Baylor College Academy at 15 and remained in Belton to complete 2 years of college work at Mary Hardin-Baylor. With a teacher's certificate she was qualified to teach, but the State law says that a teacher must be 18 years of age. She had to wait for a couple of months for that first teaching job.

After teaching 5 years in the rural schools of Travis County, Lenora Elizabeth Stanford married Sam Speir who was with the Texas Rangers, the department of public safety, a rancher and, at the time of his death, a dairyman in Travis County.

Mrs. Speir says that hers was education in reverse. Now, the wife works and sends the husband to school, but her husband sent her to school, and it was after her marriage that she received both bachelor's and master's degrees from the University of Texas.

Thirteen years ago the Speirs became parents of a son. Sam, Junior, who is among the most active 4–H boys in the county, and

now holds the title of Mr. 4-H in Travis County.

Mrs. Speir is—

1. A director of the Training Union of Marbridge Boys' Ranch, a ranch for retarded boys in Travis County.

2. Travis County rural chairman for the first Mother's March on Polio, serving in that capacity 3 years.

3. A member of the Governor's committee on children and youth, attended the Governors' conference on children and youth. At present she is tax technician for the Internal Revenue Service and has received two cash awards for sustained superior performance in Government service. She has been with the Federal Government for 18 years.

4. Is a member of Delta Kappa Gamma honorary sorority for outstanding women teachers, whose membership is by invitation only and is limited to one-tenth of all women teachers. She taught school for 15 years.

5. Is an active member of the Manchaca Baptist Church where she has been teaching Sunday School classes, president of the Woman's Missionary Union, church pianist, and training union director and church educational director.

6. Has been a Home Demonstration Club member 30 years and has held every office in both her club and the Travis County Home Demonstration Council, has served as the county chairman of the Texas Home Demonstration Association, district director; editor of the official organ of that organization, and at the present time is State chairman of the 4-H Committee for the Texas Home Demonstration Association.

7. For many years has been active as a leader in 4-H Club work in Travis County—intermittently from 1936 to 1962. Leader in countywide public speaking, subject matter leader for home management, superintendent and judge at 4-H contests; secretary and chairman of Travis County 4-H Leaders group, and members of the 4-H County Finance Committee.

---

## LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided*, That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

## SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Lyndon B. Johnson

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*, 6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*.
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind*.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*.
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md*.
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*., The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*.
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*., Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*.
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*.
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*.
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*.
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*.
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*.
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.
Eastland, James O., *Miss*., 5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*.
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*.
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*., 5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*.
Goldwater, Barry, *Ariz*.
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*.
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*.
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa*., 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*., Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*.
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*.
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*.
Johnston, Olin D., *S.C*.
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*.
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*.
Keating, Kenneth B., *N.Y*., 1233 31st St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*., 4929 Hillbrook La.
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass*.
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*.
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*.
Long, Edward V., *Mo*.
Long, Russell B., *La*.
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*., 7426 Hampden La., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*.
McGovern, George S., *S. Dak.*
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H*.
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*, The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.
Mechem, Edwin L., *N. Mex*.
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa*., 5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*., 4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*.
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*., 122 Schotts Court NE.
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*.
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis*.
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*
Pastore, John O., *R.I*.
Pearson, James B., *Kans*.
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I*., 3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*.
Proxmire, William, *Wis*.
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*., 4608 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn*.
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*., 2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*.
Simpson, Milward L., *Wyo*.
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John, *Ala*., 4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*.
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*.
Tower, John G., *Tex*.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*
Williams, John J., *Del*.
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*.
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*., Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

## STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

*Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences*

Messrs. ——— (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case, Hickenlooper, ———, and ———.

*Committee on Agriculture and Forestry*

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston, Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan of North Carolina, Young of Ohio, Hart, McCarthy, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Cooper, and Boggs.

*Committee on Appropriations*

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Humphrey, ———, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, Case, and Javits.

*Committee on Armed Services*

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Beall, Goldwater, Case, and ———.

*Committee on Banking and Currency*

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Bennett, Beall, Tower, ———, ———, and ———.

*Committee on Commerce*

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Keating, Prouty, and ———.

*Committee on the District of Columbia*

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Hartke, ———, Beall, Prouty, and Miller.

*Committee on Finance*

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, ———, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and ———.

*Committee on Foreign Relations*

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, ———, and ———.

*Committee on Government Operations*

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Javits.

*Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs*

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Jackson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Metcalf, ———, ———, ———, Kuchel, Allott, Miller, Pearson, Jordan of Idaho, and ———.

*Committee on the Judiciary*

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston, McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, ———, Dirksen, Hruska, Keating, Fong, Scott, and ———.

*Committee on Labor and Public Welfare*

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Burdick, Pell, ———, Goldwater, Javits, Prouty, Tower, and Jordan of Idaho.

*Committee on Post Office and Civil Service*

Messrs. Johnston (chairman), Monroney, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan of North Carolina, Randolph, Carlson, Fong, and Boggs.

*Committee on Public Works*

Messrs. ——— (chairman), McNamara, Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Metcalf, ———, ———, ———, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Miller, Pearson, and ———.

*Committee on Rules and Administration*

Messrs. Mansfield (chairman), Hayden, Jordan of North Carolina, Cannon, Pell, ———, Curtis, Dirksen, and ———.

## UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Goldberg, of Illinois, 2811 Albemarle St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

## UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

*District of Columbia judicial circuit:* Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

*First judicial circuit:* Mr. Justice ———. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

*Second judicial circuit:* Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

*Third judicial circuit:* Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

*Fourth judicial circuit:* Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

*Fifth judicial circuit:* Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

*Sixth judicial circuit:* Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

*Seventh judicial circuit:* Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

*Eighth judicial circuit:* Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

*Ninth judicial circuit:* Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

*Tenth judicial circuit:* Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

# *Appendix*

## Development of Nations: A Challenge of Our Times—Address by M. J. Rathbone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, January 23, 1963*

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, last October Mr. M. J. Rathbone, president of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, delivered the Founder's Day convocation speech at Lafayette College, Easton, Pa. His address, "Development of Nations: A Challenge of Our Times," provides much food for thought.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an edited version of this talk be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today, there are new and great demands on our educational institutions. One of these is the instruction and motivation of our own people in greater numbers than ever before so that they will be equipped to deal wisely and resourcefully with the challenges and opportunities of an era of unprecedented change and danger. Another is to help provide education and training to people abroad, especially in the less developed areas, who having seen what free enterprise has achieved here, are now demanding more rapid advancement for themselves.

We in this country might assume it logical that if people in other lands are impressed by our standard of living, they would follow our political and economic system. Such unfortunately is not the case. Each nation has its own unique problems, its own heritage, its own customs.

It seems to me that the developing nations have four basic needs: First, capital for industrial development, for modernization of agriculture, and for public facilities. Second, education and training to adapt themselves to industrialized society. Third, the motivational force generated by rewards for accomplishment that can best be provided, I believe, by a free enterprise system. Fourth, a stable and fair system of government.

I think it important to realize that some of these requirements must largely be met by the developing nations on their own. The developed nations must give them all the help we can, and it must be substantial in several areas. This is a challenge. It is a challenge to all our institutions—especially to education, government, and business. This is what I want to talk about today. It is not my intention, however, to do more than underscore the importance of education and government aid. This is simply because I feel better qualified to give you my thoughts on the contributions a free and responsible business enterprise can make to the development of emerging nations.

As we assess the needs of the developing countries, one fact is inescapable. Economic growth cannot be achieved without an infusion of vast amounts of capital. Capital is needed for housing, hospitals, roads, schools, irrigation, sanitation systems, factories, shops, farm equipment, power plants, oil refineries, and all the other material things that sustain life or make for a better one. The need is staggering. For example, here in the United States, government, industry, and agriculture have invested about $9,000 per capita. In the European Common Market it is less than half that amount. What is a realistic goal for the one and a quarter billion people in the 100 countries that Paul Hoffman refers to as underdeveloped? Let's say the goal is to raise the level of development to about one-fourth of that of the European Common Market. Then the capital infusion needed is about one trillion dollars. This obviously dwarfs our U.S. aid programs of $4 billion per year.

What is the answer?

In the long term most of the capital for the development of any country must come from its own savings—private and government. Most must come from the private sector, unless, of course, it is accumulated as in the Soviet Union—by the ruthless exploitation of its people.

Outside sources of capital, while relatively small compared to the internal sources, are vital because of their germination effect on the economy. The world's requirements today for such external sources of capital are so large that governments alone cannot supply them, either as aid or loans. The result is that most nations have a pressing need for foreign private capital. This is not a new development. Private foreign investment capital has already played an important role in world development, but little recognition has been given it. In the case of the United States, private capital expenditures abroad amount to twice as much as U.S. Government economic assistance. Furthermore, it should be noted that since World War II about 40 percent of these investments have been made in the underdeveloped areas.

But private oversea investments are not without opposition. There are some in many countries who oppose it for a variety of reasons. One claim is that it leads to an unfavorable balance of payments for the host country because of the withdrawal of earnings on the investment. The opposite is true. Incoming capital usually brings with it a flow of capital equipment which would otherwise have to be paid in scarce foreign currencies or would not be available at all. The creation of local industry results in products that would otherwise have to be imported at the expense of depleting foreign exchange reserves. The withdrawal of earnings is only a small fraction of the foreign exchange cost of importing equivalent products.

Also in many cases this capital creates commodities or goods for export that directly generate foreign exchange and permit the country to meet its external obligations. This is certainly true of those investments in the extractive industries. Yet this is the area most open to attack. Countries with vast amounts of minerals or commodities have a simple choice. They can, if they wish, hoard these for local consumption within their borders, or they can develop them for export and buy in return goods and services that are directly needed to supply the wants of their people. The latter course is the only one that makes economic sense.

The alternative to private foreign investment that many countries have for the development of their industries is to provide capital from their own public funds. However, if capital comes from this source, other segments of the economy—particularly vital public works—are deprived of needed funds. It is difficult to escape a conclusion: So much capital is required that there is plenty of room for private foreign capital.

There are additional advantages to a country in promoting the use of private foreign investment.

Private industry, wherever it has competed directly with government corporations, has proven itself far more efficient. No one has yet found a satisfactory substitute for the competitive system. Those who favor socialism and the resulting state monopoly tend to overlook this fact.

Though it may sound absurd—one of the principal advantages of private investment is the opportunity to fail. When there are failures in government industrial investments, they are invariably concealed by one means or another. The result, of course, is inefficiency and higher costs. But risk by private capital is a constructive force—it drives men and corporations to strenuous efforts to succeed.

The decision to make a foreign investment by the private owner comes only after he has carefully studied all the alternatives in the light of his own experience—usually in many other countries of the world.

Private foreign investment—made on the basis of commercial consideration—has advantage in that it is free of political ties or influences and of government-to-government obligations.

These, then, are some of the more obvious advantages of private investment in developing an economy. Though governments can provide general education to their people, they are often not equipped to provide the training and business skills required to run an industrial society. It is in these latter crucial areas that private investment is making and will continue to make a contribution—perhaps the most important contribution of all.

I know from experience that international business such as the one with which I am associated has devoted much energy to the training and development of people throughout the world. We try to encourage concepts of leadership, business management, and the spirit of free enterprise. These are ingredients essential to the successful development of any nation.

Satirical comments about the "organization man" notwithstanding, the really significant features of the free enterprise system are: Management independent of political dictation and free to concentrate on economic functions, multiple sources of initiative, delegation of responsibility, encouragement of ambition, recognition of men on the basis of ability, and reward for individual accomplishments.

A basic policy of all our operating affiliates throughout the world is to provide training programs for the development of skills and abilities. Most all of our employees, at one time or another, have participated in either formal training programs or on-the-job training. These cover a wide spectrum of

activities ranging from welding, to analytical laboratory work, to operating refineries, to management. As a basis for this training, we send skilled people into a country when needed. Most of these "educators"—and I really believe they are educators—return to their homeland as soon as they have trained replacements. In a sense, we and other business have had our own "peace corps" for a number of years.

I am reminded of this because our company operates two training centers abroad that specialize in accounting, sales, engineering and business management. One is at Abingdon, England, and the other at Cali, Colombia. During the past 5 years, over 2,000 employees have attended courses there.

The outcome of such programs is reflected in the makeup of our oversea management. In 20 of our principal operating affiliates abroad, 11 of the chief executives are nationals of the countries in which these companies operate. In these same 20 companies, there are 116 full-time directors of whom 79 or almost 60 percent are nationals. In managerial positions below the directorate level in these companies, the proportion of nationals is very substantially higher and in many cases is nearly 100 percent.

Let me give you some other examples of what a foreign corporation can do to help stimulate the economy of a host country. One of our affiliates, Creole Petroleum Corp., operating in Venezuela, recognized that there was a lack of adequate investment funds for industrial and agricultural development in that country. Creole created a subsidiary company with the basic objective to help solve this problem through selected investments. This company does not make loans. Rather, it provides new risk capital for business ventures outside the oil industry, and it limits its participation to less than 50 percent ownership since its purpose is not to control but to stimulate.

Skilled management and technical people from Creole's staff are appointed to the boards of directors of the companies in which investments have been made. An important part of the job of these directors is to help the newborn company on matters of broad policy, to analyze problems correctly, and to adopt all the modern techniques of organization and management that we know.

Results, after a year's operation, have been remarkable considering that this was an entirely new field for Creole. Investments have been authorized in 16 companies, for a total of $4 million. Individual subscriptions vary from $55,000 in a mushroom growing and canning project to $660,000 in a cattle ranch, and holdings in each company range from 7 percent to 49 percent. These investments are creating direct job opportunities for about 1,260 workers, and several thousand other new jobs indirectly.

Another recent example of the ability of private investment to provide income to a nation and thus raise living standards is clearly evident in the United Kingdom of Libya. In 1955 the Libyan Government, with keen foresight, opened the country to foreign capital for the exploration of oil. I'm sure you'll believe me when I say that I could talk for hours about the hazards and risks, the adventure and romance, connected with the search for oil. But to make a long story short, oil was discovered in Libya in 1959.

What has this meant to the country? From 1955 to 1959, several thousand Libyans were hired and trained in the job of exploring for oil. Since 1959, additional thousands have been employed in the construction and operation of facilities required to produce, transport, refine, and ship the oil.

Business and residential building have increased, schools have been constructed, roads built, and a myriad of businesses started to provide the oil industry with services and materials required to carry out its work in continued search for and production of oil. The per capita income of the Libyan nation has nearly doubled since the country was opened to oil exploration. During the last 2 years the national budget has more than doubled.

Training programs have been set up to teach the skills required in operation and maintenance of machinery, basic mathematics, and laboratory techniques. Some of the employees with high school and university education have been provided scholarships to specialize in law, employee relations, business administration, geology, and engineering. From this latter group will come candidates for management.

Other companies as well as the oil industry have stimulated similar activities the world over. We have all learned, however, that the process of developing economic and human resources tends to be lengthy and fraught with problems. One such problem, for instance, concerns the training of our own foreign nationals, many of whom, once they attain proficiency, leave us to join other enterprises or government service. This creates momentary headaches for local management. But from a long-range point of view it isn't quite so bad as it seems since what helps the overall economic development of other nations helps us. The talent we lose can help speed up that development.

In view of increasing world pressures, many of us are concerned with the question of what more we can do to accelerate the development of emerging nations. As a businessman searching for solutions, I'd like to suggest several ideas that might be worth exploring:

1. Where practicable, and where there is no question of conflict of interest, business organizations might undertake a lend-lease program of personnel to governments to carry out special assignments for which they are uniquely qualified. Our needs in this area are so urgent that we must find some way to bring about a spirit of coordination and cooperation between business and government, something like that which existed during the crucial days of World War II.

2. International companies should encourage their management teams abroad to look more closely at additional business opportunities outside their usual scope of activity that will benefit a host nation.

3. Business can assist educators, social scientists, and others interested in the behavorial sciences in searching for ways to teach modern management ideas to qualified people in the developing nations.

4. International business can do more to speed up the tempo and improve the quality of many of the programs already being carried out. While, as I have reported, great work has been done in the training and development of people, too often we find examples of failure and needless delays in preparing nationals for positions for which they are potentially qualified. One of the best jobs an American can do overseas is to help develop a national as his replacement.

5. Industrial research programs can give more emphasis to the needs of developing nations, particularly in the field of agriculture.

Finally, I'd like to suggest that international business should look objectively at that widely prevalent manifestation of our times that we call nationalism. It need not be a negative factor. Historically it has been associated with new and developing nations and our own country was no exception. The pride of a new nation in itself, its desire for independent achievement, the willingness to work hard for accomplishments, can constitute a very constructive force. Nationalism, of course, can, and too often does, take an unreasoning and destructive form.

I hope I have shown here today some of the unique contributions that private foreign enterprise can make and is making to help speed the development of nations. But I should not close without mentioning that there is much these nations themselves can and must do to help themselves. First and foremost they can create a favorable climate for investment through economic and political stability. They can promulgate laws that are fair and that give equal opportunity for all—whether national or foreign investor. With such a basic framework, not only will foreign investment be attracted but domestic capital will not flee.

With such an environment, I believe that all sectors of society—particularly government, education, and business—can provide a concerted and effective effort to expand the economic development of the world. None of the particular problems of any nation would be unsurmountable.

---

## Landmark Decision by Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of last week, the Supreme Court in a unanimous decision in the case of FTC against Sun Oil Co. ruled that petroleum suppliers, under the Robinson-Patman Act, can cut prices selectively only in competition with their own competitors. They may not cut prices in order to meet the competition of their dealers' competitors.

This is an historic landmark decision. It establishes new limits on the use of discriminatory price cutting by suppliers. It will be of invaluable assistance in eliminating costly and destructive price wars. This decision is one that will have great impact not only upon the petroleum industry, but upon the entire framework of American commerce and the consuming public, as well.

This case arose from a price war in Jacksonville, Fla., in the summer of 1955. At that time, the Super Test Oil Co., an independent retail chain, by virtue of its lower retail prices was drawing substantial business away from a Sunoco station. To help their dealer meet this competition from the independent station, Sun granted certain price concessions. The Federal Trade Commission charged that this was a violation of law for the reason that the Sun Oil Co. had not offered similar price reductions to their other dealers in the Jacksonville area.

The Sun Oil Co. interposed the defense that it was meeting competition in good faith. This was rejected by the Federal Trade Commission on the grounds that discriminatory price cutting can be used only to counter direct competition at the same level; that is, suppliers versus suppliers and retailers versus retailers, not, as in this case, suppliers versus retailers.

The Fifth Circuit Court overruled the Federal Trade Commission, but the Supreme Court sided with the FTC in reversing the circuit court decision. In

the Supreme Court's decision Justice Goldberg said:

> Since there is in this record no evidence of any such (lower) price having been set or offered to anyone by any competitor of Sun, Sun's claim to the benefit of good faith meeting of competition defense must fail. To allow a supplier to intervene and grant discriminatory price concessions designed to enable its customer to meet the lower price of a retail competitor who is unaided by his supplier would discourage rather than promote competition.

The decision does not apply to those cases where a competing supplier distributes his products at the retail level through company-owned stations. It is likewise noted that the record was less than completely clear on whether the independent chain competing with Sun's retailer had received price concessions from a major supplier. It was pointed out that if such evidence was forthcoming the FTC could reopen the case.

The reopening of this case by the Federal Trade Commission could conceivably establish that one of the major companies had supplied the Super Test Oil Co. with its petroleum products. It might even establish that price concessions were made which would give the Sun Oil Co. the right to use the "good faith" defense. But, even assuming this to be so, where does this leave the major oil companies?

There has long been speculation as to the extent to which the major petroleum companies control the prices on both sides of the trenches during price wars. Many independents, of course, obtain their petroleum products from the majors. Thus, the majors are in the position of acting as supplier to both sides—company stations and independents—during many price wars.

If the Sun Oil case is reopened by the Federal Trade Commission, one of the byproducts could be full disclosure as to whether there is agreement within the petroleum industry regarding the wholesale prices to be charged when major companies sell their products to independent stations for resale under an independent brand name. If this should prove to be the case, the possibilities of both antitrust violations and unfair competition are certainly great.

This entire question of price wars and price structure is of vital importance to the many thousands of small businessmen engaged in the distribution of petroleum products.

Every week—virtually every day—I receive letters from throughout the country in which service station operators tell me that if price wars and discounting are not stopped, they will be driven out of business.

Yesterday I received a petition signed by 280 service station operators in the greater Kansas City area, asking that I forward it to the Federal Trade Commission. The petition requested that the FTC "hold an on-the-spot investigation of the gasoline pricing structure for the purpose of determining whether there is price discrimination and price fixing in the area" and "to protect us as small businessmen as is guaranteed under the Robinson-Patman and Clayton Acts."

I have forwarded this petition to the Federal Trade Commission with the urgent request that action be taken at once.

But more is needed to combat price wars than sending investigators to the scene of the latest outburst. We must also examine the entire structure of petroleum pricing practices. We must find a way to stop these costly and destructive gasoline price wars. The very existence of thousands of small businesses throughout the country depends upon the prompt solution of this pressing problem.

## Tribute to Dow Henry Drukker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, January 23, 1963*

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, New Jersey mourns the passing of one of its most beloved, constructive citizens. Mr. Dow Henry Drukker, who once served the Nation in the House of Representatives, was still at work as publisher and chairman of the board of the Passaic Herald News this week when, a few weeks before his 91st birthday, he died in Lake Wales, Fla.

Immediately, thousands of his good friends from New Jersey, throughout the Nation, and abroad responded with heartfelt messages of bereavement. They paid tribute to Dow Drukker for many reasons.

Only a few years after he came to New Jersey in 1897 from Grand Rapids, Mich., Mr. Drukker built a reputation as a businessman, a banker, and a newspaper owner. His fellow citizens found him so much to their liking that they elected him as their Congressman in 1914. He served in the 63d, 64th, and 65th Congresses. When he left Congress in 1919, he announced that he would not run for elective office. Neither would he accept appointive office. As one writer has said:

> He felt that as a newspaper owner he wished to be free of partisan compulsions.

In the years that have followed, Mr. Drukker made the Passaic Herald News a newspaper of direct service to his community and to the State. Even as he contributed to the financial vitality of his community, Mr. Drukker also set high standards of journalistic service.

Many honors were given to him over the years. One of the most treasured was the award of the Officers Cross of the Orange-Nassau from the Government of the Netherlands in June 1955. Mr. Drukker, who was born in the Netherlands, had conducted an Operation Holland campaign in 1954 to help the victims of the floods of that year. Mr. and Mrs. Drukker were later received by Queen Juliana at a private audience.

Other heartfelt tributes were given at recent birthday celebrations. There seemed something permanent and continually young about Mr. Drukker. His energy and optimism never left him, even in his final years.

Many additional tributes have been paid in recent days to him. I ask unanimous consent to have two of them printed in the RECORD at this time. One is an editorial which appeared in the Passaic Herald News, and it expresses the high regard felt for him by those who worked on this newspaper. The other is a news article which reports the comments made by Governor Hughes and the legislature of our State.

Mr. President, I am sure that many persons throughout our Nation share the sadness we feel in New Jersey. A great citizen has left us. We miss him. We shall not forget him.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Passaic Herald-News, Jan. 12, 1963]

DOW HENRY DRUKKER: 1872–1963

This man passed this way.

His journey was not hurried; there were long and fruitful years, with ample time for touching hearts and people and for influencing events.

But his steps were vigorous and purposeful, as indeed were his mind and his deeds.

There was humility in his manner, born of genuine interest in and respect for those he met.

There was fairness in his dealing, born of an affection for fellow mortals that would not let him take the unfair advantage, say the unkind word, do the shoddy deed.

There was brilliance in his planning for better things for his country, his State, his community, his neighbors. He served them in government at high and low levels, at personal sacrifices he never would have acknowledged. He served them in enterprise, at profits that were shared generously with those who helped.

What he touched grew brighter, what he stimulated and encouraged grew more useful, what he accomplished was lasting.

This man shunned evil, labored at good works, and walked humbly with his God.

This man passed this way and now is gone.

And although these hearts are heavy, this place is better for having had this man.

[From the Passaic Herald-News, Jan. 15, 1963]

BOTH LEGISLATIVE HOUSES JOIN GOVERNOR HUGHES IN TRIBUTE TO MEMORY OF DOW H. DRUKKER

(By Edward J. Mullin)

TRENTON.—"The book closes on a notable career of public service."

That was the phrase used by Gov. Richard J. Hughes yesterday in his statement on the passing of former Congressman Dow H. Drukker. Mr. Drukker, publisher and board chairman of the firm which publishes the Herald-News, died Friday at Lake Wales, Fla. The funeral was yesterday.

Both legislative houses joined the Governor in memorializing Mr. Drukker.

Identical resolutions were introduced in the senate by Senator Anthony J. Grossi and in the assembly by Joseph M. Keegan, Mrs. Betty M. Kordja, Samuel L. Biber, and Robert Wegner, Passaic County's delegation. Both houses passed the resolutions unanimously.

"Not only does New Jersey mourn the passing of this distinguished American," Governor Hughes said in his statement, "but his loss will be felt throughout the Nation and elsewhere in the world, particularly in his native Holland."

The statement and the resolutions eulogized Mr. Drukker as a humanitarian and a legislator in addition to his work as a newspaperman.

"As a young man," the Governor said of Mr. Drukker, "he achieved broad public recognition in his service in Congress. As a master builder, Congressman Drukker has left his imprint on the face of America. As a publisher, he was a practitioner of objective journalism combined with a belief that it is the duty of a newspaper to advance editorially the principles it believes are in the public interest.

"I would like to express my condolences," Governor Hughes continued, "to Mrs. Drukker and the other members of the family. Perhaps it will come as a consolation that Mr. Drukker will not be forgotten."

The text of the resolution passed in the legislature follows:

"Whereas Dow H. Drukker, one of New Jersey's distinguished elder citizens, died on January 11, 1963, in his 91st year; and

"Whereas Mr. Drukker was long recognized as the guiding genius of one of New Jersey's great newspapers and is remembered in the field of business as a builder and in the area of government as a county freeholder and a Member of Congress; and

"Whereas Mr. Drukker's services in many different departments for public and private activities have left an indelible imprint on the history of his times; and

"Whereas Mr. Drukker in his work as a humanitarian has won international acclaim including recognition with a decoration from the Queen of his native Netherlands: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the senate,* That this body gives recognition to Dow H. Drukker's services and achievements and extends to his family sincere condolences and sympathy; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That this resolution be spread upon the journal of the senate and a copy signed by the president of the senate and attested by the secretary of the senate be forwarded to the family of the late Dow H. Drukker."

## How Much Government Can We Afford?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, shortly before the opening of the 88th Congress I had the chance to address the New York Chamber of Commerce on an issue, the increasing cost of Government, which has been thrust even more importantly into public focus by the President's plans for a tax reduction and his budget for fiscal year 1964. I should like to place this speech, with its comments on these very current questions, in the RECORD at this point:

HOW MUCH GOVERNMENT CAN WE AFFORD?

"Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. We will be remembered in spite of ourselves." Abraham Lincoln once used those words to admonish his countrymen. The import of those words inescapably confronts us today. History will remember us in spite of ourselves—and because of ourselves.

Today I would ask the question, "How Much Government Can We Afford?" Asking the question, I suppose, imposes an obligation to try to provide an answer. This I will endeavor to do in the next few minutes.

First, let me express my appreciation to this group of business leaders for inviting me to New York City to join in this chamber of commerce meeting. Much of what I will say this noon will be meaningless unless the people who belong to organizations such as yours take an informed stand on the issue of how much government we can afford; how much our economy can pay for and still be free and enterprising.

You will notice I said "people" must take the stand. An organization undertaking is only as good as the effort by the people who belong to that organization. How much zeal, how much knowledge, how much patriotism, how much conviction, how much principle do the people of an organization bring to their organization objectives and endeavors? When our zeal, our knowledge, our patriotism, our convictions, our principles are too little or too casual we risk having the words "free" and "enterprising" lost as being descriptive of both our economy and our way of life.

I am not here to preach on patriotism nor to speak partisanly. However, I have strong feelings on the urgency of citizen action and organization responsibility; I have strong basic disagreements with others who have recently used New York forums to espouse economic and political views which I believe hold danger for our Nation.

How much government can we afford? Over the past three decades our Federal Government has tried and failed in the effort to spend our Nation rich. With budgetary deficits 80 percent of the time in this period, our economy has grown in fits and spurts. We have failed to produce sustainable economic growth. We have produced a fiscal environment of constantly rising and mounting tax burdens; burdens that consistently proved inadequate to pay the Government bills we incurred.

We have justified our extravagant and profligate ways by giving recognition to a fiscal tenet that just does not work, this tenet says that it is not necessary to worry about a budget imbalance in any particular year so long as it is balanced over a period of years. The resort to expediency implicit in this philosophy has led us to what can only be termed fiscal immorality—the consequences of which can only be measured in a trillion dollars of debt, in a burgeoning Government bureaucracy, and in a curtailment of human liberty.

Thus, one of the answers to the question of how much government can we afford is that we apparently cannot afford as much as we have. The last time we succeeded in even paying our way in a fiscal year was in 1960, and it now seems almost certain that at least a half a decade will elapse from then before we again have a chance of a budget balance. In those intervening 5 years we will add a minimum of between $25 and $30 billion to the Federal debt even if we succeed in stemming the rising tide of annual total spending. In the past three decades we had no program for debt retirement and we have none for the future—as citizens we are content to be prodigals.

The continuing budget deficits of the last 30 years did not occur in times of depression nor in times of little or no change in Government fiscal affairs. Indeed, relative prosperity has marked the post-World War II period and the Government's fiscal experience has found budget expenditures and tax collections increasing more than twentyfold in the last three decades. We have had the opportunity to do something about paying our way, but we have instead chosen a course of Government on credit—we have chosen to let our children be the fall guys for our fiscal imprudence.

But we need not go back three decades to measure an alarming growth in levels of spending and taxing. I will not belabor you with endless statistics but the facts are there as conclusive proof that our spending increases for civil matters exceeded the relative increase in military spending.

If these spending increases had been for Government goods and services that were provided within the framework of a balanced budget, they would have represented expenditures which we were willing to pay for rather than pass on as a charge to succeeding generations. The fact is we did not pay for the cost of those goods and services and, as a consequence, we have a Federal statutory debt in excess of $300 billion. The present annual interest charges on that debt, without providing for any debt retirement, are more than double the total budget expenditures for all purposes by the Federal Government three decades ago.

But this $300 billion figure does not tell the whole story. The truth is that our Federal indebtedness today exceeds $1 trillion, and it means that every American family of four has a share of $22,000 of this debt. This trillion-dollar debt includes such items as $250 billion for unfunded obligations of the social security system, $70 billion for unfunded obligations of Government retirement programs, $300 billion of commitments to veterans, $150 billion for unfunded public works and similar charges to the statutory debt. These are currently accruing obligations of our Government that we are not paying for and that will represent demands on the productivity of succeeding generations.

As bad as these fiscal facts are, I feel that future events will pale our past experience to insignificance. Under the present administration we have found that new spending authority has risen from $80 billion in fiscal year 1960 to $100 billion for fiscal year 1963. It is inevitable that this fact will produce increased spending pressures in future years. The distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance has predicted that by the year 1965 the Federal budget figures will exceed $135 billion, including $30 billion of trust fund expenditures. I call to your attention the fact that this budget event, if it materializes as predicted, is only 2 years away. Now would seem to be the very latest moment for an all-out program to call a halt to this compulsive spending unless we as taxpayers are willing to pay for it.

In an inaugural speech of not too long ago we were encouraged, if not reassured, by a reiteration of the principle that individuals should concern themselves with what they can do for the state rather than being preoccupied with what the state can do for them. As recently as a few weeks ago we were told, "If Government is to retain the confidence of the people, it must not spend more than can be justified on grounds of national need or spent with maximum efficiency." It seems paradoxical to me that such statements are made by a political leader who since taking office has sent to the Congress 262 different spending proposals which, if they had been enacted by the Congress would, in my judgment, have done much to destroy private enterprise and individual liberty.

Regardless of the fact that our Federal Government is the biggest spender, the biggest employer, the biggest property owner, the biggest tenant, the biggest insurer, the biggest lender and the biggest borrower in all the world, we find a growing impatience on the part of many holding high office in our land to make government even bigger. Thus, we are told that it is the Federal Government which must grant aid to schools, compulsory medical care, a permanent system of extending unemployment compensation

benefits, an expanded food-stamp plan, an expansion of area redevelopment and public works, enlarged public assistance programs, increased public power projects, enlarged housing programs, increased subsidies and other items on a staggering list of so-called Government giveaways—giveaways that inescapably cost the taxpayers of today and tomorrow for programs that involve the massive Federal intervention urged by the Government spenders.

In this tragic failure to control and manage our fiscal affairs within the limits of what we are willing to afford, we have essentially departed from a basic philosophy of our Founding Fathers who believed that it was our citizen duty to support our state and not our country's obligation to support its citizens. To this end, the patron saint of the Democratic Party, Thomas Jefferson, once said:

"I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared. * * * To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt—we must make our choice between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people, under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy."

In our time we have disregarded the wisdom of Thomas Jefferson. We have also rejected the prophetic admonition of the French philosopher deTocqueville who warned us in the early history of our country that if the time should ever come when people conclude they can vote themselves benefits out of the public treasury, self-government by responsible men will be an impossibility.

I need not tell a sophisticated group such as this that the implications of our failure to do better in handling our fiscal affairs are of concern not only to ourselves and our children but also to any person now living, or to live in the future, who might aspire to be free of political domination. The truth of the matter is that we are the free world's banker; on the strength and stability of the American dollar rests the economic vitality and monetary security of the non-Communist world. In the past 12 years we have had 11 deficits in our balance of payments and our gold supply has dwindled to approximately $16 billion. Our commitments against this gold supply included our obligations of $12 billion of legal monetary reserves and obligations of a considerably greater magnitude held by foreign governments and foreign nations.

The simple fact that as the world's banker we borrow short and lend long demonstrates the importance of confidence in our ability to conduct our fiscal and monetary affairs in such a way as to avoid debasing the purchasing power of the dollar.

Against this backdrop of debt, deficits, and declining gold supply, we are now told that the cure for virtually all our problems is to be found in a tax cut. This proposal makes me wonder whether this issue should be decided by the votes of those American citizens who are now of voting age or by the votes of those young people whose age does not now qualify them for voting status. Indeed, it is the latter group that we will be taxing to make up the deficit from the tax reduction that we give to ourselves. Americans have always felt strongly against the idea of taxation without representation; hence, my suggestion that Americans under age 21 should be allowed to ballot on the question of a tax cut at this time of needlessly high spending and uncontrolled deficits.

There is no one who is more concerned than I am over the stifling effect of our present tax structure on economic growth and national strength. Our tax laws represent a peculiar tax policy for a country that relies on individual initiative for progress. Tax receipts of Federal, State, and local governments take almost one-third of our net national product, and most of these receipts are derived from assessments on earned income and on capital accumulation. The more productive and venturesome a person is, the higher tax he pays.

The result is that our present tax system has an impact that is not conducive to economic growth. We have a sharp progressivity of tax rates that is self-defeating. The complexity of our tax structure discourages enterprise and impairs venture taking. In short, I agree wholeheartedly with those who say tax reduction and reform are long overdue. I wholeheartedly disagree with those who say we can have high deficit spending as usual and still have lower tax burdens across the board. I disagree with those who believe that foolish outlays for untested and unwanted Government programs can be continued even though we are going to tax less to pay more for those programs. In short, I support a major program of tax rate restructuring and reform to stimulate incentive and capital formation, but only within the bounds of fiscal responsibility and monetary prudence.

Tax reduction should not be enacted at this time without a commitment from the administration and a pledge by the Congress to hold spending over the next 2 or 3 years at a level that does not exceed the 1963 figure. Tax reduction should not be enacted unless it is designed to increase productive incentive and to enable the capital accumulation needed to undertake the entrepreneurial risks. Tax reduction should not be enacted if it is designed for a mere short-term stimulant that would not result in sustainable economic growth.

Thus, I think it can generally be agreed among this group that our tax reduction objective (1) must be sought under conditions of our regaining control over our spending activities, (2) must be directed toward the attainment of long-term economic progress, and (3) must have as its focal point the easing of tax burdens from those critical rates and substantive provisions that, under present law, make tax saving more important than taxable earnings. In short, we must free our tax structure from its inhibitants against growth and efficiency. How do we do this?

First, we must realize that as long as we are spending for more Government than we are willing to afford, we cannot have tax reduction solely for the sake of making the cost of Government generally less on our citizens. Any tax reduction must be so planned and designed as to achieve maximum incentive benefit at minimum revenue loss. We must not have a tax reduction that seeks to solve our growth and full employment problems merely by increasing the size of the deficit that would have to be financed by added Government borrowing and bank-created funds.

Second, we must recognize that the economic progress from tax reduction at this time finds its key in the vigorous expansion in business investment in new plant and equipment and in the growth of small business. In our last two recessionary periods business capital investment has lagged and, as a consequence, we have had a recovery in each instance that fell short of expectation. This supports the view that our tax reform at this time and under present circumstances must emphasize easing the tax burdens on savings and investment.

Parenthetically, on this second point, I would observe this fact: Anything we may do in the area of tax reform, revision, and reduction will be to no avail if our people do not have confidence in Government administration and policies. Therefore, we must not repeat the self-defeating mixture of bad and good tax changes that comprised the administration's tax package of the last Congress. We should avoid seeking through tax legislation the accomplishment of nonrevenue objectives such as social reforms and curbs on foreign investment by American free enterprise. We should strengthen, not weaken, confidence in the integrity of government. We should base our tax reform on the hard realities of sound economics and competitive advancement and let the politics be damned.

A third factor that we must take into account as we seek tax reform conducive to growth and efficiency is our present undue reliance on taxes on earned income to produce our Government revenues. The statistic and comparative tax tables on this point are well known, and the details need not detain us here. The effect is that our tax structure with its steeply progressive rate schedule and high corporate rate discourages risk and productive effort and even brings about what I will term the "economic withdrawal" of some of our most promising and able producers.

Tax reduction involving minimum revenue loss and maximum economic benefit will take account of those factors which will encourage utilization of technological innovation and which will sustain in our people a desire to work hard for enlarged incomes and a willingness to accept the risks of entrepreneurial activity. This sort of tax reduction can help us to afford the government we need; government whose every expenditure meets the test of absolute essentiality and government whose every service and good is provided to the people only because the people cannot do it for themselves.

I would close this discussion of how much government we can afford by recalling the words of President Eisenhower in his last budget message presented to the Congress in which he said:

"In summary, if we plan wisely and allocate our resources carefully, we can have both public and private advancement. Sound fiscal policies and balanced budgets will sustain sound economic growth and, eventualy, will make possible a reduced tax burden. At the same time, we can have necessary improvements in Federal programs to meet the demands of an ever-changing world.

"If, however, we deliberately run the Government by credit cards, improvidently spending today at the expense of tomorrow, we will break faith with the American people and their children, and with those joined with us in freedom throughout the world."

My friends, the government we can afford is only that which we are willing to pay for in the tax burden we are willing to sustain. If we seek more government than that, the price we will pay will be in more than dollars—it will be in terms of lessened individual liberty and curtailed economic opportunity. In answering the question of "How much government can we afford," we should do so in the context of how do we wish to be remembered by history in spite of and because of ourselves. Thank you.

## John Duncan: Georgia's Big Man in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, January 23, 1963*

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the State of Georgia is proud of John P. Duncan, Jr., Assistant Secretary of Agri-

culture, for his indefatigable efforts to better the lot of American farmers. Recently, Mr. Duncan was distinctly honored by the Progressive Farmer magazine, which selected him as an Agriculture Man of the Year for 1963.

The Atlanta Journal-Constitution magazine, on January 20, 1963, also pointed with pride to Mr. Duncan. Miss Margaret Shannon, Washington correspondent for the Atlanta Journal, wrote a discerning article on Mr. Duncan, tracing his career from a Quitman, Ga., farmer to president of the Georgia Farm Bureau and to national prominence in the U.S. Agriculture Department.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN DUNCAN: GEORGIA'S BIG MAN IN AGRICULTURE

(By Margaret Shannon)

WASHINGTON.—One day last month John P. Duncan, Jr., of Quitman, Ga., and Alexandria, Va., got a four-line memorandum from Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman. It didn't amount to much in wordage, but it just happened to mean that the one-time south Georgia farm boy had 14,000 additional employees to look after for a while.

Mr. Duncan is Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Marketing and Stabilization. The memorandum assigned responsibility for the Cooperative Extension Service to his office temporarily. It was the sixth agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture to come under his wing. Evidently somebody up here likes him.

Secretary Freeman must. He continues to pile work on him, and the 45-year-old former president of the Georgia Farm Bureau Federation seems to thrive on it. His hair is almost white, but it has been that way for years. He keeps fit by playing squash with Secretary Freeman at the Pentagon or golfing in the eighties on a Virginia course when he has time.

The highest and best evidence that John Duncan is a success is the shift within the Department last March that put him in charge of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service right at the time of the Billie Sol Estes scandal. Actually ASCS had been taken away from James T. Ralph shortly before the scandal broke, and it fell Mr. Duncan's lot to straighten out a mess he hadn't made.

"We came out all right on Estes," Mr. Duncan said. "The Department didn't lose a nickel on him, and that's more than can be said for anybody else who dealt with him. We have all our grain, and we are holding $2 million in escrow until final disposition of the case."

His presence in Dr. Ralph's old job at a time like that made him a target, too, and last July a Washington newspaper reported that Mr. Duncan once went to speak to the Texas Cotton Ginners Association and accepted free meals and hotel rooms from the organization.

Since Billie Sol's spreading of largess among agricultural workers had been much talked of and testified about, this was news. Mr. Duncan at once asked the Agriculture Department auditor to check all his expense accounts. It turned out the Government owed him $150 in unpaid per diem. Mr. Duncan also said that accepting room and board while on speaking engagements is a common practice for Government officials and lies within the code of conduct promulgated by the President.

Another kind of trouble came Mr. Duncan's way—or he came its way—when he went to Atlanta in December during the American Farm Bureau Federation convention. He didn't go to the convention; he wasn't invited. He went to try to counteract on the scene some of the drastic Farm Bureau criticism of the Government's farm program.

Around the Department, they refer to Mr. Duncan in this role as a one-man truth squad. When the Farm Bureau president said the administration's farm program isn't working, Mr. Duncan fired back that it is, too, working and furthermore, farmers like it.

Such headaches—scandals, bad publicity, powerful opposition—are unpleasant, but they are minor compared to the one that Mr. Duncan calls the biggest of all: "Trying to find some way to cope with the capacity of the American farmer to produce."

"If you turned the American farmer loose to grow all he could, I don't know whether the oceans would hold it," Mr. Duncan said.

It seems an incurable headache. As Mr. Duncan sat talking about it, he'd just learned that the wheat crop estimate was up 25 percent even with thousands of acres taken out of production since the last crop. "That's a lot of wheat," he said.

So Mr. Duncan goes forth to battle with opposition to the Government farm program. Sometimes the battleground is Capitol Hill, sometimes a convention hall, sometimes a press conference. He works, too, at his office—to make the program work.

A large part of the job of crop controls and surplus storage is carried on by the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, one of the agencies that comes under John Duncan's supervision. It is in a sense not only the center of the Government's farm program, but also the heart of American agriculture.

When Mr. Duncan left his 807-acre Brooks County farm and the presidency of the Georgia Farm Bureau to become Assistant Agriculture Secretary at the start of the Kennedy administration, he was placed in charge of the Foreign Agricultural Service. This was new stuff to him. He held the assignment for 15 months, and became a well-traveled man in that time.

He went to Punta del Este, Uruguay, in August 1961, and took part in drafting the Alliance for Progress. He went to Rome in November that year and to the Philippines later. He visited U.S. agricultural attachés around the world. Once he flew to London one day and back the next after opening an agricultural trade center there.

What impressed him most, he says, is the part food can play in America's efforts to stop communism and win the peace throughout the world.

"We can talk satellites and sputniks and all that, but the hungry man is more interested in feeding his children. And we have got so much more food to offer the world than have the Russians and other Communists.

"The hungry people in Africa, in South America, and in east Asia, where I visited, were not much interested in whether we or the Soviets put the first man in orbit or which of us was ahead in space. They are chiefly interested in getting food for themselves and their families, and that's where our food-for-peace program is winning us friends.

"I believe we can whip the Russians in the fight for men's minds if we can just put the food where it is needed. And the men who have given leadership to this fight are the American farmers with their abundant production."

Last May, delegates from 38 countries, meeting in Washington, elected Duncan as chairman of the International Cotton Advisory Committee, representing 95 percent of the world's cotton production.

In the departmental reshufflings last spring Mr. Duncan was given supervision over the Commodity Exchange Authority, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, the Agricultural Marketing Service, as well as ASCS, and was placed on the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation, largest Corporation in the world. The Foreign Agricultural Service was assigned to someone else.

He didn't mind the change. "I'm kinda in a shop now that I'm familiar with," he said.

John Duncan learned the "shop" as a farmer who has never farmed except in the time of Government controls and price supports. In 1939, the year after he finished Emory University, tobacco growers decided they'd do better without the Government program. The result was a glut of tobacco on the market and a poor price for all.

"We have opposition now that wants the Government out of the farm business," he said. "The Government would like to get out, but you have to be realistic about it. The problem is not whether to have controls, but to get legislation that would do a better job at a lower cost to the Government."

The big farms could survive, but the family farms couldn't, and Mr. Duncan is concerned about family farms. "You can't say to these people, 'Look, we're going to wipe you out just because you're not big.' " he declared. "We just don't do things that way in this country."

As the 88th Congress proceeds and the administration sends its farm proposals to the Hill, Mr. Duncan will be among the Agriculture Department's salesmen seeking support among the lawmakers. He gets a good share of the credit for saving the administration farm legislation from complete disaster last year. There was a series of cliff-hanging votes, and the Duncan influence helped to turn the tide.

Mr. Duncan averages about a trip a week to the White House to discusss farm problems with presidential advisers and, on occasion, from President Kennedy himself.

There have been reports from time to time that the President is bored with farm problems and doesn't know much about them, Mr. Duncan does not agree.

"I'll say this—he's a lot more interested than President Eisenhower ever was," the Assistant Secretary says.

When the Cuban crisis threatened to develop into nuclear war, Mr. Duncan took part in high-level conferences on how to meet the Nation's food needs under enemy attack.

He also spends some time on the convention circuit, usually as the invited guest. His foray into Atlanta for the Farm Bureau convention was an unusual approach. Most of the time, farm-related organizations want to hear the Government's side.

One of Mr. Duncan's most powerful jobs is on the Board of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Corporation has borrowing authority of $14.5 billion. It makes decisions about commodity transactions that greatly influence prices. Outside traders make and lose fortunes in commodity dealings. The CCC has a tremendous responsibility.

How does it feel to have this responsibility and all the others involved in being Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Marketing and Stabilization?

"It gives you the feeling of wanting to be pretty doggone careful before you make a decision," Duncan says.

Any decision of his will come from a lifetime of association with farming. His agricultural education began on the family farm 4 miles north of Quitman. Now rented out, it produces cotton, tobacco, peanuts, and livestock.

After finishing at Emory, he took graduate work in agriculture at the University of Georgia. He played professional base-

ball for a short time, but went back to farming.

His wife is the former Branch Ellis Orr of Macon. They and their four children—Judy, 20; John, 15; Ellis, 8, and Nancy, 5—live in a brick split-level house in Alexandria.

Mr. Duncan goes to work at 7:30 every morning and gets home after 7 every night. Often he is in his office even on weekends.

He intended to go back to being Georgia Farm Bureau president after 2 years in Washington, but it didn't work out that way. The administration wanted him to continue. He was on leave from the Farm Bureau office, and staying here meant he had to resign the post. So it won't automatically be his when he does leave the Government.

"I don't know what I'll be doing 2 years from now," he said. "If President Kennedy is reelected and the administration wants me to stay, I might do that. I might go back to the Farm Bureau; I think I could."

"Or"—he was answering a question on this point—"I might run for Congress. It's too soon to say. I didn't think 2 years ago that I'd still be here, but here I am."

## W. A. Boyle, New President of United Mine Workers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, January 23, 1963*

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, Monday's issue of the Evening Star noted that a distinguished Montanan, Mr. W. A. (Tony) Boyle, is acting president of one of this Nation's major independent unions, the United Mine Workers of America.

About 2 months ago, President Thomas Kennedy appointed Mr. Boyle, then vice president, acting president. With Mr. Kennedy's death, Mr. Boyle will serve out the remainder of the term ending late next year.

Born in a Montana mining camp, Tony Boyle lived in Billings from 1940 to 1948 when he was president of UMW District 27. He is credited with drafting the Montana Mining Code enacted by Montana's legislative assembly.

I ask unanimous consent that the Associated Press article, headed "New UMW President Reminiscent of Lewis," published in the January 21, 1963, issue of the Evening Star be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW UMW PRESIDENT REMINISCENT OF LEWIS

The death of Thomas Kennedy brings to the presidency of the United Mine Workers another heavy-browed folksy-talking union leader of the John L. Lewis school.

W. A. (Tony) Boyle has been, in effect, the president of the big independent union for nearly a year because of the 75-year-old Mr. Kennedy's illness.

As vice president, Mr. Boyle assumed most of the administrative duties of the office last spring when Mr. Kennedy first became gravely ill. About 2 months ago, Mr. Kennedy named his top lieutenant acting president.

Mr. Boyle will serve until the end of Mr. Kennedy's 4-year term in late 1964 and it is assumed he will seek reelection.

Mr. Boyle is a native of Billings, Mont., and comes from a long line of Irish miners. His father began work in the mines in Scotland at 9 and his maternal and paternal grandfathers and great-grandfathers all worked in English mines.

STYLE IS REMINISCENT

The 58-year-old Boyle has a fine set of red eyebrows and a gift for direct, plain, and vigorous speech. He hardly compares in either department with his mentor, the 82-year-old Lewis, but his appearance and style are reminiscent of the almost legendary builder of the UMW.

Although long retired as UMW president, Mr. Lewis looms large in the background of coal industry affairs and is believed to have had a part in guiding Mr. Boyle's widespread activities in recent months.

Both men differ markedly in manner and appearance from Mr. Kennedy, a quiet persuader who labored for years under the shadow of the forceful and hard-hitting Lewis.

MEMBERSHIP DWINDLES

For years relations between the larger mines and the UMW have been serene but the union has been having increasing troubles with smaller operators, as coal has been harder and harder pressed by competing fuels.

Nonunion production has increased from 20 to 27 percent of the national output and under the impact of automation UMW membership has dwindled to 160,000.

Mr. Boyle has been attacking these problems, with the advice and counsel of Mr. Lewis, whom he served for 12 years as special assistant at the union's Washington headquarters.

Like Mr. Lewis, Mr. Boyle occasionally shows considerable disregard for both major political parties.

After public schooling in Montana and Idaho, Mr. Boyle studied law at LaSalle University and became active in union affairs at the local level more than 30 years ago. In 1940 he was elected president of District 27 of the UMW and while in that office also served as regional director for the CIO in four Western States. He later was regional director of the UMW's District 50 in the same territory.

ON U.S. COMMITTEES

During World War II, Mr. Boyle represented the union on various Government and industry committees, manpower councils, and War Labor Board panels. He was the first labor representative on Montana's advisory council to the State unemployment compensation commission.

He married a schoolteacher, Ethel V. Williams, and they have a daughter, Mrs. Daryl E. Engebregson, who practices law in Montana with her husband.

## Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, in the great tradition of the gallant and gifted Ukrainian people there are many glorious events, but the event that marked the rebirth of the Ukraine and the rise of the Ukrainian Republic early in 1918 stands out most significantly in its history. On January 22, 1918, after enduring the oppressive yoke of Russian autocracy for more than 250 years, Ukrainians proclaimed their independence and founded their Republic. From the time of its very birth, however, this weak state found itself in the midst of insurmountable difficulties. And it was surrounded with enemies whose aim was to put an end to its very existence. After struggling for a little over 2 years against formidable odds, the country was invaded by the Red army, and the Ukrainian Republic was no more. The land became part of the U.S.S.R. and its unhappy people fell under the tyranny of the Kremlin.

Today there are no free Ukrainians in that fair land, but even under totalitarian tyranny a stout-hearted and freedom-seeking people cherish their national goal, their freedom and independence. On this 45th anniversary celebration of their independence day let us all hope that they attain that goal.

## Gov. Bill Scranton's First Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following message of Gov. William W. Scranton, of Pennsylvania:

LEGISLATIVE MESSAGE OF GOV. WILLIAM W. SCRANTON, OF PENNSYLVANIA, JOINT SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, JANUARY 22, 1963

Mr. Lieutenant Governor, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the general assembly, we gather here today at the beginning of a great adventure; an adventure of the heart and mind.

Our aim can be no less than to create a sounder, more effective, more enlightened framework of government in Pennsylvania. A framework so sound, so effective, so enlightened that it will substantially help a revitalized society to grow and flourish in our Commonwealth.

It is time for Pennsylvania to lead the Nation. To be a pacesetter. A progress-maker. Together, we the legislative and executive branches of this government have it within our power to do just that. We can produce here models in the practice of government that our sister States will hasten to copy.

I look upon this as a joint effort. A blending of the ideas, imaginations, hopes and labors of both the executive and legislative branches. Having served as a legislator myself—on the Federal level of Government—I have understanding for your problems and concerns as members of the legislative branch.

It seems to me that the proper role of the executive is to lead, not to dictate.

In line with this belief, many weeks ago I asked the majority leaders of both houses

to join with me and the Lieutenant Governor in developing a legislative program to carry out the mandate that was given to us last fall by the people of Pennsylvania.

As a result, the program I am about to present to you is a product of the combined efforts of both the administration and the majority leaders in the legislature.

As for the minority party in the legislature, I am sympathetic with their role, too. After all, my legislative experience was obtained on the minority side of the aisle. I expect them to scrutinize the program most carefully. But, just as I voted when I was a legislator with the majority on proposals which were for the good of the Nation, so I am confident that the minority here will give us its support for the good of Pennsylvania.

In this message today it is my plan to offer highlights of our program. Some vital items I will not treat at all today. They will be the subject of full-scale special messages in the next 6 weeks. Other items I will touch on only briefly, fully developing our position in later special messages. Fiscal matters will be handled in a budget message which is planned for early March.

Specific legislation to improve our industrial development program and wage war on unemployment is one of the items which I will discuss in a special message.

But, in a larger sense, every item I mention today is tied to industrial development. Government which does a good job in providing necessary services for people is one of the first essentials demanded by modern industry. If our legislative program were to be defeated, it would be a real defeat also in our battle to build an economically stronger Pennsylvania.

A vote against most of the items I am proposing today, is a direct vote against the jobless men and women of our Commonwealth.

One pressing need in the field of industrial development, however, does require your immediate attention, so I will mention it today rather than wait for the special message.

The loan fund of the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority is at present almost completely exhausted. In order that there shall not be the slightest slowdown of the essential activities of this agency, I recommend that you grant a deficiency appropriation of $4 million for industrial development purposes.

Education is another subject so vast as to require a full-scale special message. Two specific recommendations on education are, however, in order at this time.

First, I commend those members of the legislature who on opening day introduced a bill to declare a 1-year moratorium on all deadlines in School Reorganization Act 561.

Considerable confusion exists in the Commonwealth over application of the act, which even its warmest advocates admit is incomplete. Many others describe it as unworkable, both because it is incomplete and for other reasons.

Since opening day, the moratorium has been praised by both educators and laymen in all parts of Pennsylvania. It should be enacted.

Second in the field of education, it is imperative that we move immediately to separate the policymaking from the administrative function. All further progress in Pennsylvania education depends upon this.

To do this, we should set up a State board of education. It would be responsible for formulating general education policy. The department of public instruction would operate under the supervision of the board of education. It would stop making policy. It would administer the policy formulated by the board.

Working with the board of education would be a council of higher education and a council of basic education. Each would exercise primary responsibility in its own field. Among other things, the council of higher education would develop a master plan for college education in Pennsylvania. The council of basic education would be responsible for achieving elementary and secondary education of uniformly high quality throughout the Commonwealth.

In areas where the concerns of basic and higher education overlap, and in budget matters, the State board of education would retain authority.

Each of the councils should have six lay members. Each should be provided with a staff. Members of the two councils, plus three at-large members, would make up the State board of education.

After industrial development and education, the next important need of Pennsylvania is reform of the laws and machinery through which government itself is administered.

I am proposing five actions in this field:

First, we should establish a new department of mental health of cabinet rank. This will take over—without additional cost—the duties of the present bureau of mental health in the department of public welfare. A new department will give our mental health program new emphasis. This is necessary since mental and emotional disorders are our greatest single health affliction today. Moreover, it will assure the complete freedom of our mental health program from political interference. We want no politics in the wards of mental hospitals.

Second, I intend to establish by administrative action a council of human services. Members will include the secretary of public welfare, the secretary of health, the secretary of mental health, and the directors of other State agencies which deal with the problems of those who suffer disease and privation.

This council, while giving us direct and independent action in each area of human services, will also give us coordination of all of these governmental services. This we need to avoid present overlapping and confusion.

Third in the field of governmental reforms, I call for establishing a cabinet-rank department of community development.

The problems of our cities—whether large or middle sized—require expanded attention from the State government.

We have a clear choice here. Either the State government will come to the assistance of cities in such challenges as mass transportation, uban renewal, housing, and the rejuvenation of community life, or the Federal Government will do it.

The Federal Government cannot do it as well as we can. What is more, in the trying, the Washington bureaucrats will destroy the historic relationship between the State and its member communities. If we believe in the Federal principle—the principle whereby the States retain the duties not expressly given to the Federal Government in the Constitution—this is our chance to prove it.

Fourth in the field of governmental reforms, I call for formation of a commission of professional affairs.

Presently, 16 boards, attached with little rhyme or reason to the department of public instruction, handle professional licensing. These duties should be assumed by the new commission, headed by a commissioner appointed by the Governor. For administrative purposes the commission should be assigned to the department of state.

Fifth in the field of governmental reforms, I recommend enactment of strict penalties against fraud in obtaining professional licenses. Proposals to put real teeth in our laws against fraud in this area will be placed before you. They should be enacted. We cannot afford even the breath of scandal in our licensing procedures.

The next major area with which this legislature should be concerned is medical care for the aged.

Once and for all we must eliminate the stigma that this State program is "for paupers only."

Proposals to make the dramatic first steps toward this will be placed before you.

We must increase substantially the limits on assets of eligible elderly persons contained in the present law. We must eliminate completely the cruel liens which the State now files against the estates of persons who have received medical aid. We must establish machinery whereby the eligibility of elderly persons to receive aid can be determined before illness strikes. A system of determining eligibility in advance will remove the additional suffering needlessly imposed by the present law.

Improving medical care will cost money. But the sums involved are comparatively modest when measured against the relief they will bring to our older citizens. When measured against the debt we owe to those who have labored long in the struggle of life, they become very modest indeed.

Improvement of civil service is another area of vital importance in Pennsylvania. Our Commonwealth now suffers from the worst system in the Nation.

First of all, we must write a uniform Civil Service Act. This must replace the current bewildering hodge podge of inconsistent statutory and executive programs. Every employee covered by civil service should be governed by the same laws and regulations. The best aspects of all existing programs should be included in the new uniform act.

The same act, along with covering all jobs now under present forms of civil service, should extend complete coverage to certain vital departments. Among these should be: Complete coverage for the department of public instruction; complete coverage for the public utilities commission; complete coverage for the department of banking; complete coverage for the insurance department; complete coverage for the department of health; complete coverage for the boards which will make up the new commission of professional affairs; and complete coverage for the new department of mental health.

Under the new uniform act, so-called executive civil service will be superseded and jobs now under this status which require civil service protection will be covered by the new act. Persons in these positions, who have qualified under genuine civil service competition, should be protected in their jobs. For the sake of governmental efficiency, as well as out of common fairness, however, it will be necessary that the Governor shall for 1 year have power to review the records of performance of such employees. If necessary, he should have the power to remove these persons who receive their jobs on a political rather than on a professional merit basis. Their replacements should be employed through civil service competition and examination.

Another area in which I urge the attention of the legislature is in the maintenance of fair and honest elections. This is fundamental to our system of Government. We will seek enactment of laws which will prevent an entrenched political machine of either party from completely dominating the election procedure in a given area.

In a separate message I will offer proposals to make it possible for all parties to maintain adequate watchers at every poll, to free election officials of political ties, and to safeguard the use of absentee ballots.

Regarding the problem of bituminous strip mining, I have four recommendations to make.

The strip mining industry has made a valuable contribution to our State's economy. In the future it will continue to do so. I do not, however, accept the argument that the industry can only survive by completely sacrificing beauty and safety.

Therefore, I recommend shifting authority to enforce laws regulating reclamation of strip mined areas from the department of mines to the department of forests and waters. Five of the seven major coal mining States already invest this authority in their departments which are responsible for conservation, and I believe we should join them.

Second, more backfilling of strippings is essential. The law should strictly require restoring terrain to a condition so that farm equipment may move across it or so that new recreation benefits are created.

Third, the amount of the bond posted per acre by strip operators should be increased.

Fourth, I recommend that you pass legislation which would limit both the time which a bituminous strip mine may remain open and the length of the strip that may be exposed at any one time. By such strict limitations we will not only reduce the problems connected with the mines themselves, but also will prevent the accumulation of acid polluted water. No other state has such laws. If they are enacted, Pennsylvania will once again be pioneering in constructive regulation of the strip mine industry.

Also in the field of conservation, I recommend that you approve Project 70 for the second time. It is essential that you do this so that this long-range project for development of the natural beauty and resources of Pennsylvania can be submitted to the voters this November.

In the field of harness racing, I have three recommendations:

First, legislation should be passed prohibiting admission of minors to track grounds.

Second, it should be made unlawful for either public officials or officers of political parties to participate in the ownership of tracks.

Third, to improve administration and cut cost, the harness racing commission should be returned to the department of agriculture.

Another major field of concern for the legislature is the matter of reapportionment. The membership of both houses must be brought into conformity with population shifts. This is primarily a matter for the legislature itself. I am pleased that I have been informed by your leaders that the house and senate committees on elections and apportionments will soon begin to hold joint meetings on this difficult problem.

Next, we must make it possible for residents of our largest city to carry out a long-needed reform in their local government. I recommend that you approve legislation which will permit the people of Philadelphia to achieve, at long last, the final city-county consolidation which was envisioned in the city charter of 1951.

Another matter you have before you is an amendment to the U.S. Constitution to outlaw the poll tax. This device was repealed many years ago in Pennsylvania. It survives today in only a few States where it is used to keep Negroes from exercising their rights of suffrage.

I urge you to swiftly approve the amendment passed last year by Congress so that it will become part of the law of the land.

Next, I urge you to adopt amendments to the uniform commercial code which have been proposed by the permanent editorial board for the uniform commercial code.

Pennsylvania has long led the Nation in this field of legislation. We were the first State to adopt the code. We ought to modernize it now.

Another matter for which I urge your support concerns the blind veterans of the Commonwealth. I recommend enactment of an additional pension of $50 per month to every honorably discharged Pennsylvania veteran suffering service-connected blindness.

Finally, I urge you to take action on the need of Pennsylvania to revise its constitution.

Fundamental inadequacies and anachronisms plague the operation of our government. These can be cured only through the drastic surgery of revision of our State constitution. The unwieldy incubus of dead law and outmoded rules contained in our present constitution is the greatest single deterrent to progressive government in Pennsylvania.

While there is wide agreement that revision is necessary, there is less agreement on how such revision should be achieved. Some suggest that the legislature itself should call a constitutional convention. Others argue that the legislature should submit the convention to a referendum of the people. Still others favor a comprehensive process of amendment such as that which will be proposed next week by the Pennsylvania Bar Association.

Bluntly, I say this to you:

I am not so concerned with the method as I am with getting the job done. To do this, two things are necessary: legislative action and strong leadership in obtaining the support of the people of Pennsylvania.

If it be the will of the legislature to call a convention without a referendum, I shall lend my wholehearted support to such action.

All things considered, however, it is my own judgment that the method by which we stand the best practical chance of seeing a new constitution through to final acceptance is by asking the people to approve in a referendum the calling of a convention.

I recommend that you act immediately to set up machinery for this referendum and convention.

In addition, certainly the legislature should study and take appropriate action on the bar association's amendments. In this way all progress would not be lost if the convention method should fail.

Let me make one thing absolutely clear: I shall devote every ounce of leadership within me to persuade the people of Pennsylvania of the crying need for constitutional revision and to follow through on whatever positive action you take. This is a must for Pennsylvania.

Though this completes my message to you today, it by no means completes the legislative program of the administration.

I will be sending you other special messages. I will be conferring weekly with your leaders. I will welcome all suggestions and criticisms that any of you may individually make.

If the program so far recommended is enacted we will have gone far toward transforming Pennsylvania. Toward restoring her old vigor. Toward once again being the model of her sister States—an example for all men and women who are enrolled in the long struggle to help make government good.

## Why Not Reverse Tax Program of President?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, January 23, 1963*

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the editor of the Washington County (Pa.) paper known as the Washington Observer has come up with an interesting formula concerning the manner in which tax reduction and fiscal reform by the Federal Government might most appropriately be implemented. He recommends expenditure reform first; tax reform, second; and tax reduction, third.

An old and valued friend of mine, L. D. Schreiver, of Dunns Station, Pa., sent me this editorial with his own endorsement supporting the economic concept that expenditures should be reduced before revenue returns are diminished. Borrowing money to reduce taxes does, indeed, seem a strange form of fiscal alchemy which could lead to Federal fiscal disaster if the theorists favoring this strange, new concept should be proved wrong.

I ask unanimous consent to have the Washington Observer editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY NOT REVERSE TAX PROGRAM OF PRESIDENT?

The principal significance of President Kennedy's budget message, delivered Thursday to the Congress of the United States, is that it calls for tax reductions he very likely will not get.

The only way most Republicans, and quite a few Democrats, will vote for such a reduction of revenue will be to make an approximately equivalent reduction in expenditures and outgo. Otherwise, they already feel, the deficit will be so large it will be too dangerous.

The President thinks the cuts will in the end bring about enough more revenue to bring the budget back into eventual balance—after some years. But during those years the Government will operate under such heavy deficit financing that the stability of the currency of the United States will be endangered. This must not happen. It could destroy the Government, bankrupt every citizen of the Nation, and possibly bring about a dictatorship. It would be exactly what such men as Lenin and Stalin and Khrushchev have predicted and wanted, and they would have the achievement of their highest goals.

There is a chance for the tax cuts, however, and every American would like to benefit by them.

That chance is that Congress—or enough Members of both Houses of that body—would have the courage to defy the President and to cut his budget very sharply. They would have to examine and audit it for unnecessary (not merely undesirable) spending proposals and to eliminate them. There are such items. Much of the welfare program has called for pouring money down the drain, the foreign aid program contains provisions for helping peoples who no longer need help or who never used our money for the purposes for which it was given. Congress would not have to search hard to find other actually undesirable items of expenditure, if the Members of the two Houses would discard politics for the national good.

It is true, as the President says, that there are loopholes through which many taxpayers are escaping from their tax liabilities. That kind of tax reform is needed. There is reason to believe also that unfairness in the tax setup forces some to pay taxes they should not have to pay.

In other words, thorough tax reform is needful, as well as tax reduction and spending reform. But the President himself points out that closing the loopholes will not recapture enough taxes by several billions of

dollars to balance the reduction in revenue he proposes.

We would like to reverse his order of procedure and put it in this order: Expenditure reform, tax reform and then tax reduction. And we're inclined to think the most important of the three is the first.

## Hon. Burris C. Jackson, President National Cotton Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the address delivered by the Honorable Burris C. Jackson, president of the National Cotton Council to the 1963 Beltwide Cotton Production-Mechanization Conference in Dallas, Tex., January 10, 1963.

Mr. Jackson is from Hillsboro, Tex., and is a resident of my congressional district. He has been associated with the commodity of cotton all of his life, and is probably as well versed on the subject as anyone I can think of.

It gives me pleasure to include this address:

COST REDUCTION: THE BIG KEY TO A BIG FUTURE FOR COTTON

(By Burris C. Jackson)

As some of you may know, the National Cotton Council is going to have its 25th birthday this month.

This occasion of our silver anniversary means quite a lot to me as one of the council's founders and one who has been officially associated with it ever since.

As I look back over the last quarter century, I can see many things in the council's record that I am intensely proud of. The council has a record of serving good causes—causes which not only operate in behalf of cotton, but of the country as well. And if there is one great cause that the council has given its all-out support from the very beginning, it is the cause of agricultural research and education.

Throughout its whole existence, the council has championed and built support for the programs in which this group is engaged—programs which seek to advance cotton and agriculture through the use of science and technology.

Those of us in the council have always done our dead-level best to build more adequate programs of research—and research application—for cotton and for agriculture.

We have consistently said that our industry's basic problems cannot be solved by any panaceas to be found in Government price and production control programs.

We have said that in meeting competition for markets, there is no substitute for developing a better product at lower cost.

We have said that science and technology must be at the very heart of any program capable of saving and advancing the American cotton industry.

That is our philosophy, and we have pushed it with all the power at our command. In cooperation with other groups, we have helped win some very significant increases in the total level of cotton research. There have even been a few cases in which we have helped generate an all-out research attack on a particular problem—the new Central Boll Weevil Laboratory in Mississippi being a prime example.

Through the combined efforts of the various groups which do cotton research and education, our industry has made an awful lot of progress in quality improvement and efficiency. And to all of you who have had a part in this accomplishment, I want to say that the council and the cotton industry are indeed grateful.

Yet my principal message to you today is that the total cotton research effort—as productive as it's been—has still fallen woefully short of meeting the industry's needs. The consequences of this are tragically evident today. They will soon become utterly disastrous unless we achieve a big, a fast, a crash buildup in research in the near future.

Just look at the situation we are in today in terms of price competition. We face the most rugged kind of opposition both at home and abroad. And with our production costs where they are, we are in very poor shape to try to stand on our own feet in meeting this competition.

Overseas, American cotton seems to be reasonably competitive with foreign growths and foreign rayon, but only because our Government gives us an export subsidy, which currently comes to 8½ cents a pound. Without the subsidy—which we have no assurance of keeping—we would quickly lose our export market and growers would face the impossible task of trying to adjust their production down to the domestic consumption level.

Remember, too, that the export subsidy—as vital as it is to us at this time—is by no means an unmixed blessing. It permits foreign mills to buy raw cotton at $42.50 a bale less than our domestic mills. This is a huge advantage—especially when you couple it with the fact that the wages paid by foreign mills are only a fraction of those paid in the United States.

The net result of this is that foreign-made cotton goods have been flooding into this country at an ever-increasing rate. Last year, manufactured goods were imported at a rate equivalent to more than 650,000 bales of raw cotton. They took that many bales of consumption away from us in our domestic market. They are going to take over a still larger part of our domestic market unless we do something about the raw cotton cost advantage enjoyed by foreign mills.

But our troubles in the domestic market don't begin and end with imports. Rayon, our biggest and oldest enemy among the manmade fibers, is beating us over the head with the largest price advantage it has ever had. Today, in net cost to domestic mills, rayon is 12 to 15 cents a pound cheaper than cotton. Over the last couple of years, and largely because of rayon's price advantage, we have lost hundreds of thousands of bales of consumption to this competitor.

But this still doesn't tell the whole story. Some of the more expensive fibers such as nylon, Dacron, and Orlon—fibers which have previously competed more on special qualities than on cost—are definitely trending downward in price. There seems little doubt that this downtrend will continue. And as it does, price will become an ever-more-critical factor in competing with the noncellulosic fibers.

The situation we face is not just serious, it's desperate. We have been losing markets fast over the last 2 years. The carryover of cotton has already risen some, and could very well be up sharply by next August 1. The national acreage allotment for 1963 has been reduced by about one-tenth below last year's level. Actually, the allotment is at the legal minimum. And how long can we keep even this legal minimum allotment if it produces more cotton than is consumed?

Now, what are we going to do about all this? What can be done?

An obvious part of the answer—and the only immediate solution—is a revamping of the Government's price and production policies on cotton. This is a must, and there's no question about it.

We must have a Government policy aimed at competitive pricing for U.S. cotton. We must have a policy aimed at doing away with the inequity of the two-price system which we have had for the last several years.

I am extremely hopeful that we will soon see a new Government policy calculated to permit a competitive, one-price system. I can assure you that a determined effort to achieve this goal is underway—and has been underway for the past several months.

President Kennedy has publicly recognized the need for a new cotton program. So have many of our key leaders in the Congress. And of course, the cotton industry itself is mustering every resource it can in the drive for new constructive legislation. Let's hope that this drive will be successful in giving us something that cotton needs—and that success will not be long in coming. To that end, we all pledge our best efforts.

At the same time, let's remember that no government program is going to underwrite and guarantee a big future, or any future, for American cotton.

We are fooling ourselves if we think the Government is going to commit itself to perpetual and massive assistance to cotton in meeting price competition. Certainly the Government has a deep interest in maintaining cotton as a big and vital part of the national economy. But there is bound to be a limit on how far and how long the Government can go in bailing cotton out of trouble. We must, therefore, make plans for the future.

There is really only one long-range solution to our price problems. We must do the things that will permit us to stand on our own feet in meeting price competition. And this means, of course, that we must mount a massive, all-out effort to reduce the cost of producing cotton.

Cost reduction is the key. It has to be the key. In the long run, there is no other way to meet price competition without ruining the producer's profits and driving him out of cotton.

Fortunately, we have a terrific, an enormous potential for getting down the unit cost of producing American cotton, and it is most gratifying to me that the emphasis in this conference program has been placed on exploiting that potential.

One of the ways we can get costs down is simply to do a better job of putting to work the techniques and know-how that have already been developed and proved by research. I would not want to hazard a guess on how much we could reduce the average cost of production by making maximum use of existing technology, but obviously we could make a substantial gain.

How many farmers do you know who are careless about insect control? Farmers who fail to get anything like the full benefits out of mechanical harvesting? Farmers who don't fertilize properly? Farmers who could profit from irrigation? Farmers who should but who haven't tried chemicals for weed control?

What I am saying here is that those of you who work directly with farmers—those of you who have the job of helping farmers apply the results of research—have a tremendous opportunity to help with the vital task of bringing down production costs. This is an opportunity that needs to be exploited with every bit of speed and urgency and resourcefulness that can be applied to it.

Then there's the huge and even-more-difficult task of beefing up our cotton research efforts so they will give us bigger and faster breakthroughs in cost reduction.

Up to now, in spite of a great deal of effort, we have been terribly slow in achieving a buildup in the overall level of cotton research. This has been particularly agonizing in view of the fact that an adequate level of research could in all likelihood reduce the cost of growing cotton by 10 or 11 cents a pound within a reasonable period of time.

If we had had a massive buildup in research several years ago, I am fully confident that farmers would not only be able to meet price competition today, but would be making greater profits to boot. But we didn't get it. Today we still face a great deficit in research. And, in my judgment, we are fast running out of time in which to overcome that deficit.

One of our big hopes for bolstering research lies in the program of self-help that farmers are mounting through the cotton producers' institute. Through the institute, producers are already putting hundreds of thousands of dollars directly into crucial research projects, as well as other hundreds of thousands into cotton promotion, where we also are running a big deficit.

Within a short period of time, the producers' institute expects to be spending millions on research, because this self-help, voluntary program has been splendidly received in all the areas where it has been introduced up to now.

But it is just a plain fact that producers want and need all the help they can get if the total cotton research buildup is to be big enough and fast enough. They need the help of government. They need all possible help from private businesses and industries which are allied with cotton.

I am especially hopeful that the Federal Government will see the wisdom of a sharp step-up in its cotton research efforts. This kind of step-up would involve just a few million dollars, only a minute fraction of what the Government is spending on price and production programs.

Actually, an additional investment in research would be the smartest kind of spending the Government could do for cotton. It would help maintain cotton as a big, dynamic part of the Nation's economy. It would permit farmers to go it on their own in meeting price competition. It would help eliminate any need for heavy subsidies from the Federal Treasury.

In any event, whatever we must do to achieve it, there is no alternative to a crash program to reduce cotton production costs. Without this kind of program, cotton can have no real hope for surviving as a major industry. With such a program, cotton can not only survive but move forward into the healthiest and most prosperous era it has ever known.

There is no question, absolutely no question at all, about our tremendous potential for reducing costs, for meeting price competition, and for increasing the farmer's profits. The only question is whether we are going to move far enough and fast enough in capitalizing on it, and I am confident we will. We simply cannot afford to do anything else

## Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with Americans of Ukrainian descent in celebrating the 44th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day and in paying tribute to these freedom-loving people who have a history of a great struggle for independence.

Their dedication to the principles of freedom and the dignity of the individual, in the face of the oppression to which they have been subjected, is a shining example to all of us in our efforts to see that every country has the right to determine its own form of government.

To those of us who are free, the flame of Ukrainian liberty should renew our desire to maintain and strengthen the cause of freedom everywhere.

It is a pleasure to join my colleagues in commemorating the 44th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day and to assure the captive people of that country that we in America join in their prayers and hopes that freedom will again shine in their land and they will be given the opportunity for a free and just form of government.

## Foreign Economic Policy: The Herter Lecture Series

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly honored shortly before the opening of the present session of Congress to be invited to initiate the Christian Herter lecture series at Tufts University. In recognition of the services which Herter has given as Congressman, Governor of the State of Massachusetts, and Secretary of State of the United States and in the understanding of the difficult job which lies ahead of him as Chief Trade Negotiator under the new American Trade Act, Tufts has begun a lecture series to look into the difficult area of trade policy and foreign economics. I join with Tufts and the entire Nation in wishing Christian Herter well in his new job, so important to our economic future.

I was very much in favor of personalizing the job of Trade Negotiator as the considerations of the Trade Expansion Act were in progress and I believe both the job and the man offer the greatest promise.

My speech in the lecture series concerned trade, economic policy, and Herter's job as Chief Trade Negotiator.

It is set out below:

FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY

(Remarks of the Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, Second Missouri District, at the Herter lecture, Tufts University, Boston, Mass., Monday, Jan. 7, 1963)

It is a privilege to be a participant in the Christian Herter lecture series established at this great university. It is appropriate that I should discuss foreign trade on this occasion as Christian Herter, the first Chief Trade Negotiator of the United States, pilots this Nation on a new and an uncharted course in the altered archipelago of foreign trade.

I would be remiss if I did not take note of the appearance of Walter Hallstein, the President of the European Economic Community, here at Tufts in April of 1962, to lecture on the dramatic economic developments occurring in Western Europe in the 5 years since the Rome Treaty was signed. This massive emergence is one of the major reasons that old charts and old courses must be abandoned and new ones charted.

The most important provision of the Reciprocal Trades Act of 1962 (Trade Expansion Act) was the creation of the position of Chief Trade Negotiator requiring Presidential appointment and Senate confirmation, carrying with it the rank of Ambassador Plenipotentiary, and investing in it the basic powers of negotiating our trade treaties, and chairing the newly designed Intercabinet Trade Policy Committee.

There are two basic reasons for the importance of this provision. First, it raised the stature of trade negotiating throughout the world. Other countries sent their trade negotiating teams to Geneva headed by top Cabinet officers or other top governmental official. The United States, on the other hand, frequently and usually sent a team headed or directed by a top civil service employee, a highly competent person with highly competent people to assist him, but one with no stature of his own. His decisions were subject to telephone approvals sought from other faceless officials back in Washington, D.C. Now this has been changed. The decisions now will be made on the spot backed by the authority and integrity of one of the highest officials in our Government, one who is directly responsible to the President.

Second, it raises the stature of trade negotiating in the United States. Personally, I favored the creation of a new Department of Foreign Economics headed by a Cabinet officer who would be the Chief Trade Negotiator, and who would draw together in one place all the various important points where foreign economics impinge upon our domestic economics. As it is, the contact points of foreign economic forces are spread in an uncoordinated fashion throughout our Federal departments, bureaus, and agencies.

I believe foreign trade or, to use the broader terms, foreign economics, has assumed such great importance to our Nation, even though trade itself amounts to less than 10 percent of our gross national product, that we could not possibly deal with the problems it creates under our former administrative setup.

However, I believe it is possible for the Chief Trade Negotiator to develop the powers that are entrusted to him in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 so that he can deal with the most important of the foreign economic contact points.

The powers that go with preparing for trade negotiating are vested in this newly created office. The powers of conducting the negotiations of course are vested here. Furthermore, if the concept of the Intercabinet Trade Policy Committee that some of us had, and tried to spell out in the committee report and during the congressional debate, is carried out, the compliance with the treaties and agreements negotiated will be supervised by the Chief Trade Negotiator. Finally, the Committee has authority to develop procedures for receiving, hearing, evaluating and recommending remedial action to the President on allegations of unfair trade practices which bear on foreign trade agreements, even though not specifically a part of them.

These charges of unfair trade practices may be directed against foreign or domestic businessmen, I hasten to point out.

At this point, let me state that President Kennedy by appointing a former U.S. Secretary of State to the position of Chief Trade Negotiator has captured the full significance of upgrading the place foreign trade should hold in the council of nations and in the United States. Let me further state that by appointing a person with the wisdom, experience, imagination, and integrity that Christian Herter possesses, we are most likely to develop the governmental machinery the new law makes possible for dealing with the problems presented in the field of foreign economics.

It is in these areas that the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 deserves the oft applied cliche, bold and imaginative. At the same time I make this point I want to make the point that what has been hailed as bold and imaginative in the Trade Expansion Act—the granting to the President of additional trading material to further reduce tariff rates and eliminate many altogether—is shirking and stereotype. This is no more than the last possible move remaining that could be made under the provisions of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930. Too many people have forgotten that the Reciprocal Trade Acts were mere amendments to this basic act which remains on the books today. By starting from a level of high tariff rates, we were able to negotiate downward as Congress intermittently gave the President power to do so. Incidentally, the original Reciprocal Trade Act and most of those that followed permitted the President to negotiate upward if he had been so inclined, and so does the present law. This point has not been overlooked by many people who are unsympathetic with the doctrine of freer trade and may have a great significance. Time will tell.

What our trade policy will be, once we have used this last bit of tariff trading material the President now has is one of the questions not yet resolved.

I have said that in this area of trading material the act is shirking, not bold. I justify my choice of words for the following reason. Today tariffs are among the least of the trade barriers that hamper free trade. Quotas, licenses, embargoes, internal excises, monetary policies, exchange rates, governmental subsidies of an infinite variety, state trading, Government sponsored or unrestrained cartels, health and other regulatory laws perverted to embargoes are the major barriers in international trade today. The United States is an offender in these areas, along with the other major trading nations, yet nothing meaningful is said in the Trade Expansion Act about these trade barriers. The GATT, which seeks to eliminate all trade barriers, remains unmentioned in the Trade Expansion Act, either by name or by reference to its principles.

As a matter of fact, the most liberal of all trade barriers is the much abused tariff which is now being abandoned in toto. A tariff at least is a law for all to read, determine, and apply, and courts have been set up to resolve differences of interpretations in accordance with established laws and procedures. The other types of trade barriers I have listed almost without exception require administrative determination without established laws, procedures, or courts. Who gets a quota, and how much, and into what ports in what quantities is the subject of administrative negotiation. This is government by men, not government by law. In this process woe betides the little operator and fortune blesses the operator with political connections and power.

The trade adjustment features in the Trade Expansion Act deserve no such accolade as bold and imaginative. Redundant and defensive are the adjectives that come to my mind to describe them. The adjustment features for the unemployed duplicate the provisions in our unemployment insurance laws, our Manpower Training Act, and our depressed areas legislation. These new provisions can only confuse and damage established programs and do little or no good. The adjustment features which relate to employers are unnecessary for large corporations which can adjust their line of products and services within their own structure, and duplicate for smaller businesses the loan provisions of the Small Business Act. I used the adjective "defensive" because these provisions were placed in the law as a defense mechanism against those who had been claiming for years that foreign competition damaged their business or their jobs. The same reasoning could be applied to any form of competition. The proponents of this defense mechanism fell back on the thesis that this economic damage results from the governmental action in reducing tariff rates and, therefore, the Government should compensate. The same reasoning should then apply when Government moves its contracts from certain businesses in one area to businesses in other areas, or when Government takes any action which has an impact upon the marketplace. This would be quite an undertaking for a Government with an annual expediture of $100 billion.

At this point I would like to make an observation that I have been making for the past few years. I am convinced that most of our people who think they want protection really want fairness in trading—not protection, not an advantage, and definitely not a handout. I have listened for years to the testimony of businessmen, labor and farm groups who have appeared before the Ways and Means Committee in opposing the Reciprocal Trade Act extension. I have dug into what seemed to be bothering them. Most of their troubles arise from lack of fairness or reciprocity in trade matters on the part of their foreign competitors, from a State subsidy to their competitor, or an embargo, or a quota system, or an unhealthy wage scale—unhealthy to the overall economy of the country which permitted it.

I recall a statement from one of our exporters to Venezuela. He said his company was unable to compete with the Western German companies in that market because the German companies could offer more liberal credit terms financed by the German Government. I posed this case to Secretary of Commerce Hodges during the public hearings on the Trade Expansion Act last year. The Secretary's response worried me. He said, "Well, we will look into that and perhaps we (meaning some governmental agency) can enable the U.S. companies to match this liberal credit extension." My expressed thought was, if we really are talking about freeing up trade, why not negotiate with the German Government to quit subsidizing their businesses? Don't compound the error by subsidizing ours.

Another matter coming out of the hearings comes to my mind which illustrates the point in a somewhat different way. The Secretary of Interior pointed with some pride to the fact that Government loans had been extended to some of our west coast fishermen who otherwise would have been forced out of business by the Japanese. The point was that our fishing boats were obsolete and needed renovation. I asked why the tariff on fish was not increased, if there was to be protection. In that way the most efficient of our fishermen would do the renovation. By a subsidy, the fishermen who were most efficient in presenting their case to the Small Business Administration for the guaranteed loan, not necessarily the best fishermen, would do the renovation. Either way, however, we were not freeing up trade and by the subsidy method we might even be keeping an inefficient operation alive which would be coming back for more subsidy. As a not too irrelevant side point, there was testimony to the effect that it was not the efficiency of the Japanese fishing boats as much as it was the noncompliance by the Japanese with the international fishing agreements set up for conservation purposes which kept our fishermen from competing.

If this latter point turned out to be true, the gravamen of our fishermen's case was not protection of an American industry, but rather, insistence on the mutual observance of good conservation laws. By protecting instead of insisting that a violation cease, we compounded the error and impeded the expansion of trade.

I want to express one other specific point of concern I have about our foreign trade policy. Section 203 of the Agriculture Act which authorizes the President to enter into international cartel agreements in respect to agricultural products and products manufactured therefrom with other nations was not only not repealed by the Congress, but at the request of the administration, its authority was broadened to provide that these agreements would be made binding on nations not party to the international agreement. It was this authority, incidentally, that lay at the base of the international textile agreement entered into in Geneva in January of 1962.

I asked Secretary of Commerce Hodges how it was determined how much textile, of what varieties, from what companies, from what countries were to come into what U.S. ports. He replied straight-facedly that they were going to use the 1960 census figures. In other words, we are going to freeze the trade pattern as of that date. How expansive and progressive can we get? I know of nothing that more dramatically drives home the point I seek to make of the regressiveness, the stifling aspects of the license-quota type trade barrier. Is this what we are coming to once we have run out of the tariff-rate trading material set up in the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act? This is not an isolated example of our use of quotas and licenses or international type cartel agreements. The Sugar Act is an example. Many of our agricultural products are state traded, under Public Law 480. Indeed, very few agricultural products move without knocking against these kinds of trade barriers and government subsidies. Recently we have been utilizing the quota system instead of tariffs for oil imports.

And now I must relate another important piece of legislation affecting foreign economics which was passed the last session of Congress. I refer to the Revenue Act of 1962; that part which altered the tax treatment of American enterprise abroad. It has been my observation that we cannot separate trade from foreign investment and that anything that deters foreign investment will deter trade. I think this is particularly true in face of the development of the European Common Market. Much has been made of the efficiencies the EEC countries will derive from manufacturing for a mass market. However, these are efficiencies that they should be able to put into effect without too much to do. However, mass manufacturing is based upon mass distribution and mass servicing, a point that seems to escape many economic planners. It requires the economic infrastructure of power, communications, transportation, and education. The United States is just about the only society that has developed the techniques of mass distribution and mass servicing. For this reason I have suggested that the greatest opportunities open to U.S. enterprise in the European Common Market lie in the field of distribution and servicing.

If some question this point, let me give just a practical illustration which may drive

it home. I have a friend who mass-produces special pallets to be used in mass warehousing where turnover is fast and handling must be made as efficient as possible. There is no market in Europe, as yet, for his product, because warehousing has not been developed to this point and probably will not be for many years.

We have had so little regard for the distributive and servicing sectors of our economy, probably as a result of what seems to be our mesmerization with mass production, that we really have been unaware of what is going on. We accept packaging as routine and actually curse advertising with an unawareness of the vital economic part they both play in obtaining the efficiencies that can be had in a mass market. Perhaps this point will drive the point home; while employment has been steadily declining in manufacturing in the United States, employment in the service and distributive fields has continued to climb, even during our post-World War II recessions.

Now, to get back to the point I sought to make about foreign investment. If we are going to avail ourselves of the opportunities offered in the European Common Market in the service and distributive fields, we must encourage, not discourage, our capital to move there. All the talk about our manufacturing processes moving to Europe is largely unanalytical. What movement there has been is largely to gain the efficiencies derived from having a crucial part of the manufacturing process nearer to the market for distributive and servicing efficiencies. Actually this process creates more jobs in the United States than it displaces, not less. However, it is true the jobs will be shifted out of manufacturing into distribution and servicing, but they will become better paying and requiring less brawn, but a little more brains.

It certainly is a shortsighted policy which seeks to solve a balance-of-payments problem through discouraging healthy and remunerative private investment going abroad. This is sacrificing gain over the long haul for a very temporary short-term benefit. One of the strongest items in our balance of payments is the income we derive from our foreign investment. And yet government policy seeks to weaken it.

I do not introduce the subject to argue its merits or demerits. I brought it up primarily to emphasize its inseparable relation to our trade policy. In trade we talk of going one way, toward expansion, to help our balance of payments, and in investment we talk and promote contraction, allegedly for the same purpose. This is a grave inconsistency.

I do not like to mention the relatively trivial items the administration sponsored in the previous Congress, such as increasing the tariffs on the most person to person of all foreign trade, the trade between our tourists and the foreign shopkeeper, and cutting back on military personnel purchasing abroad, but they are straws in the wind which reflect the way the trade policy really is blowing. These two pieces of leigslation were also promoted in the name of balance-of-payments problems.

I must mention a major administration policy not referred to the Congress but set by Executive decree. This is the buy American program adopted by the Defense Department. This policy requires purchases of military goods to be made in the United States if the United States price is not 25 percent greater than the foreign price. Already this has cost the Military Establishment over $100 million, at least, that is the boast of the Defense Department and the administration when they were toting up the effective job they claimed they had done in respect to the balance-of-payments problem.

While the administration talks freer trade every policy it has followed to date indicates it is pursuing a course of more restricted trade—all in the name of balance of payments.

From this discussion you may be gaining the impression that I am the greatest free trader since Adam Smith. In theory, I guess I may be, but in practice I am a fair trader which puts me in bad with the so-called protectionists with some frequency. I happen to believe that increased trade depends upon free trade and free trade depends upon fair trade. The points at issue revolve around the definition of fair trade. For a starter I will take the definitions set forth in the GATT. What my protectionist friends call protection I find, on analysis, to be usually a differential reflecting some subsidy or impact of a trade barrier set up on the other side by the competitor. The policy I would have us pursue is to remove the subsidy or the barrier which is the justification for the differential. However, if a differential is to be used, I would recommend that the most liberal differential possible be used; this happens to be also the most flexible—it is the tariff. I would adopt only as a last recourse the other differentials—those regressive devices of licenses, quotas and subsidies. I would eschew without equivocation health and other regulatory laws used as subterfuges for economic differentials.

I would oppose any differential that created a preference, that is, any differential which went beyond the economic difference sought to be measured for adjustment.

I think our foreign economic policy should be trade wherever possible, not aid; when trade is not possible, then loans rather than grants; where loans are not possible, then know-how rather than money; and when know-how is not possible, then outright gifts, rather than money with a string tied to it. When we get to money with strings tied to it, we move out of economics into diplomacy which is the realm of the State Department.

I am happy that foreign economics is being taken out of the hands of the State Department and is being placed, to some degree, in the hands of a new, independent and possibly coequal agency headed by the Chief Trade Negotiator. This new law serves as the authority to do this. I believe our State Department should be relieved from any control of the details that go to make up our economic arm, just as they have no control of the details that go to make up our military arm. Diplomacy is the area of endeavor of the State Department. In implementing our foreign policy, exercising diplomacy that is, we must be able to utilize the strength of either and both arms, military and economic. To make and keep them as strong as possible, they must be under the direction of their specialists, not specialists in diplomacy who sometimes are tempted, like Xerxes, to whip the seas when the laws of nature fail to respond to their pleas.

## Freedom and Union Publication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of an article that appeared in a publication entitled, "Freedom and Union," edited by Clarence Streit. The article concerns the splendid election victory of our colleague Representative, PAUL FINDLEY, of the 20th Congressional District of Illinois.

It will be seen that Streit's basis is his article around PAUL FINDLEY's superb speech on the subject of World Federation. The title of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] address is "America's Greatest Invention—and How Best To Use it Now." Its theme is that the United States made a contribution to the world when it fashioned a Federal union plan for government as embodied in the U.S. Constitution. Why should not, then, this concept be applied to world unity?

Full text of the gentleman from Illinois, PAUL FINDLEY'S, speech is attached along with the introductory article that appeared in the magazine, Freedom and Union:

CONSERVATIVE FINDLEY WINS CRUCIAL SEAT IN CONGRESS, BACKING ATLANTIC FEDERATION

With Atlantic federation as the most distinguish plank in his platform, PAUL FINDLEY, a freshman Republican Congressman, roundly defeated on November 6 Peter Mack, liberal Democrat, who had the advantage of having served seven terms in Congress. Mr. FINDLEY won by a majority of 10,871, in a total vote of 190,209. His victory is the more significant since it came in the heart of the Middle West, in the 20th District of Illinois.

Before the election, Robert C. Albright, political correspondent of the Washington Post, made a special visit to this district. In a column-long report his paper published November 5, he said this was "1 of the 12 House contests that the two political parties consider crucial." Mr. Albright explained:

"Representative Peter Mack, 46, the Democratic loner with the Houdini flair for winning in gerrymandered congressional districts is walled in again but he hopes not for long. In 1952 he confounded Republicans and his own machine leaders by escaping from a similar reapportionment lockup. The big question is: Can he duplicate that difficult feat in Tuesday's election?

"Representative PAUL FINDLEY, 41, a deeply conservative Republican freshman, was thrown into the same district with the Kennedy-endorsed Mack by the Illinois Legislature. The two are grappling for holds in one of the tightest of off-year races. Some say it could be decided by less than 1,000 votes. The statistics narrowly favor Mack's Republican opponent, as they did in 1952 when the dexterous Democratic independent bucked the Eisenhower landslide to hold on to his seat. * * * The 14 counties now comprising the new Mack-Findley (20th) district went 51.6 percent Republican in 1960."

That Mr. FINDLEY's victory was not due to gerrymandering would seem evident from the fact that he gained 53 percent of the votes and a majority 10 times greater than the experts had expected. Moreover, President Kennedy had gone out of his way to endorse Mr. Mark to quote the Albright report.

"At the Illinois State Fair Colosseum in Springfield, Mr. Kennedy singled Mack out from his colleagues. 'I'd like to have him stand up,' the President said. 'He is a great Congressman.'

"FINDLEY said he was delighted the President had plumped for Mack. 'It helped identify Mack as a New Frontiersman,' said FINDLEY. 'He's been trying to dodge it. Now everyone knows.'

"FINDLEY, rated by some as 'to the right of GOLDWATER,' goodnaturedly denies it. 'I'd class myself somewhere between GOLDWATER and Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN,' he said. In fact, he is one of the few Republicans able

to produce letters from both GOLDWATER and Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, strongly endorsing his candidacy.

"FINDLEY goes along with some of Rockefeller's foreign policy views, including his belief in a Federation of Western Nations. He said as a youth he won a prize for an essay contest on an almost identical theme. The contest was sponsored by Clarence Streit.

"FINDLEY makes no bones about differing with Rockefeller's domestic views, however. He takes pride in his 100 percent rating with the conservative Americans for Constitutional Action."

The essay contest referred to was one sponsored by the Federal Union Association about 1940, the prize being a trip to Washington and lunch with Mr. Streit at the National Press Club. Mr. FINDLEY was then one of the organization's collegiate Student Federalists. When the association founded Freedom and Union in 1946, Mr. FINDLEY, back from the Guam invasion, was assistant editor through its first year. He left to become publisher and editor of the Pike County Republican in Pittsfield, Ill., and later acquired another weekly. He graduated from Illinois College a Phi Beta Kappa, and married his charming wife, née Lucille Gemme, while on the staff of this magazine. They have two children, Craig and Diane.

Congressman FINDLEY is, so far as we know, the only candidate for either House of Congress who made Atlantic Federal Union a feature of his campaign. Like Governor Rockefeller, he not only shares a widespread view that it is right but he—unlike timid politicians—believed there were votes in it. He seems to have proved it. For he won a resounding victory in what the experts deemed the hardest kind of district in which to test this belief, while Governor Rockefeller, who, after making a bold stand for federation in February, did not speak of it in his campaign because his advisers urged it was not a State issue, was reelected with a smaller majority than before.

We reprint below Congressman FINDLEY's opening speech on Atlantic Federal Union which he delivered at Carthage College in his district September 28, to show the way in which he stepped forward "where devils feared to tread."

"In television statements late in the campaign," Mr. FINDLEY said, in response to a question on whether he supported the U.N., "I have always believed in the U.N. I want it to continue to function. It has performed valuable services in the past and can do so in the future. It is primarily a meeting place for representatives of sovereign nations, and affords a mechanism through which member nations can carry forward projects over which there is little controversy.

"I do object to efforts being made by some groups to transform the U.N. into some sort of world government. Such an effort would surely destroy the U.N. My suggestion is to permit the U.N. to continue to provide the limited but valuable function as a meeting place.

"I do strongly recommend, however, that a new unity—indeed an organic union—be formed among the U.N. members that have demonstrated over a period of years their ability to govern themselves and protect individual liberty. These would be the United States, British Commonwealth nations, France, the Low Countries, and a few others. Such a union would be the greatest possible step forward in the cause of liberty, and the best possible news for the U.S. taxpayer. The cost of armament and space activities would be shared with millions of others. I also referred briefly to the Federal Union idea in several other brief appearances on television.

"I kept this up through my final TV broadcast. Mr. Mack never challenged me on this issue. I don't believe I had even one murmur of criticism on this issue. Which is astonishing. But I learned my lesson before the campaign when I made a speech in favor of Atlantic Federal Union at a DAR meeting in my district and found that, when they understood the proposal, none of them expressed any opposition."

The only part of Representative FINDLEY's Carthage speech which he gave in his press release on it was the lesson he drew from U.S. history at the end, which we have put in boldface type. His full speech follows.—EDITORS.

AMERICA'S GREATEST INVENTION—AND HOW BEST TO USE IT NOW

(By Congressman PAUL FINDLEY, Republican, of Illinois)

"Have you ever considered this question: What was America's greatest invention?

"Was it Alexander Graham Bell's telephone, which opened a new era in communications?

"Was it Thomas A. Edison's electric light, which turned a world of flickering nighttime into one in which night can be as brilliant as day?

"Was it the Wright brothers' airplane, which gave mankind wings, for good and for ill?

"Was it Henry Ford's assembly line which led to mass production and a sharply rising standard of living?

"Was it atomic energy, which ushered in an age that is now only beginning to unfold?

"Each has a claim to greatness. Each is uniquely American. Each has contributed immensely to progress. Which would you choose?

"My choice may surprise you. It is none of these. My choice is nothing more tangible than a manuscript, and yet it has become the most vital force for freedom and progress history has known. It is uniquely an American invention. It is the Federal Union plan for Government as embodied in the U.S. Constitution.

"The laboratory where Federal Union was created was Independence Hall in Philadelphia. The year was 1787. In the same Hall 11 years earlier had been signed the Declaration of Independence, the vital spark that was to ignite this torch of freedom.

"The inventors were farmers, professors, businessmen, lawyers—39 men representing 12 American States.

"In 3 months they created the Federal Union idea, an accomplishment which historian John Fiske called 'the Iliad, the Parthenon, the fifth symphony of statesmanship.'

"You have all seen Christy's massive painting of the signing of the Constitution. It shows a room filled with distinguished bewigged gentlemen. At the speaker's desk with austere bearing is George Washington. One has the feeling that here were the beloved statesmen of the colonies commissioned by a grateful people to fashion a new government, now that the British yoke had been lifted. It is an illusion of peace, unity, good feeling, solidarity, confidence, and high purpose, untainted by usual human frailties.

"The true picture was one of disunity, open warfare between States, rebellion within States, bitterness and sectional strife, and, in Independence Hall itself, a constant struggle between lofty purpose and provincialism, between freedom and slavery. The American States were on the verge of anarchy.

"The Central Government—the 'League of Friendship' organized under the Articles of Confederation—was weak, nearly bankrupt and without support abroad.

"The league was unable to meet its own current expenses and too weak to enforce payment of debts, public or private.

"The league was so weak foreign governments refused to enter into agreements. Barbary Coast pirates were seizing American ships and American citizens. The league was too poor to build a navy, and too poor to buy off the pirates.

"The States erected a maze of foolish discriminatory tariff walls among themselves. New York levied a high import duty on Connecticut firewood, for example, so Connecticut voted to forbid all trade with New York.

"Connecticut and Pennsylvania quarreled over a river valley. One winter and spring was especially rough on the valley. Floods, ice floes, and storm were almost devastating. Under the pretext of helping the population of Connecticut 'Yankees,' Pennsylvania sent militia into the area. Their conduct would have disgraced barbarians. They stole and plundered, naturally got violence in return. On one occasion, the militia emptied a Connecticut town of 500 people, burned the homes and at bayonet point forced the inhabitants, children and all, into the wilderness.

"Currency collapsed in most of the States, and efforts to establish fiat paper currency led to rebellion, a new high in bitterness, hatred. The only sound currency was a meager and assorted supply of foreign coins, called specie. Clipping of coins was so common, many people carried scales with them to verify weight of gold coins before accepting them.

"In Rhode Island, money-hungry citizens forced the legislature to issue paper money, even though it was doomed to failure. Realizing there was no public confidence in paper money, merchants refused to accept it at the same value as hard money, or specie. Laws were passed providing fines or imprisonment for refusing to accept paper money at the same value as hard money. Rather than go to prison, merchants shut up shop.

"In defiance of the merchants, farmers dumped their produce, burned corn for fuel, and tried to starve city people into accepting paper money at face value. All trade, except on a barter basis, stopped. In 6 months, paper money dropped in exchange value from $1 to 16 cents. There was virtually no money to pay debts, and imprisonment for debt became commonplace.

"In Massachusetts, a mob angry over the collapse, of that State's currency, took it out on established authority. The mob stormed the courts and forced the State supreme court to leave town. Rebels seized leading citizens as hostages in other communities.

"Such was the American mood in 1787, on the eve of America's greatest invention.

"An impotent Central Government, unable to defend American rights abroad, or to make foreign agreement, unable to meet its own expenses.

"Bloody warfare between States, and rebellion within States. A maze of tariff walls separating one State from another.

"Looming anarchy because of the collapse of currency.

"Jealousy, hatred, chaos, rebellion, anarchy.

"What was the mood of delegates at Independence Hall? The mood was despair. A year earlier a Convention had been called for the purpose of strengthening the Central Government. The Convention ended before it began, because only five States sent delegates.

"The Second Convention was called to meet in Independence Hall on May 14. There was very little interest in it among the State governments. Indeed, New York thought so little of it that that State did not send its best men as delegates. John Jay, who could have added strength to the Convention, was left at home.

"The one fact which added hope to this Second Convention was the news that Gen-

eral Washington was to be in the Virginia delegation.

"Washington arrived at Independence Hall on schedule. So did a few other delegates. They had to wait 11 days before delegates from the seventh State arrived, providing a quorum. Before the Convention was concluded, 12 States participated. Rhode Island never did send delegates.

"The night before the Convention was to have its opening session, some of the delegates were gathered before the fireplace, 'shooting the breeze.' The Convention was called for the purpose simply of revising the Articles of Confederation, and several delegates warned that the country was in no mood for any radical changes in the Central Government. It would be better for the Convention to deal with mild changes, and avoid anything very sweeping.

"Washington could not bear this talk in silence. He rose and delivered his shortest and one of his greatest speeches. He said, 'It is too probable that no plan we propose will be adopted. Perhaps another dreadful conflict is to be sustained. If, to please, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work?'

"Perhaps thinking of the border warfare, the low estate to which America had fallen in the eyes of the world, the rebellion in Massachusetts and the crying need for a strong Central Government, Washington added: 'Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The event is in the hand of God.'

"But in the Convention, the outlook fell from bad to worse. Big States vied with little States. Southern interests opposed New England. The longer the delegates debated, the more remote seemed agreement.

"After 6 weeks, Washington wrote a note to Alexander Hamilton, who had left the Convention for business in New York. In the note Washington said, 'I almost despair seeing a favorable issue to the proceedings and do therefore repent having had any agency in the business.'

"At a critical moment when the Convention appeared to be on the verge of collapse, Ben Franklin had this to say:

" 'In this situation of this assembly, groping as it were in the dark to find political truth, and scarce able to distinguish it when presented to us, how has it happened, sir, that we have not hitherto once thought of humbly applying to the Father of lights to illuminate our understandings? In the beginning of the contest with Great Britain when we were sensible of danger, we had daily prayer in this room for the divine protection. Our prayers, sir, were heard, and they were graciously answered. All of us who were engaged in the struggle must have observed frequent instances of a superintending providence in our favor. To that kind providence we owe this happy opportunity of consulting in peace on the means of establishing our future national felicity, and have we now forgotten that powerful friend? Or do we imagine that we no longer need His assistance?

" 'I have lived a long time and the longer I live the more convincing proofs I see of this truth: that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid? We have been assured, sir, in the sacred writings that "except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it." I firmly believe this; and I also believe that without His concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel: we shall be divided by our little partial local interests; our projects will be confounded, and we ourselves shall become a reproach and byword down to future ages. And what is worse, mankind may hereafter from this unfortunate instance, despair of establishing governments by human wisdom and leave it to chance, war, and conquest.

" 'I therefore beg leave to move—that henceforth prayers imploring the assistance of Heaven, and its blessing on our deliberations, be heard in this assembly every morning before we proceed to business, and that one or more of the clergy of this city be requested to officiate in that service.'

"Tempers were snapping. Angry words were heard. Delegations threatened to go home. But out of desperation and adversity, one by one, were hammered out the great principles which formed America's greatest invention.

"The United States was to be a union of people, not a union of States. The citizen was to be the sovereign power, and he was to have dual citizenship, being a citizen of a State and a citizen of the Nation.

"The Central Government was to have strictly limited powers, with a balance of these powers among the two Houses of Congress—the executive and the judiciary.

"Senators and Congressmen were to vote individually and not by State blocs. This permitted a vigorous party system to develop in the United States.

"States were to have equal representation in the Senate, and Congressmen were to be chosen on the basis of population. This was the result of compromise, and the agreement was reached only after long dispute.

"Laws and treaties of the Central Government were to be supreme.

"Free trade was to be established throughout the area of the Union. It was the first time a group of sovereign States had agreed to abolish all tariffs. This act made possible America's tremendous economic growth and our sharply rising standard of living.

"But it was a gain not without cost. The price paid for free trade and for the right of the Central Government to control foreign commerce was a grisly deal that later was to haunt the United States.

"Involved was the problem of the slave trade. Ten of the twelve States—including Virginia—favored stopping import of slaves, and many freely predicted that slavery would soon be abolished.

"Only South Carolina and Georgia resisted. There, rice was the principal crop, and the death rate in the sickly rice swamps was so high, the planters needed a steady supply of new slaves to replace those who died.

"So a compromise provided that import of slaves could not be halted for another 20 years. By that time, the cotton gin had changed the principal crop of the South to cotton, and a new expanding demand for slaves was created.

"It is ironic that much of the opposition to the deal was from Virginia, soon to become a center of slave activity. George Mason was so incensed that he refused to sign the Constitution, despite Washington's fervent appeal for unity. Said Mason, 'I would sooner chop off my right hand than put it to the Constitution as it stands.'

"Yet, without this and other compromises, the Federal Union would not have been created in the summer of 1787. America would likely have gone the way of Europe with numerous small warring states. Instead of one war on a great moral issue, there would have probably been several wars on petty issues.

"But for this slave deal, a mighty force for freedom might never have been created.

"And who is to say it was a wrong compromise?

"America's greatest invention was a creature of compromise from start to finish, and yet the invention created a strong central government, and protected the liberty of citizens and retained the authority of the States.

"William Gladstone said the U.S. Constitution was the greatest work ever struck off by the mind of man.

"Considering the obstacles, the rivalries, open warfare, suspicion among the States, it is all the more remarkable that the Convention of 1787 should have produced this fifth symphony of statesmanship. As Washington had predicted, the event was in the hand of God.

"Surely a power greater than man contrived to resolve the antagonisms of the day and to inspire those 39 men to create in this greatest of all American inventions a shield for liberty that would survive the test of time and become an example for others to follow.

"Here, indeed, was raised a standard to which the wise and honest can repair—in 1787—and in 1962. How fully we understand and appreciate this great charter will determine in large measure how well we fulfill our stewardship in keeping high the torch of freedom.

"The great historian of this period, John Fiske, concluding his study entitled 'The Critical Period of American History,' had this to say: 'In some future, still grander convention, we trust the same thing will be done between States that have been wholly sovereign, whereby peace may gain and violence be diminished over other lands than this which has set the example.'

"Fiske wrote these words 80 years ago. And today leaders in both political parties speak hopefully and confidently of this still grander convention Fiske foretold. As Longfellow wrote:

" 'Sail on, O ship of state.
Sail on, Union strong and free.
Humanity in all its fears
In all its hopes for future years
Hangs breathless on thy fate.'

"What is the lesson for us now? The United States should take the lead in sponsoring a convention of delegates to take up the proposal, just as delegates met 175 years ago in Philadelphia to construct the American Federal Union. The barriers which keep the free nations from uniting today are no more formidable than those which separated the Original Thirteen States in 1787.

"I would limit union to nations which have demonstrated over the years capacity for self-government and protection of individual rights, and a willingness to stand up and fight for freedom.

"This federation would lighten for U.S. taxpayers the crushing burden of the arms race, make impossible for Khrushchev and future dictators the ancient game of divide-and-conquer, and offer untold opportunities for material progress.

"It would be the most impressive action possible to meet the Communist threat, and might well usher in a millenium of peace.

"It would not replace the U.N. but would create a new union of some of the nations now in the U.N. The U.N. is essentially a meetingplace for representatives of sovereign nations. It is valuable as such, and should be kept alive. The U.N. is not capable of meeting the Communist threat, and in my opinion it is unwise to give the U.N. the powers of government.

"In recent weeks President Kennedy Governor Rockefeller, and former President Hoover have each spoken of the need for a new unity of free nations. Certainly there could not be an hour of greater need."

## Former Weaver Coach Retires—Gipson Began Hoop Hoopla

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend to the House a recent story which appeared in the Hartford Times marking the career of one of the outstanding athletic coaches in the Greater Hartford area.

In the formation of youth and character the time spent in high school sports plays an important role. When a young fellow is learning the skills of varsity football, basketball, or baseball he is also learning how to play the game. The attention given him by his coach, the lessons he learns, the attitudes which are encouraged, and those which he is warned to discard become lessons which he often retains throughout his lifetime. We have often heard of the influence of the playing fields of Eton upon British skills of the last century and we know of General MacArthur's high regard for collegiate sports while he was superintendent at West Point.

In recent decades in Hartford, all of our schools have had fine coaches. Often the men they have taught have taken over the reins of athletic instruction to carry on in the present day. One of the best of the pace-setting coaches was Charles Gipson who was the first to bring a Hartford basketball team through the grueling competition of Connecticut sports to the New England championship finals at Boston.

A summary of the record he achieved is contained in this article, and I believe it is most fitting that we recognize the work he did in building great teams and fine young men. Under consent, I include this article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

FORMER WEAVER COACH RETIRES—GIPSON BEGAN HOOP HOOPLA

(By Frank Cline)

Retired from the teaching and coaching ranks of the Hartford school system this week was Charles Gipson. The name may not ring a bell with relative newcomers to the scholastic sports scene, but older fans will recall him as a former Weaver High coach.

Sending teams to the New England basketball tournament had become "old hat" to followers of the three city high school teams. Hartford High won the last two New England crowns and Weaver was top dog in 1957. Bulkeley has never picked up all the marbles but had a contender up there in 2 of the last 4 years.

Know who the fellow was who started all this New England tournament business as far as Hartford teams are concerned? None other than this same Mr. Gipson.

Both a teacher and coach in the Hartford system since 1932 until last week when he retired the first of the new year, Gipson served as head football, basketball, and track coach at Weaver from 1941 through 1948.

His teams were always well coached and almost every year won more games than they lost. Gipson's 1944–45 quintet was the best of them all posting a 10–3 regular season's record and taking three of four in the State tournament before bowing in the finals to New Haven Hillhouse.

In its first New England hoop start this Weaver quintet, made up of Bruce Rosow, George Sottile, Bill Griffith, Everett "Chick" Ciccone and Bill Barnard, caught a tartar in defending champion Waterville, Maine. Waterville went into the game with a 6–0 game winning streak and made Weaver its 61st victim in the opening round at Boston.

"That was a real good ball club," Gipson declared as he recalled his only tournament team. "Lots of hustle and desire along with plenty of ability. Rosow was a real leader and one of finest defensive players I ever coached."

Nor did Gipson, who is a graduate of the University of Illinois, have any mean record as a football mentor. During his 8 years at the helm Weaver gridiron squads scored 33 victories, lost 21 and were involved in 4 ties.

He had undefeated teams in 2 of his 8 years as head football coach. Gipson's 1941 team went 6–0–1 with only a 7–7 tie with East Hartford spoiling a perfect campaign which his 1945 club won all six of the games they played.

Of his 1941 team, which was Gipson's first year as head coach, he said, "Their fine record was accomplished on mostly team effort. That and the fact I had Connie Nappier who is probably the finest athlete I ever coached."

Nappier was a fine halfback while Bob Yellen was the fullback and Bob Christino the quarterback, to mention a few on that fine squad.

"But," declared Gipson, "no question about it, the best team I ever had at Weaver was that 1945 football squad. It was great both offensively and defensively. It scored 222 points while holding its opponents to a mere 25."

One of the highlights of that season was the Bulkeley clash. Both teams went into the game with undefeated and untied records and Weaver came away a decisive 25–0 victor.

Quarterbacking that fine 1945 Weaver club was Leo Yaconello. Fullback was Frank Mangini with George Sottile and Paul Grisovitch the halfbacks. At the ends, two of the best ever to pay in the city were Frank Toro and Bill Griffith. Capt. Moe Romano and Jeff Sklar were the tackles with Nick Tosca and Max Skol the guards and Andy Jenks the pivot.

In recent years Gipson has been serving in the elementary and junior high systems being on the staffs at Burns, Kinsella, and Jones.

---

### RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

### LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

---

### GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

---

### PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

---

### CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

---

### CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

# Appendix

## The Imperative Need To Examine the Social and Economic Implications of Automation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH**
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I noted with interest the information in the RECORD regarding the introduction by the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] of a bill to provide for a White House conference on the impact of automation, to be called by the President within a year of the enactment of the measure.

The social and economic implications of automation have long been an area of particular concern to me. As Vannevar Bush stated last year in an article, "Automation's Awkward Age," there is "nothing new about automation, except the term itself." The process of technical innovation in the methods and machines of industrial and agricultural production, has been going on for generations.

But the impact becomes more severe as the rate of change accelerates. And as technological developments now reach what the experts term an "exponential" rate of change, they hold the prospect of severe dislocations in our society unless they are accompanied by social, economic, and political innovations as well.

It was such considerations as these that first prompted my efforts as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives to confront some of the problems that follow in the wake of technological developments. It was in the 75th Congress, in 1917, that I first introduced a bill to provide for the promotion of the general welfare in relation to the economic effects flowing from scientific and technological developments. Prior to our entry into World War II, I introduced some five bills and resolutions in this general area.

Since that time we have entered virtually a new technological world dominated by developments in the fields of nuclear science and electronics. Yet our legislative efforts to cope with the impact of automation have been largely piecemeal and ameliorative and have failed to come to grips with the central elements of the problem.

It would not be amiss to indicate that if any one of my earlier measures had been enacted by Congress, and if Government, industry, and labor had given more systematic attention to the long-range effects of automation, the coal-producing regions of the Appalachian area would not now find themselves in conditions of severe economic distress.

Mr. President, we cannot meet the problems by simply decrying the advent of more efficient and more highly automatic means of production. Nor can we solve the problem simply by lowering the workweek to 35 hours. The pressure of economic competition from abroad impels us to raise our own productivity. And, indeed, the Federal Government is itself engaged in a major effort toward this end.

According to an authoritative recent study which draws heavily on the National Science Foundation's report, "Funds for Research and Development in Industry, 1959," our national investment for that year in the field of research and development—to increase productivity—amounted to $1.4 billion. Of this total, the Federal Government supplied almost $500 million; that is, in 1959 the Federal Government alone spent almost $500 million in research and development activities to accelerate the technological development that is broadly covered by the term automation.

It is my contention that we must begin to display at least as much ingenuity in the fields of social, economic, and political innovation if we are not to suffer severe dislocations in American society and impose grave hardships on hundreds of thousands of our working men and women.

A cogent editorial in the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette points to the need for such long-range planning, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENNEDY NEEDS A PLAN TO HANDLE AUTOMATION

Commenting on President Kennedy's budget message to the Congress, AFL–CIO President George Meany said:

"The President's budget is based on a 3½-percent rate of national economic growth. That is not good enough. It leaves our economy stalled on the side of the mountain just where the President said we stood last Monday. Such a growth rate would insure 6 percent and more unemployment in 1963. Idle men and idle plants mean an idling economy. That is the deficit that should alarm us—the deficit in unused resources."

With a statement reminiscent of President Coolidge (unemployment results when a lot of people are out of work), Representative CANNON, Democrat, of Missouri, the crusty chairman of the House Finance Committee, decries the Kennedy budget:

"Spending money we do not have for things we could get along without—that is what invariably unbalances our budgets."

Regrettably, CANNON neglects to detail what it is the Nation can get along without. Suffice it to say it wouldn't be any pork barrel project in CANNON's district.

Between CANNON's and Meany's view of the Presidential budget, there is no choice. Meany wins hands down.

The corrosive agent rubbing away at today's economy is hard core unemployment. It is the same corrosion which has been wearing the economy thin for the past 5 years. The higher than 5-percent chronic unemployment rate is too much. It is too wasteful of the Nation's manpower, too injurious to democracy's case in its constant contest with the challenge of communism.

The lamentable fact is that the problem of persistent unemployment started at least a decade ago in the backwash of the technological revolution that saw machine after machine in industry after industry replace men.

At that time the danger of what was to happen—what did happen—was apparent, but government, business, and organized labor neglected their responsibilities and let it happen without fighting back. There were some industries and labor unions which made preparations and softened the impact of automation for employees and members, but they were too few and too insignificant.

The cause of hard core unemployment still defies solution. Automation has triggered most labor-management disputes of the last 4 years, especially those involving transportation workers. Strife and long work stoppages, to the detriment of the whole economy, have replaced hard thinking and creative ideas.

President Kennedy's budget with its substantial tax cuts is a new approach, if nothing else. It deserves to be tried, but, like Meany, we fear it isn't enough. The President must develop a modus operandi to deal with automation, some arrangements which will preempt the necessity for the crippling strike, so harmful to the total economy.

Lowering taxes will not do the job, unless there can be peace on the economic front in those critical industries that contribute so much to the Nation's prosperity.

## Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. NEIL STAEBLER**
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 45th anniversary of the short-lived Ukrainian independence, a period of but 2 brief years beginning in 1918 after some 300 years of oppression.

We all know the tragic course of events which saw the Ukrainian people trampled anew under the heel of Russian Communist aggression. This brought to a swift end the Ukrainian National Republic, snuffing the flame of freedom and silencing the voices of brave men.

Yet the fierce spirit of independence and freedom lives on; it lives among the 45 million Ukrainians who today are the captive people of Russia; among the many thousands of Ukrainian-Americans who carry the battle forward in this

country, and among the rest of us who add our voices of comfort and hope.

It is proper during this anniversary observance for us to pay tribute to the Ukrainian people who, in the spirit of their great poet, Taras Shevchenko, continue their resistance to oppression and their dedication to freedom.

Let us hope that one day soon the Ukraine will take its rightful place in the world community as a free and independent nation.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to the remarks of Councilman Mary V. Beck of Detroit, Mich., a prominent leader in the Michigan Ukrainian-American community, on this occasion. I also support her in urging the creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. Her remarks follow:

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

(By Mary V. Beck)

On January 22, 1963, in every major city and in hundreds of other cities and towns in these United States, and in the Capital of our Nation, the blue and golden Ukrainian banner will be raised to commemorate Ukrainian Independence Day of 1918. Proclamations issued by many Governors and mayors will be read at commemorative ceremonies acknowledging the sad plight of 42 million Ukrainians enslaved by Russia. Warm words of sympathy, understanding, and encouragement will be uttered profusely.

And even in the Halls of Congress, distinguished Senators and Representatives will rise to make appropriate remarks on this occasion, displaying their awareness of the yearning for freedom of these Ukrainian captives, and expressing their agreement that the denial of liberty to an entire nation whose history and culture precedes that of Russia itself, is a tragic miscarriage of justice and not to be ignored or forgotten.

Yet as gratifying and heart-warming as these manifestations of sympathy may be, alone, they offer no real solace, no solid comfort, nor even the slightest ray of hope to the unhappy victims of Soviet aggression, on whose behalf no voice of protest is raised nor to whom a hand of aid is extended, particularly at a time when throughout the world the need for freedom is being recognized as a deep-seated and undeniable craving of every human being.

Since peace, too, is a natural and basic human aspiration, military warfare as a course of action is abhorrent and unwise, except as a last resort measure when no other alternatives are acceptable or possible. And it is not being suggested that military action is the manner in which our Government should now give meaning and substance to the sentiments expressed by our governmental officials in statements relating to the captive nations and their justified demands for freedom and independence. There is a simpler and easier way.

We Americans are already engaged in a global struggle between two ideologies and have committed ourselves to the prevention of communistic conquest of the world. Would not our own burden of the cold war, and perhaps even of the hot war, if such ever became an eventuality, be lessened and our effectiveness increased by the recognition and the enlistment of the potential strength that exists in the anti-Communist fervor, deeply hidden but always nurtured in the hearts of the captive peoples? And, by the same token, would it not offer them the hope, the encouragement, the inspiration to carry on their own efforts in what must often appear to be a vain struggle in view of the overwhelming odds?

An earnest beginning has already been made and a solid foundation laid for that kind of action by the congressional resolution and the President's proclamation establishing the Captive Nations Week. But to make our political warfare with the Soviet Union and the communistic world a dramatic success there is an urgent need for further constructive action along the same lines.

I share with many others who are well informed on this matter an abiding conviction that the immediate creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations could be the most significant step taken to reveal to the world the Soviet Union for what it is and not what it is purported to be—its skillful propaganda machine notwithstanding.

Continuous and rapid-fire exposure of its colonial system which is sold as a voluntary union of free and independent republics; its widespread persecution of religious groups, which is disputed by pointing to a few churches that are allowed to remain open; its mass exportation of people to Siberia who exhibit the slightest aversion to nonconformity to the Communist Party; its warmongering and aggressive acts while parading as a promoter of peace; and its denial of basic human rights and exploitation while arrogantly labeling the Prison of Peoples the "Peoples' Paradise."

What better way, except by truth and its dissemination, to destroy the U.S.S.R. image that has no foundation in fact? What better way to impress the Communists with the wisdom of the words that, "those who live in glass houses should not throw stones?" What better way to engage them in dealing with the problems on their own doorstep, leaving little or no time for meddling or creating artificial problems where there are none?

Real progress, in my humble opinion, can and should be made in the above-mentioned manner—not only in the cause of halting the expansion and influence of communism, but striking at its very roots with repeated, telling blows and thus sowing the seeds of its own ultimate destruction.

In the interest of our own national security and the preservation of our American way of life; in the furtherance of our own dedication to the promotion of a free world and the right of self-determination for all subjugated and oppressed peoples; in support of our own devotion to the achievement of a just and lasting peace; and in the honest belief that a token commemoration of Ukrainian Independence Day or the independence day of any captive nation can only be interpreted by hte U.S.S.R. as meaningless lip service, I respectively urge your serious and favorable consideration of the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Such affirmative action would be the finest and most fitting tribute to accord the countless and valiant people of the Ukraine, past and present, who have never allowed the flame of liberty, no matter what the sacrifice, to expire even though frequently forced to secrete it in the depths of their hearts; and, who, in concert with their neighbors and covictims of Russian aggression massed in other captive nations, are pledged to keep it burning forevermore.

## Address of Welcome Honoring New Members of the 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the local governmental housekeeping problems of Washington, D.C., have beset the National Capital City since the cornerstone of this building in which we are assembled was laid in 1793. From the day Pope's mansion on this site was torn down 169 years ago to make way for the Capitol Building, the problems and plight of local government here have not been easy in this federally owned city.

One week ago the President of the United States sent a special message to the Congress urging legislative and budgetary steps to place the District's local government on what I believe would be a sound, businesslike fiscal basis for the first time in many years.

Since each Member of Congress is a city councilman for Washington, D.C., may I urge that the membership of the Senate and the other body read a most interesting thumbnail history of Washington, D.C., given by the Honorable Charles E. Phillips, president of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, before a dinner tendered by that organization on January 16 at the Sheraton-Park Hotel honoring new Members of the 88th Congress. The historical tidbits of Washingtonia are both fascinating and thought provoking.

Mr. Phillips, a native Washingtonian and an outstanding civic leader for many years, points up the growth problems of the past. All of us may anticipate those of the future as this metropolitan area continues its growth to an estimated 3½ million residents in less than 20 years and 5 million residents within 40 years. If the larger growth problems of tomorrow are to be less gigantic for this unique central city in this second, fastest growing metropolitan area of the country, one important growth problem of today—fiscal responsibility—should be faced squarely by Congress with the realistic approach suggested by the President as a guide.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Phillips' address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD together with a statement I issued as chairman of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia in connection with the President's District of Columbia special budget message.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF WELCOME BY CHARLES E. PHILLIPS, PRESIDENT, METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON BOARD OF TRADE, AT THE SHERATON PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 16, 1963

Honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is a rare privilege, a real pleasure and a great honor to have this opportunity of welcoming recently elected Members of the Congress to Washington. The several hundred residents who are your hosts this evening express warm greetings not only from the 7,000 members of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade but also from the more than 2 million people who live and work and take delight in this great National Capital community. On their behalf, let me also say "Welcome home" to our old friends from the District of Columbia Committees whose fine work in the Congress has merited the faith and continued support of the voters at home.

There was a time—not too long ago—when many new Members of the Congress got their first glimpse of this unusual city when they came to claim their seats. In such circumstances, old-time Washingtonians endeavored to show them the sights and explain to

them the mores and the facts of life in Washington, D.C.

Happily, this is no longer true. I would be surprised if there is a single new Member who has not visited Washington before. In fact, there are many who have made frequent trips, and quite a few who have been residents—some for years—before being elected to the Congress.

All of you know where the White House, the Lincoln Memorial and the Smithsonian Institution are, and what is done in them. You have visited our principal hotels and are well acquainted with Washington's many fine restaurants and stores and, perhaps, even its limited night life.

You know that Washington has been first in war and first in peace and often last in the American League.

Perhaps you may come to feel, as one new Congressman did during the Arthur administration, when he said, "On my first day in the House I looked around on that magnificent body of men, and wondered how in the dickens I got there. But after I had been here a few months I looked around again. Then I wondered how in the dickens those other fellows got there."

In these circumstances, it seems advisable to abandon the posture of the native welcoming strangers to their new and unknown home this evening and to devote instead a few moments to some observations concerning the past and future of this community which are unknown or little known to most of you. I have, therefore, assembled some comments from my background as a native and have done a little reading of Washington's history.

A wit once remarked that stealing from one person is plagiarism but stealing from many is research. The material in this brief talk was collected by light-fingered research from guidebooks, histories, newspapers, and the like.

Early records show that Capitol Hill was probably always an important site. Before 1700 the mighty Algonquin Indians selected it for their tribal council house.

One of our earliest settlers, Francis Pope, built a mansion where the Capitol Building now stands. He named it "Rome," and the hill, "Capitoline Hill." The stream at its foot, which is still there but covered over, he named the Tiber.

The eighth section of article I of the Constitution states, "Congress shall have power to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such district (not exceeding 10 miles square) as may, by cession of the particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States."

In pursuance of this provision, President Washington on July 16, 1790, signed the bill establishing the National Capital on the banks of the Potomac. Commissioners were appointed to proceed with the task and, after some delays, signed an agreement with the 19 proprietors of the land for the original city of Washington. It provided that the United States would receive one-half the lots laid out and would retain public squares and streets. The agreement stated, "For the streets the proprietors shall receive no compensation but for the squares or lands in any form which shall be taken for public buildings or any kind of improvements or uses the proprietors whose land shall be taken shall receive at the rate of 25 pounds per acre to be paid by the public."

George Washington selected Pierre Charles L'Enfant to plan the city. L'Enfant, his associates and his successors—who soon supplanted this eccentric Frenchman—were men of bold imagination who stood among the swamps and briar patches at the head of navigation of the Potomac and visualized a city of half a million people.

They laid the foundation stones, not of a small town, but of a world capital, and they suffered the fate common to genius—of being laughed at while they lived and derided for many years after they had gone to their graves.

They have now come into their own. A full century was required for this great city to prove itself equal to its destiny. For a long time—really until after the Civil War—there was uncertainty as to whether the Capital would stay here.

L'Enfant first selected sites for the White House and the Capitol Building. Since the latter is where you now work, let us quickly note a few interesting facts about it.

The cornerstone of the Capitol was laid September 18, 1793. The original Senate wing, until a few years ago the Supreme Court Chamber—was completed in 1800. The House wing—now the Hall of Statuary—was not completed until 1811; and then soon after, during the War of 1812, the British invaded Washington and set a torch to it. After this humiliating incident, the two wings were rebuilt, and the central segment joining them was completed in 1825. The present House Chamber was finished in 1857 and the Senate Chamber 2 years later. Then, toward the end of the Civil War, the cast iron dome supporting the Statue of Freedom was dedicated. Since then, the only major addition to the Capitol was the extended east front completed just before the last inauguration.

Commenting on Washington in 1800, Oliver Wolcott described conditions like this: "one good tavern 40 rods from the Capitol, and several other houses * * * building * * * but I do not perceive how the Members of Congress can possibly secure lodgings unless they will consent to live like scholars in a college or monks in a monastery, crowded 10 or 20 to a house and utterly secluded from society."

Then, in 1838, a visitor, Captain Marryat, wrote, "Everybody knows that Washington has a Capitol, but the misfortune is that the Capitol wants a city. There it stands, reminding you of a general without an army."

Over the years, many interesting anecdotes and bits of history were recorded. Members wore their hats in the Chambers, and female visitors sat on the Senate floor until about 1838.

Senator Sam Houston was a whittler. Page boys filled his desk with white pine sticks every morning so that he could whittle souvenirs and send them up to the ladies in the galleries.

Styles changed too. It is recorded that in 1853 not more than four Senators wore mustaches; but, in January 1861, there were only four men who didn't have mustaches or beards.

In early days, Congress sat for only a few months each year, and when it adjourned, the city literally came to a standstill. In 1811, Washington Irving wrote, "You cannot imagine how forlorn this desert city appears to me, now that the great tide of casual population has rolled away."

The city of Washington was developed very slowly too, and for years was the butt of jokes both at home and abroad. It was known as the City of Magnificent Distances or the City of Miserable Morasses.

Tom Moore, a visiting Irish poet, composed these satirical lines:

"This embryo Capital, where fancy sees
Squares in morasses, obelisks in trees,
Where second-sighted seers, e'en now adorn
With shrines unbuilt and heroes yet unborn,
Though naught but woods and Jefferson they see
Where streets should run and sages ought to be."

But all were not critical, as evidenced by the words of Lafayette during a visit in 1824: "The city of Washington, the central star of the constellation which lights the world".

Charles Dickens was not impressed. In 1842 he said, "It has spacious avenues that begin in nothing and lead nowhere; streets a mile long that only want houses, roads and inhabitants; public buildings that need but a public to be complete; and ornaments of great thoroughfares which only need great thoroughfares to ornament".

And soon after Andrew Jackson took his place in Lafayette Square, Thackeray commented that "the hero is sitting in an impossible attitude on an impossible horse with an impossible tail".

But, as has previously been noted, this unique planned city was planned well. Alexander Shepherd paved the streets, built bridges and public works rapidly after the Civil War; and, a consequence, the District was impoverished and unable to pay its debts. Then the Congress, through the Organic Act of 1878, provided for Federal financial help and established the commission form of government, which has been effective ever since. At the same time, the Congress assumed the legislative and budget-making functions which it still exercises and which many of us wish will continue in the future.

After the Civil War, more Senators and Congressmen began moving their families to Washington. They became more familiar with local needs and problems, and in 1901 Senator McMillan and his commission unfolded their plan which revived the original L'Enfant concept and has guided the development of the District of Columbia ever since. We are proud of the part local citizens played in this important activity, for it was the Washington Board of Trade which encouraged Senator McMillan to undertake this effort.

From the period of the McMillan report, Washington has continued to grow in beauty and activity. No longer does the city fold when the Congress adjourns. World War II changed the pace forever. As the capital city of a great nation and center of the free world, Washington has become a dynamic metropolitan community of more than 2 million people. It is the seat of institutions—governmental and nongovernmental—which significantly influence the affairs of men throughout our Nation and throughout the world.

But Washington, the city of all the people, has continued to be criticized by many of them. Two highly critical commentaries of the Nation's Capital have just been published by the American Institute of Architects and by the Architectural Forum. It almost appears that these were timed to coincide with your arrival in the Congress.

While we do not subscribe to many of their observations and conclusions, we recommend them to you for early and careful reading. Just as it is fair game and standard procedure for those from afar to criticize and be vitriolic about the city—particularly those who do not understand it—it is standard practice to criticize Members of the Congress for what they do or might not do. These publications I have mentioned do not neglect you.

The Architectural Forum refers to Washington as a "company town" and the American public as stockholders in the company, and then suggests that the stockholders should correct the undesirable conditions. Perhaps you will be hearing from some of them from home.

Every major city in America has its problems. In fact, I know of some of them which deserve a more vigorous raking over hotter coals than this one does. But this is the only one which is the Capital of the United States of America, which was planned, designed and built from the start for that purpose. This is the only one which the Congress rules in accordance with the terms of the Constitution. Truly it is a "company town" and must concern you. Moreover, history has shown, and logic will support our conclusion, that you cannot successfully divest yourselves of the responsibility for this great and glamorous headquarters establishment and showcase of American democracy.

The United States is, was and presumably always will be Washington's principal employer. But, it is by no means the majority employer. More than twice as many people in Metropolitan Washington work for others. The ratio of Federal to other employment has been decreasing and our forecasters predict a continuation of this trend.

We are a great and growing retail market. The number of visitors to the Nation's Capital is increasing year by year and totaled about eight million last year. The $380 million we estimate they spent is a powerful economic force, second only in importance to the Federal payroll.

National organizations—patriotic, fraternal—labor, business and scientific—account for a large payroll and are an important part of the economy.

During the last few years we have also become one of the world's great scientific centers. Some 200 private research and development companies, which have opened here in recent years, importantly supplement the well-known Government scientific agencies which have been on the local scene for many years.

Metropolitan Washington will continue to be one of the fastest growing major urban areas in America. By 1980 we confidently anticipate a population of about 3½ million, and by the year 2000 about 5 million. Most of this growth will be outside the District of Columbia. Its impact may be more readily pictured if I say that it will require urbanization of 100 square miles of rural land in nearby Maryland and Virginia to provide housing and workplaces for the 1½ million more people expected in 1980.

As it has been since 1800, Washington will continue to be a fascinating, dynamic, rapidly changing community. Perhaps you will criticize it, but you will love its excitement, its tempo, its sights, and its people. In the pattern of your predecessors most of you will never return to your homes permanently. While you will maintain close ties, most of you will spend more time in Washington in the years ahead than you will at home. It behooves you, therefore, to give more than passing consideration to its affairs.

We earnestly hope that you will.

One of the reasons you will enjoy the Federal City is the fine people you will meet and get to know here, those who will be your friends and neighbors. Many of them have been here for generations, most of them came from some other place—your home city—your State—Europe or even Timbuctoo. They will respect you because of your position, but I think you will enjoy most their cordiality and neighborly concern for your welfare.

Certainly we of the board of trade, which includes a large number of the community's business, professional, and civic leaders, want to extend a cordial, helping hand to you and your families. We earnestly hope we have made that clear, and urge you to call on some of those you have met this evening if there is something we can do to make you feel more comfortable in and enjoy your new home.

## Deterioration of U.S. Position in Nuclear Test Ban Conferences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in the body of today's RECORD will be found my discussion of the steadily deteriorating position of the United States in the nuclear test ban conferences. Printed herewith is a summary table of the burden of this discussion comparing circumstances and our positions when the conferences began in 1958 with what they now are, in 1963. It is emphasized that the subject of a test ban treaty was placed in a frame of reference by former President Eisenhower when negotiations began as aiming at a treaty, self enforced by adequate machinery to detect violations and inspection machinery to confirm their occurrence or nonoccurrence. Today the discussions proceed on a basis which would provide neither adequate detection machinery nor adequate inspection procedures. As a consequence, any treaty arrived at on this basis will not be cheatproof. Thus, it cannot be expected to forward the national security interests of the United States, rather it could imperil them.

TABLE ILLUSTRATING DETERIORATION OF CIRCUMSTANCES AND U.S. POSITIONS DURING NUCLEAR TEST-BAN NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN THE YEARS 1958–63

| 1958 | 1963 |
|---|---|
| (1) United States began negotiations: (a) After completion of adequate series of nuclear weapons tests. (b) After sufficient time to analyze preceding Soviet test series for possible nuclear weapons breakthroughs. | (1) United States carries on negotiations: (a) After series of U.S. tests in which several planned events had to be canceled. (b) Unlikely sufficient time has elapsed to discover any breakthroughs in the Soviet test series which lasted until late December 1962. |
| (2) Area of Soviet Union demanding adequate detection machinery and adequate inspection procedures spans 2 continents, encompasses 8½ million square miles, and comprises one-sixth of the world's land area. | (2) No change. |
| (3) Detection machinery: (a) Network of 180 internationally manned and controlled seismic detection stations. (b) Nineteen of the one hundred eighty internationally manned and controlled seismic stations to be built at necessary locations within the Soviet Union. | (3) Detection machinery: (a) International network replaced by scheme in which cheaters are relied upon to submit seismic evidence of their own crimes. (b) Three unmanned, tamper-prone "black box" seismic devices (as yet undeveloped) for entire Soviet land mass—to be shuttled to and fro by Soviet airplanes and installed by Soviet personnel. |
| (4) Onsite inspections: (a) 20 inspections annually on Soviet territory. (b) Mandatory inspections on independent initiative of International Control Commission. (c) No limitation on size or composition of inspection teams. (d) Inspection methods to include aerial photography, physical above and under the ground surveillance, radiation monitoring equipment and the like. (e) Any part of Soviet Union subject to inspection on detection of a suspicious event. | (4) Onsite inspections: (a) Khrushchev's low of 2 annually, Kennedy's high of 10 annually, or something in between. (b) Inspection only upon "invitation" of the U.S.S.R. (c) Size and composition of teams subject to availability of Soviet-furnished transportation and logistics. Soviets may screen windows of transporting vehicle and impose "prohibitions to carrying photocameras, etc." (d) Again, dependence on Soviet-furnished transportation can limit, delay or "misplace" equipment needed by inspection teams. (e) Inspection teams subject to restrictions on or complete denial of entry into an area of suspicion on grounds of "danger to the security interests" of the U.S.S.R. |
| (5) Objective of negotiations to pose such serious risk to cheaters of getting caught that cheating will be deterred. | (5) Reference frame of current negotiations will encourage cheating by posing only nominal risks of getting caught. |
| (6) Possibility of France and Red China becoming subject to test ban. | (6) France and Red China have declared unwillingness to forego nuclear testing in any environment. |
| (7) Negotiations proceed from "safe" basis for U.S. national security. | (7) Negotiations proceed from "unsafe" basis for U.S. national security. |
| (8) Communist dogma decrees destruction of all that is non-Communist and Communist worldwide domination. | (8) No change. |

## Space Explorations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, last week I made a speech to the Columbian Women of George Washington University in which I discussed the subject of space. I did not anticipate that there would be any interest in my speech beyond the group to which I spoke.

Surprisingly, I have received several requests for copies of that speech—and with most of the requests coming from the Pentagon. It makes me somewhat curious as to what I said that so interested the people, particularly in the Office of the Secretary of Defense and in the Air Force.

I have received so many requests that I think the only practical thing to do is to place the speech in the RECORD. I, accordingly, request unanimous consent that the speech be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD so that it may be available to all interested parties.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPACE EXPLORATIONS

(By Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine)

It is a pleasure to be with you this morning. With George Washington University having honored me with an honorary doctor of laws degree and thus made me an honorary alumna of your fine institution, I feel somewhat as though I was a member of the family—a sort of an in-law.

The subject of my discussion is prompted by something that I read in the newspapers recently. To my way of thinking it was big news—but it was buried in the news. It was the statement of the Russian Astronaut Popovich that the Russians would soon send a woman into space and would have the distinction of having the first woman astronaut.

Now I am not going to talk about women astronauts. I think time will take care of that. But I am going to talk about space. I don't profess to be an expert on the subject since I am not a scientist—but this month I became the highest ranking Republican on the Senate Space Committee—and through the years in rising to that position inescapably I have absorbed some information, knowledge, and sophistication about space.

The first difficulty one encounters in discussing space is to comprehend its dimensions. The distances involved are so enormous, so much greater than those we meet in everyday life, that they are practically meaningless. As speeds of aircraft have increased, so has our sense of distance altered.

In the same way our mental attitude in dealing with interplanetary distances must change, even if the mind can never really envisage the vastness of it all. Space extends in all directions and has no known limits or outward boundaries. But in this decade we are determined to explore this vast unknown.

Our prime goal in the 1960's is the moon, and while this is extremely ambitious, it is only the beginning. Our ultimate goal will be the stars and to quote the British astronomer, Sir James Jeans, "There may be as many stars in the universe as there are grains of sand on the beaches of the world."

Thus it is readily apparent that we are engaged in what can truthfully be described as the greatest of pioneering efforts. I would like to talk to you in some detail about the imminent goals we have set for ourselves in this decade and why this effort is necessary.

I am sure you recognize that the United States needs to lead in space for several reasons, each of which will contribute to the scientific, technological or economic advancement, or to the peace and security of the free world.

We must lead because of our basic responsibility for the broadening of our understanding of the universe and our obligation to make available to ourselves and our descendants the resources of the universe which our expanding knowledge will permit us to utilize.

Second, we need to lead because of our desire to realize the direct and immediate benefits from the application of satellites into operational use, and the technological advances and stimulus to our economy which will emerge from our space effort.

Finally, we need to lead because of the potentially hazardous consequences to ourselves, and free peoples everywhere, were a hostile power to surpass us in the race in space. These needs are the impetus for what will be the greatest technological achievement man has ever attempted, manned flight to the moon.

The moon is our first objective, mainly because it is our closest neighbor. It is only 240,000 miles away, or a 3-day trip in the Apollo spacecraft. Also, since it is so close to us—speaking in space terms—there is much we have already learned about the moon through the astronomers.

A day on the moon consists of 14 earth days and since there is no sky to reflect the sun's afterglow, night descends suddenly. The temperature variation goes from about 212° Fahrenheit, which is equivalent to about that of boiling water, to a night temperature of 200° below zero. This compares with the highest earth temperature ever recorded of 136° Fahrenheit and 125° below zero.

It is because of these extreme temperatures and the lack of an atmosphere that it is assumed there is no life on the moon. However, there are some astronomers who dispute this and believe that some lowly forms of plant life may have adapted themselves to the moon's environment.

In any event we cannot tell with any degree of certainty what the moon is composed of and how it was formed without detailed observation. It is to that end that our Ranger program is addressing itself. The Ranger program consists of nine flights which will, among other things obtain high resolution television pictures of the lunar surface and perform scientific investigations of the moon's surface.

The Ranger program will be followed up by the Surveyor program, which is designed to land a package of instruments on the moon's surface. These instruments will return information concerning physical, chemical, and biological properties of the lunar surface, the general environment as well as pictures of the local terrain.

Additional programs will call for the placing of a space platform to orbit around the moon containing instruments for monitoring radiation, determining the properties of the moon's gravitational field and finally to provide information concerning possible sites for the manned landing on the moon. All of this must be done before we can attempt to land a man on the moon with any degree of safety.

The lunar exploration phase of the manned program will be conducted, as part of Project Apollo, in a capsule carrying a crew of three. The Apollo program requires space techniques far in advance of those that were needed in the Mercury program. The Apollo spacecraft must be built for flights of 2 weeks duration. It must be capable of guidance toward the moon and a gentle landing on the moon.

For man to land and remain in this hostile environment the establishment of a manned lunar base will be required. Supporting a base on the moon compared with one at the North Pole is almost like comparing pears and potatoes. While both are edible the similarity thereafter is less evident.

While food, shelter, and fuel can be supplied with comparative ease to the North Pole or any place of the earth's surface the life supported requirements for the moon present a problem of far greater magnitude.

For example, a specially designed space suit with built-in air pressure to offset the moon's airlessness and the streams of ultraviolet and X-rays spewed forth by the sun, must be worn by the astronaut. A two-way radio is also necessary to converse since without air, sound cannot travel.

There will be many other aids for his protection but those I have mentioned provide some idea of his support requirements. One compensating feature for the astronaut is that he will be able to move about freely with all this equipment for his weight will be only one-sixth of what it would be on earth.

Simultaneous with our preparation to explore the moon, programs are underway to venture out to Mars and Venus. Ever since astronomers first reported "canals" and polar snowcaps upon Mars it has been the subject of much speculation. Is it a dead planet? Is it strewn with the remnants of ancient civilization? Does life exist there?

As for Venus, what mysteries lie behind its swirling clouds? Does it hide a lush tropical climate as some believe, or is it a watery waste, or perhaps a desert swept by dust storms. Venus and Mars, though the nearest planets to earth, are 100 times further away than the moon.

One important factor in planning a trip to either Venus or Mars is proper timing. To go to either planet we should plan our departure from earth when those planets will be nearest to us. In the case of Mars that period would occur about every 2 years while Venus comes to within 26 million miles of the earth periodically.

The little we know today regarding these neighbors of ours is from the astronomers. More has been learned about Mars than any of the other planets, since the atmosphere on Mars is thin enough to make telescopic observation easy.

It is from these observations that some scientists have deduced that there could be some form of life on Mars. However, it is doubtful that life exists there that can be compared with that found on earth, because of the scarcity of oxygen.

Venus, though the nearest of our neighboring planets, is called the mystery planet. The Venus' atmosphere is so dense, our astronomers have not been able to see through it, as they have in the case of Mars. Here again we are relying on our Mariner program to penetrate some of the enigma that surrounds Venus.

From all of this space research and exploration will come knowledge—knowledge about the universe and its physical laws; knowledge about the earth on which we live, and knowledge about life itself.

The space program will stretch the abilities and minds of our people for years to come. It will provide a continuing, long-term stimulant to our economy. The magnitude of the task will test the resources and cooperative will of all major elements of our society. Still, space exploration, and manned space flight in particular, offer the United States the opportunity for unparalleled progress in the future.

Ultimately, within this century, the sum of all our efforts will give us the equipment, the knowledge and the skill to utilize space as we now utilize the seas and the air.

This then is our motive—our objective. To develop superior competence in space which will be available for any national purpose which may be required, whether it be for the peaceful use of space for the benefit of all mankind or to keep the peace.

Past experience has shown that the most important benefits of basic research are probably unforeseen. Yet there are many areas in which we can predict direct benefits. The results of materials research—ceramics, metals, and plastics, for example, will inevitably find their way into industry and to the consumers. The values of new fuels, new methods of power generation, and supersonic transportation are clear.

Weather satellites have already shown vividly what can be done to aid in weather surveillance and forecasting. The improved Nimbus satellite is being developed by the United States to succeed Tiros. This will provide the basis of an operational weather satellite system.

Eventually we will be in a position to predict weather anywhere on the globe with precision. The human and monetary values of being forewarned about approaching hurricanes and typhoons will prove invaluable. It has been estimated by authorities in this field that in 1 year alone we could be completely repaid for the initial outlay of the entire program.

Then there is the communications satellite. On July 10, 1962, the whole world knew of Telstar. The telephone company's ground station at Andover has been described as the granddaddy, the champion of them all.

Eventually, of course, there will be many more, some big and some small, depending upon requirements. But I would always hope that this Nation will have not only the grandfather ground station, but the biggest and the best.

What the Telstar can do is only the beginning of what we can expect in improved worldwide communications. Since one of the major problems in the struggle between ideologies is the problem of communication between peoples it is intriguing to contemplate the effect on international understanding and cooperation that could result from instantaneous radio and television presentations.

The communication satellite experts point out that a tremendous increase in global communication capabilities is in the offing. Hundreds of times the number of presently available oversea channels will be opened and service to points where present-day cable and microwave systems do not reach will become feasible.

Lower costs for oversea services should be realized, and such techniques as the use of closed circuit television conferences to obviate the need for some transatlantic travel should come into being. The satellite system will also open the possibility of establishing local communications networks centered on a satellite terminal in areas which now have little or no external communications services.

The technology we are developing in our space program is certain to have immense and growing effects on the national economy, the professions and on everyday life. Already industry is profiting from new techniques, alloys, plastics, fabrics, and compounds of many kinds, originally created to do space jobs.

We are merely at the beginning of an era of profound technological change, whose end no one can foresee. Today, far more than in the past, scientific progress determines the character of tomorrow's civilization.

There are many, many other benefits that will be realized from our space efforts, but basically it will be knowledge, knowledge that will put mankind in a position to develop applications to human progress and welfare, to make new consumer goods, and to build up our standard of living.

We are doing this for ourselves right now with the legacy of knowledge given to us by our forebears. Some of the knowledge that we are now gathering, we will ourselves use for our own gain. But more important than that, it will be our legacy to our children and grandchildren, for them to use in furthering their own welfare.

## Analysis of H.R. 265 and H.R. 348, Providing for Basic Reform of Federal Tax Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HOWARD H. BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, on January 9, 1963, my distinguished friend and fellow member of the Committee on Ways and Means, A. S. HERLONG, JR., and I introduced H.R. 265 and H.R. 348. These bills are the reintroduction of measures originally submitted in the 87th Congress which call for basic reform of Federal tax rates over a 5-year period.

These bills strike at the graduated rates of personal income tax, particularly in the middle and upper income ranges, and the high corporate tax rates which restrict the development and use of capital and thereby restrict economic growth to a rate far below that which is actually possible. Tax rates for individual and corporate taxes would be reduced over a 5-year period, unless budget imbalance and current fiscal year domestic and foreign economic assistance spending in excess of the previous fiscal year required postponement of scheduled rate reductions which could prolong the period of reduction over an 8-year maximum span.

The mounting interest in the reform of tax rates as embodied in our legislation has prompted my cosponsor and I to prepare an analysis of each section of the bills.

SECTION 1. REDUCED RATES OF TAX ON INDIVIDUALS

Annual reductions in individual tax rates applicable to the years beginning January 1, 1963, through January 1, 1967, are contained in this section. Over this period the minimum rate would be reduced from 20 to 15 percent, top rates would be reduced from 91 to 42 percent and all other rates would be reduced correspondingly, subject only to the postponement features covered in section 5. The individual tax rate reductions are shown in the table below:

*Reform of individual tax rates*

| Taxable income bracket (thousands) [1] | Present rates | Original rates, Jan. 1, 1963 | Amended actual rates, Jan. 1, 1963 | Jan. 1, 1964 | Jan. 1, 1965 | Jan. 1, 1966 | Jan. 1, 1967 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 to $2 | 20 | 19.0 | 19.5 | 18.0 | 17.0 | 16.0 | 15 |
| $2 to $4 | 22 | 20.5 | 21.25 | 19.5 | 18.5 | 17.5 | 16 |
| $4 to $6 | 26 | 24.5 | 25.25 | 23.0 | 21.5 | 20.0 | 17 |
| $6 to $8 | 30 | 28.0 | 29 | 26.0 | 24.0 | 21.0 | 18 |
| $8 to $10 | 34 | 31.0 | 32.5 | 28.0 | 25.0 | 22.0 | 19 |
| $10 to $12 | 38 | 35.0 | 36.5 | 32.0 | 28.0 | 24.0 | 20 |
| $12 to $14 | 43 | 39.0 | 41 | 35.0 | 31.0 | 26.0 | 21 |
| $14 to $16 | 47 | 42.0 | 44.5 | 37.0 | 32.0 | 27.0 | 22 |
| $16 to $18 | 50 | 45.0 | 47.5 | 40.0 | 35.0 | 29.0 | 23 |
| $18 to $20 | 53 | 48.0 | 50.5 | 42.0 | 36.0 | 30.0 | 24 |
| $20 to $22 | 56 | 50.0 | 53 | 44.0 | 38.0 | 32.0 | 25 |
| $22 to $26 | 59 | 53.0 | 56 | 47.0 | 40.0 | 33.0 | 26 |
| $26 to $32 | 62 | 55.0 | 58.5 | 48.0 | 41.0 | 34.0 | 27 |
| $32 to $38 | 65 | 58.0 | 61.5 | 51.0 | 43.0 | 36.0 | 28 |
| $38 to $44 | 69 | 61.0 | 65 | 53.0 | 45.0 | 37.0 | 29 |
| $44 to $50 | 72 | 64.0 | 68 | 56.0 | 47.0 | 38.0 | 30 |
| $50 to $60 | 75 | 66.0 | 70.5 | 57.0 | 48.0 | 39.0 | 31 |
| $60 to $70 | 78 | 69.0 | 73.5 | 60.0 | 51.0 | 40.0 | 32 |
| $70 to $80 | 81 | 71.0 | 76 | 62.0 | 52.0 | 41.0 | 33 |
| $80 to $90 | 84 | 74.0 | 79 | 64.0 | 54.0 | 44.0 | 34 |
| $90 to $100 | 87 | 76.0 | 82 | 66.0 | 56.0 | 46.0 | 36 |
| $100 to $150 | 89 | 78.0 | 83.5 | 68.0 | 58.0 | 48.0 | 38 |
| $150 to $200 | 90 | 80.0 | 85 | 70.0 | 60.0 | 50.0 | 40 |
| $200 and over | 91 | 82.0 | 86.5 | 72.0 | 62.0 | 52.0 | 42 |

[1] After deductions and exemptions. Applies to single persons, married persons filing separate returns, and "split income" of husbands and wives filing joint returns.

The bills are drawn up in contemplation of enactment after January 1, 1963, but in time to make the first reduction in the withholding rate effective July 1, 1963. Since taxpayer returns are on a calendar year basis, the actual 1963 tax rate cuts apply to the entire year but with a reduction in the withholding rate applying for only the last one-half of the year. The practical effect of the first year cuts is to provide a new scale of rates ranging from 19 percent in the first bracket of taxable income to 82 percent in the over $200,000 taxable income bracket during the last 6 months of the calendar year in place of the present rates ranging from 20 to 91 percent. However, because all individual tax rates resulting from reduction are levied against the incomes of individuals for a full year, the rates applying to the entire year 1963 must actually be one-half of those which, in practical effect and due to withholding, apply from July 1 on. The rates of individual tax, effective January 1, 1963, therefore, range from 19.5 percent at the first bracket of taxable income to 86.5 percent at the top bracket. All other rates are reduced in a consistent manner.

The scheduled second year personal tax rate reductions would remain unchanged from the original version of our bills introduced on July 20, 1962, that is, the range of rates would be from 18 to 72 percent. However, the difference between the personal tax rates effective January 1, 1963, and January 1, 1964, appears as a combination of the half a year's cut carried over from 1963 with the full reduction otherwise scheduled for 1964 or a year and a half reduction compressed into a 1-year period.

On a calendar year basis this is the case but viewing the rates as applied through withholding during the last 6 months of 1963, that is, a tax rate range of from 19 to 82 percent, the net effect is one of lowering the rates from 1963 to 1964 on a basis identical to that contained in the original series of scheduled reductions as contained in the table above.

SECTION 2. REDUCED INDIVIDUAL RATES APPLICABLE TO HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS

This section sets forth the reduced rates which apply to heads of households during each year of the period in which scheduled reductions would take place. Rates are comparable to those set forth in section 1.

SECTION 3. REDUCED RATE TABLES FOR OPTIONAL INCOME TAX

Taxpayers with adjusted gross income of less than $5,000 would adhere to the rates shown on this section from the period beginning January 1, 1963, to January 1, 1967, and beyond. Rates follow those stated in section 1.

SECTION 4. REDUCED RATES OF TAX ON CORPORATIONS

This section would amend section 11 of the Internal Revenue Code which currently provides for a normal tax rate on corporations of 30 percent and a surtax of 22 percent on taxable income in excess of $25,000. Five annual reductions applicable to the years beginning January 1, 1963, through January 1, 1967, would be spread between normal and surtax rates.

Due to the halving of the personal income tax rate reductions in 1963, the originally scheduled corporate tax rate reductions of 2 percentage points in the first year also have been halved. Therefore, the corporate tax rate applicable for the full 1963 year is 1 percentage in the normal tax rate, reducing it from 30 to 29 percent. To keep the corporate tax rate reductions for the second year consistent with the original 5-year schedule, that is, reduction in the normal corporate rate to 26 percent, the 1964 corporate reductions would merge the additional 1 percentage point of reduction unapplied in 1963 with the regularly scheduled 2 percentage point cut scheduled for the second year thereby bringing the total corporate tax rate reduction in the normal tax down by 3 full percentage points. The normal corporate tax rate would be further reduced by 2 percentage points during the third year and 1 additional percentage point in each of the last 2 years of the plan. The surtax rate also would be lowered by 1 percentage point in each of the last 2 years of the 5-year schedule or a combined normal and surtax rate reduction of 2 percentage points in each of the calendar years 1966 and 1967. At the end of the 5-year period the normal tax rate would be lowered from its present rate of 30 to 22 percent and the surtax rate would be reduced from 22 to 20 percent or a total reduction of 10 percentage points from the present 52 percent combined corporate tax rates. The following summary illustrates the corporate tax reductions:

| | Percent |
|---|---|
| Jan. 1, 1963: | |
| Normal tax | 29 |
| Surtax | 22 |
| Combined | 51 |
| Jan. 1, 1964: | |
| Normal tax | 26 |
| Surtax | 22 |
| Combined | 48 |
| Jan. 1, 1965: | |
| Normal tax | 24 |
| Surtax | 22 |
| Combined | 46 |
| Jan. 1, 1966: | |
| Normal tax | 23 |
| Surtax | 21 |
| Combined | 44 |
| Jan. 1, 1967: | |
| Normal tax | 22 |
| Surtax | 20 |
| Combined | 42 |

SECTION 5. POSTPONEMENT OF SCHEDULED TAX REDUCTIONS

The language of this section is appended hereto. It incorporates two changes from our earlier bills.

The first change is to make postponement effective only as to rate cuts scheduled for the third and later years, as contrasted to the second and later cuts as originally provided.

The second change is to add to the original postponement test of budget unbalance a new test in regard to expenditure control. Postponement would be applied only if the budget is out of balance and if what are described as "subordinate expenditures" are higher in the current fiscal year than in the preceding year. "Subordinate expenditures" are defined to include all expenditures of the Federal Government except those related to military preparedness, space research and technology and interest on the public debt. As a general positive description, "subordinate expenditures" cover those generally known as domestic spending programs plus foreign economic assistance.

The postponement procedure sets up a series of decisions and acts which if carried through to the final step would result in postponement of the affected cuts for 1 year, moving forward by 1 year all subsequent cuts.

The first step takes place as of November 15. No later than that late, the President is obligated to determine whether a state of budget unbalance would exist for the current fiscal year if the cuts scheduled for January 1 next go into effect and, if his finding in this respect is "yes," then he makes the further finding of whether "subordinate Federal expenditures" for the current fiscal year are in excess of those of the previous fiscal year. If the findings in both respects are "yes," then he has no alternative but to postpone the January 1 cuts for 6 months.

The second step takes place when the President submits his annual budget message to Congress in the following January, in which he is required to recommend to the Congress whether the cuts postponed to July 1 shall take effect on that date or should be further postponed for an additional 6-month period.

The third step is permissive as regards Congress. It may, by joint resolution enacted into law prior to May 15, put the cuts back into effect as of July 1 or postpone them to the following January 1.

The fourth step is dependent upon whether the Congress takes action. If the Congress does not, then the President is obligated to make the further postponement of 6 months.

Regardless of whether the final 6 month's postponement takes place by congressional resolution, or Presidential action, the effect as indicated above is to move forward for 1 year all subsequent proposals. The statute provides however that one set of cuts can be postponed for only 1 year. Hence, the last three scheduled cuts under the bills could be spread over a maximum of 6 instead of 3 years, without substantive change in the legislation.

The budget balance test remains an important benchmark of the postponement objective. It was originated when inflationary pressures were great and when the budget was in balance, as contrasted to the present situation in which most prices have been relatively stable for several years but the budget is substantially out of balance. If tax rate reform is to be accomplished, it has to be done within the realities of the present prospective budget situation, which is the reason for adding the new expenditure test. However, should an easing of world tensions permit a significant cutback in military spending, there would be no reason why the budget should not be quickly brought into balance. If the budget were balanced, the postponement test would be met in this respect, even though there were some increase in domestic expenditures. In short, the two tests together assure that there will be effective control over domestic and foreign aid spending at the minimum, and budget balance at the optimum, while the last three steps of rate reform are being put into effect.

SECTION 6. REDUCTION OF WITHHOLDING TAX

This section would amend present withholding provisions of the Revenue Code to permit reductions in the amounts withheld in accordance with the individual income tax rate reductions scheduled over the 5-year period commencing on July 1, 1963.

REDUCTION OF WITHHOLDING RATES

| | Percent |
|---|---|
| Current withholding rate | 18.0 |
| Withholding rate after— | |
| June 30, 1963 | 17.1 |
| Dec. 31, 1963 | 16.2 |
| Dec. 31, 1964 | 15.3 |
| Dec. 31, 1965 | 14.4 |
| Dec. 31, 1966 | 13.5 |

SECTION 7. DECLARATION OF ESTIMATED TAX BY INDIVIDUALS

This provision makes it clear that declarations of estimated tax filed by individuals can be based on the tax rates in effect on the last day for filing such estimate.

SECTION 8. DECLARATION OF ESTIMATED TAX BY CORPORATIONS

This section extends the same right to corporations as is provided for individuals in the immediately preceding section.

POSTPONEMENT PROVISION—(SEC. 5) OF H.R. 265 AND H.R. 348

Section 5, part III of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by the addition of a new section 22 to read as follows:

"SEC. 22. POSTPONEMENT OF TAX REDUCTIONS.

"(a) SIX-MONTH POSTPONEMENT OF REDUCTION OF RATES.—The President by November 15 shall determine, if the reductions in taxes under sections 1, 3, and 3402 (relating to income taxes on individuals) and section 11 (relating to income taxes on corporations) scheduled for January 1, 1965, and subsequent dates take effect, whether an imbalance in the budget of the Federal Government for the current fiscal year would exist and, if so whether the subordinate Federal expenditures for the current fiscal year as

defined in subsection (f)(2), will exceed the subordinate Federal expenditures of the previous fiscal year. If the President determines that an imbalance in the budget would so exist and that the subordinate Federal expenditures for the current fiscal year exceeds that of the previous fiscal year, he shall, stating his reasons therefor in an Executive order, postpone until July 1 the date upon which such reductions of taxes are otherwise scheduled to take effect. In the next annual budget message to the Congress the President shall recommend whether any reduction in a rate of tax postponed under this subsection should become effective on July 1 or whether such reductions should be further postponed until the following January 1.

"(b) CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON RATE REDUCTIONS POSTPONED UNDER SUBSECTION (a).—Congress may by means of a joint resolution which has become law before May 15 act—

"(1) to make effective upon July 1 next the rate reductions scheduled under sections 1, 3, and 3402 which have been previously postponed under subsection (a) or to postpone further such rate reduction dates until January 1 and/or

"(2) to make effective upon July 1 next the rate reduction scheduled under section 11 which has been previously postponed under subsection (a) or to postpone further such rate reduction date until January 1.

"(c) FURTHER PRESIDENTIAL ACTION ON RATE REDUCTIONS POSTPONED UNDER SUBSECTION (a).—With respect to any rate reduction postponed under subsection (a) as to which Congress has not acted under subsection (b) by means of a joint resolution which has become law before May 15, the President shall, by May 15, further postpone until January 1—

"(1) any rate reduction scheduled under section 11 which has been postponed previously under paragraphs (a) (1) or (2), or

"(2) any rate reductions scheduled under sections 1, 3, and 3402 and section 11 and which have been postponed previously under paragraph (a)(2).

"(d) TOTAL POSTPONEMENT NOT TO EXCEED ONE YEAR.—Under this section the date upon which a rate reduction is scheduled to take effect under section 1, 3, 11, or 3402 cannot be postponed under subsections (a) and (b) or (c), for more than one year.

"(e) EFFECT OF POSTPONEMENT ON SUBSEQUENT REDUCTION DATES.—When a rate reduction date otherwise scheduled to take effect under section 1, 3, 11, or 3402 has been postponed under subsection (b) or (c) until January 1, then as to the tax whose rate reduction date has been so postponed, the rate reduction dates not affected by such further postponement shall be deferred for one year upon the occurrence of each such further postponement.

"(f) DEFINITIONS.—When used in this section:

"(1) 'Imbalance in the budget' means the existence of a situation where 'budget expenditures' exceed 'budget receipts' as those terms are used in the 'Annual Budget Message of the President' as submitted to Congress.

"(2) 'Federal subordinate expenditures' means budget expenditures as classified in 'The Budget of the United States Government for 1963' except expenditures for the following functions:

"i. MILITARY FUNCTIONS.—Military expenditures by the Department of Defense including foreign military assistance but excluding expenditures for civil defense; expenditures for atomic energy activities directly devoted to military purposes; and expenditures by other Federal agencies for specific defense activities.

"ii. SPACE RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY FUNCTIONS.—All expenditures by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and expenditures by the Atomic Energy Commission directly devoted to space efforts.

"iii. INTEREST.—Expenditures for interest on the public debt, interest on refunds of receipts, and interest on uninvested funds.

"Additions or deductions for interfund transactions shall be taken into account in arriving at the total amount of the subordinate expenditure level.

"(3) 'Rate reduction date' means the date upon which would become effective a reduction in the rate of a tax imposed by sections 1, 3, 11, or 3402.

"(4) 'Current fiscal year' means the fiscal year used for Federal Government accounting purposes during which a postponement provided by this section is or can be made.

"(5) 'Previous fiscal year' means the fiscal year used for Federal Government accounting purposes immediately preceding the current fiscal year against which the Federal subordinate expenditure level is compared for purposes of determining postponement.

"(6) 'Following fiscal year' means the fiscal year used for Federal Government accounting purposes which immediately follows the fiscal year during which a postponement provided by this section is made."

## Tribute to Hon. Jose E. Benitez, Deputy High Commissioner, Pacific Trust Territory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I was particularly pleased to note in a recent press release issued by the Office of Emergency Planning of the Executive Office of the President that a certificate of appreciation award was presented to the Honorable Jose A. Benitez, Deputy High Commissioner, Pacific Trust Territory, for the invaluable service rendered by him in connection with the rehabilitation of the Territory of Guam, following typhoon Karen of November 11, 1962.

This honor by the Government of the United States was conferred upon Mr. Benitez by Mr. Edward A. McDermott, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

Mr. Benitez, present during the storm which was one of the severest in the history of Guam, was commended by Mr. McDermott for "his on-the-spot actions and subsequent counsel and guidance which were invaluable to Federal officials working to restore and rehabilitate the territory" which comprises some 70,000 people.

Many of us will recall that there were many casualties as a result of this storm and over $100 million of property damage.

It is interesting to note that Mr. Benitez, who was appointed Deputy High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in March 1961, was exceptionally well qualified to render such assistance in the Guam disaster because he has held important administrative posts in the executive and legislative branches of the Puerto Rican Commonwealth where he was confronted with numerous social and economic problems.

I have known Mr. Benitez for a number of years. He is a man of high character, integrity, and outstanding ability. I know that many of my colleagues here certainly join with me in congratulating him for the outstanding service he has rendered and are particularly pleased to note that this service was recognized by the award which was conferred upon him by the Government of the United States.

## Patman Report Disputed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Winston-Salem Journal of January 16, 1963:

PATMAN REPORT DISPUTED

(NOTE.—Early this month a report from a congressional committee headed by Representative PATMAN, of Texas, indicated that many philanthropic foundations, including five from Winston-Salem, were using only a small portion of their income for philanthropic purposes. Since the figures released by Patman seemed out of line with the known grants of the local foundations, the Journal assigned staff reporter Chester Davis to check the committee figures against foundation reports. This is what he found.)

(By Chester Davis)

The woes in giving away money are legion and not the least of these is Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, a Democrat from Texas.

PATMAN heads a congressional committee that is investigating the operations of the Nation's tax-exempt trusts and foundations. Periodically PATMAN releases reports on his investigations. These reports invariably are so shocking they claim front-page headlines. And PATMAN'S reports are customarily so misleading they require a careful second look.

During the first week of January, for example, PATMAN announced that 534 foundations, including 11 in North Carolina, gave less than half of their earnings to philanthropic good works.

FIVE IN TWIN CITY

Five Winston-Salem trusts and foundations were named in the Patman report. According to the figures released by PATMAN these five local philanthropic agencies had a combined income that ran into many millions of dollars during the 10-year period of 1951–60.

PATMAN'S figures seemed to show that these five Winston-Salem trusts and foundations spent only a small part of that income on the purposes for which they were created and for which they were given tax exemption. According to PATMAN'S figures, the great bulk of this vast income was squirreled away, unallocated and tax free.

PATMAN, for example, reported that from the time of its creation late in 1953 until

1960 the Mary Reynolds Babcock Foundation showed the following financial profile:

| | |
|---|---|
| Receipts | $20,661,847 |
| Expenses and administrative costs | 260,821 |
| Gave away | 4,680,387 |

The implication is that the Babcock Foundation earned some $20.6 million and spent—in grants and operating costs—only about $4.9 million. The remainder—some $15.7 million—presumably was tucked away in a tax-free corner against some rainy day.

The records of the Babcock Foundation show quite a different story.

This foundation was created in September 1953. At that time $12 million was placed in the foundation under the will of Mrs. Babcock. Since then the corpus, or body, of this trust has appreciated greatly in value because of stock splits and a general rise in the value of the securities and other assets held by the foundation. As of August 31, 1961, the corpus of the Babcock Foundation was valued at $20,561,619.93.

Under the loose head, "Receipts," PATMAN has included the original gift the foundation, the appreciation in value of that gift over the 8-year period, and the income earned by the foundation in that same period.

CONTRADICTED

The charge by PATMAN that this foundation has not spent anything like the income it has enjoyed on philanthropic purposes is flatly contradicted by the published records of the Babcock Foundation. A table accompanying this story reports the financial story of the Babcock Foundation for the period of September 11, 1953, through August 31, 1961.

The fact that the Babcock Foundation actually made grants that were larger than current income is not unusual. Foundations of this type frequently make grants which run over a period of years. In so doing the tendency is to anticipate future earnings and to assume long-range obligations in excess of current income.

PATMAN's report on the John Wesley and Anna Hodgin Hanes Foundation presented the following financial picture of that foundation for the period 1951–60:

| | |
|---|---|
| Receipts | $2,825,638 |
| Expenses | 20,142 |
| Grants | 411,433 |

Here again the great bulk of the "receipts" reported by PATMAN—actually $2,182,769.63 of the $2,825,638—consisted of gifts made by James G. Hanes, Ralph Hanes, and the late Robert M. Hanes to the foundation. (And to this you can add another $159,790.89 that came over the 10-year period in the form of an appreciation in the value of the corpus on the foundation.) The rest of the difference—actually well under $500,000—was earned income.

In the period 1947, when the Hanes Foundation was established, through 1960 the total earnings of the foundation came to $483,077.15. And in this same period the Hanes Foundation made cash grants of $411,433.58. As of October 31, 1962, this foundation had, in addition to its cash gains, outstanding pledges of $159,000.

Here again you have a foundation which in the form of cash grants and pledges, actually has overspent its current income.

At least on first glance the most shocking of the Patman disclosures related to the various Reyonds trusts and foundations. Here is how the Congressman presented that story to the press:

| | |
|---|---|
| The Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation (1951–60): | |
| Receipts | $13,513,340 |
| Expenses | 40,909 |
| Grants | 12,841,545 |
| The W. N. Reynolds Trust: | |
| Receipts | 9,039,029 |
| Expenses | 614,152 |
| Grants | 6,206,661 |
| The Zachary Smith Reynolds Trust: | |
| Receipts | 8,067,757 |
| Expenses | 178,084 |
| Grants | None |

Accepted at their face value, these figures imply that the three operations enjoyed a total income of about $30.6 million for the 10-year period and that in this same period they spent, in expenses and grants, only about $19 million. In the case of the Zachchary Smith Reynolds Trust, PATMAN charges that there was an income of just over $8 million and that no grants whatsoever were made.

Actually, the two trusts were established to receive and administer gifts made by members of the Reynolds family. Income from these trusts then went to the Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation to be distributed for a variety of philanthropic purposes.

TERMS

The terms under which the two trusts were established differed somewhat:

1. The W. N. Reynolds Trust was to hold back 20 percent of its income until the aggregate of the two trusts reached $50 million. After that, 100 percent of its earnings were to go to the Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation for distribution. The aggregate of the two trusts reached $50 million several years ago. In recent years 100 percent of the income of this trust, therefore, has gone to the foundation.

2. The Zachary Smith Reynolds Trust was to withhold 20 percent of its income until the corpus in this particular trust reached $50 million. This point has not yet been reached. As a result, this trust is paying 80 percent of its income to the foundation and plowing the remaining 20 percent back into the corpus.

So, with the exception of the 20 percent of the earnings of the Zachary Smith Reynolds Trust that are plowed back, all of the earnings of these two trusts go to the foundation for distribution. Neither trust makes any other grants.

The record is plain that the Smith Reynolds Foundation has distributed the earnings of the two trusts as fast as these earnings have been transferred to it. PATMAN's figures—which show receipts of $13.5 million and grants of $12.8 million for the Smith Reynolds Foundation—reflect this fact.

Along with these cash grants the Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation also has taken on some sizable long-range obligations. These include a $500,000-a-year gift in perpetuity to Wake Forest College. When you add these long-range obligations to the actual grants you find, again, a picture of a foundation which is spending its income right up to the hilt and even a little bit more.

At the time PATMAN blasted the Nation's tax-exempt foundations and trusts for spending less than half their income on philanthropic purposes, the Congressman also released a letter from William A. Johnson, North Carolina's commissioner of revenue.

On its face Johnson's letter appeared to be a strong endorsement of both PATMAN's investigation and of the broadcast charges he leveled against North Carolina trusts and foundations.

REPLY

Johnson's letter, written in November 1962, was in reply to a letter from PATMAN's committee which asked 7 questions relating to the manner in which North Carolina administered tax-exempt foundations.

As a matter of fact, this State has no effective control over tax-exempt foundations and trusts. When these operations are granted tax-exempt status by the Federal Government they automatically receive the same concession from the State.

"But," Johnson says, "these trusts and foundations make no reports to us. From year to year we have no way of knowing whether their tax-exempt status continues to be justified. There are 265 tax-exempt trusts and foundations in North Carolina today. We know that some of them—usually small trusts or foundations set up by individuals—have been used to circumvent income taxes.

"Because this is true," Johnson continued, "I feel strongly that some more effective method of supervision must be established. And in that sense I heartily endorsed the Congressional investigation Representative PATMAN heads.

IMPORTANT SERVICE

"But," Johnson added, "I am fully aware that the largest trusts and foundations in this State—the Duke, Reynolds, Babcock, Hanes, Morehead, and Richardson foundations, for example—are doing a great and very important service for North Carolina.

"For foundations of that type I have nothing but admiration and the warmest feeling. The danger is, however, that we risk getting too many trusts and foundations, some of which are not legitimate and which are used for purposes of tax evasion. My fear is that the few bad apples will cause Congress or the general assembly to adopt punitive legislation which will be harmful to the legitimate and important work of the truly philanthropic foundations."

In making this statement Johnson emphasized that in his letter to PATMAN he did not single out any specific trusts or foundations for either praise or criticism.

*Babcock foundation grants*

| Fiscal year ending— | Net income | Total grants committed for payment | Excess or (deficiency) of income | Grant payments |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1954 | $41,017.69 | $129,500.00 | ($88,482.31) | $39,000.00 |
| 1955 | 439,820.06 | 1,165,070.22 | (725,250.16) | 428,570.22 |
| 1956 | 615,008.05 | 1,127,000.00 | (511,991.95) | 913,901.91 |
| 1957 | 662,275.97 | 624,589.64 | 37,686.33 | 680,772.90 |
| 1958 | 721,509.16 | 345,786.20 | 375,722.96 | 908,495.40 |
| 1959 | 771,700.62 | 1,276,951.87 | (505,251.25) | 839,282.50 |
| 1960 | 872,782.99 | 1,371,927.00 | (499,144.01) | 894,092.00 |
| 1961 | 1,264,179.55 | 678,292.20 | 585,887.35 | 911,685.50 |
| Total | 5,388,294.09 | 6,719,117.13 | (1,330,823.04) | 5,615,800.43 |

## Newsday Contest Winners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Newsday of Long Island has been conducting an excellent and worthwhile American history contest for students of all senior high schools in Nassau and Suffolk Counties. Each month a new topic is chosen and a boy or girl winner selected. The essays and winners for the month of December have come to my attention, and I am very much impressed with the high caliber of thinking and writing that is shown in these essays by Long Island students. The topic for December was "America's Greatest Military Leader." The two winners were Barry Michael Mitnick, who is a junior at Plainview High School; and Susan Carr, who is a junior at Seton Hall High School in Patchogue. Barry Mitnick chose Nathaniel Greene and defended his choice with an impressive array of Revolutionary War research. Susan Carr nominated Gen. Douglas MacArthur, making an important and perceptive distinction in what constitutes a brave man and a good leader.

Mr. President, I commend these two winners on their good work and I commend Newsday on the stimulating contest it sponsored. I shall look forward to reading more of these winning essays in the future. I hope that when some of these monthly contest winners come down to Washington in June on the all-expense trip, which will be one of their rewards, I will have a chance to congratulate them in person. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD these two essays and the contest rules.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRIZE-WINNING ESSAYS IN NEWSDAY CONTEST PICK "AMERICA'S GREATEST MILITARY LEADER"

(By Barry Michael Mitnick—junior, Plainview High School)

What makes a great military leader? He is a man who can consistently snatch victory from the jaws of defeat, triumph from the mouth of tragedy. He is an inspiring leader of men and a model for the men he leads. He is the light in the darkness of despair, the Galahad of the partisan round table, the stanch Gibraltar of determination.

Who was America's greatest military leader? I say Nathaniel Greene.

Nowhere in the Colonies was the struggle more fierce, more desperate, and perhaps more vital than in the South in 1781. Here lay the key to the Revolution, the crutch without which Washington's valiant stand in the North was inevitably doomed. To save the South was to save the Colonies—French aid was penning the British in New York. The South thus became the crux of the Revolution.

Greene directed the Americans here. Replacing inept Horatio Gates in 1780, he brought a remarkable spirit and drive to his task.

On January 17, 1781, Daniel Morgan's detachment routed hated Lord Tarleton's light forces at Cowpens, N.C. Lord Cornwallis' regulars moved to revenge this affront to English arms. Greene, with the rest of the patriot army, joined Morgan, hotly pursued by Cornwallis, and raced for the Dan River. The American general entered Virginia on February 14, just ahead of John Bull.

The South belonged to the king—or did it? The English lord commanded a starving army in the midst of a hostile, aroused country. Greene had outwitted him, for in Virginia, the militia flocked to patriot colors; the army swelled from the influx. Cornwallis' subsequent withdrawal was a desperate search for supplies. The race to the Dan was the turning point of the war in the South—a British army defeated in victory.

GREENE WON THE DAY

At Guilford Court House, on March 15, history repeated itself. Cornwallis won the field of battle, and Greene the day, for the English were forced to fall back to their stronghold at Wilmington for supplies. Greene's was a cat-and-mouse game—he wisely chose not to risk losing the only American Army in the South in a do-or-die fight. His shrewd planning, however, changed a technical British victory into a harrowing strategic disaster.

Daringly, Greene decided to invade South Carolina, a fortress of British strength. Forts Granby, Motte, Watson, Georgetown, and Augusta fell to the partisans. Only General Stewart stood in Greene's way.

On September 8, in a brilliant tactical maneuver, the American general surprised the English at Eutaw Springs. Although twilight saw the field of honor in his hands, Stewart fled to Charleston's safety the very next day. Only Charleston and Savannah still waved the Union Jack in the colonies south of Virginia.

But what of Cornwallis? He did what Greene had foreseen and prepared for by meticulously guarding his rear in South Carolina. Cornwallis marched into Virginia where Lafayette, Steuben, and Yorktown awaited him.

In Greene's startling, masterful campaign, genius and sly cunning turned sorry defeat to smashing victory. This is the quality that great military leaders must possess—the ability to make the most of the situation at hand. Greene exhibited this without winning a single major battle—he had merely freed the South and provoked Cornwallis' march to infamy.

The South boasted many outstanding fighters: Marion, the "Swamp Fox," "Light Horse" Harry Lee, Morgan of Cowpens and Saratoga—but Greene was the brightest star of them all. He is little known, it is true, but it may be that because of his efforts our country exists today.

---

(By Susan Carr, junior, Seton Hall High School, Patchogue)

A coward cannot be a good military leader but a brave man does not necessarily make a good leader, either. Leadership encompasses more than just a show of bravery. Good leadership can galvanize men into feats above the call of duty. In contrast, however, poor leadership can confuse and bring panic into the heart of the most courageous soldier.

Defining leadership is not easy. What really is this quality? West Point has developed a preferred definition. "Leadership is the art of influencing and directing people to an assigned goal in such a manner as to command their obedience, confidence, respect, and loyal cooperation." In light of this definition, many men have been generals, admirals, and commanders in chief but few have been considered great leaders. There is, however, a small group from which one can choose the greatest military leader. In my opinion, Gen. Douglas MacArthur would be this choice.

General MacArthur certainly acquired one important trait of leadership—a good background in and a firm knowledge of military skill. He was exceptionally brilliant as a graduate of West Point and an officer in the Army's Corps of Engineers. His rapid rise to high rank although still a young man attests to his capabilities. Also, the fact that the general reached the top rank of the Army and successfully led a great army in battle can be counted as evidence of his military prowess.

A second measure of leadership is the thorough understanding of the men under command and of their abilities and limitations. As commander of all the United States and the Commonwealth forces in the Philippines during World War II, General MacArthur realized that he had a total of one Regular Army division and four sketchily trained and inadequately equipped Reserve divisions with which to work. His greatest need was for highly trained men to act as instructors. Another 50,000 men were at his disposal, but they were useless for they lacked training and equipment. The men, themselves, were brave and willing to fight so the general used this to the best advantage. He spread the trained men throughout the units and made sure that all the officers were well-trained men. With proper leadership the ill-trained natives became good fighting men, perhaps the best in the Pacific.

A NATURAL LEADER

Few people who have met General MacArthur come away without having the impression that they have been talking to a natural leader. The effect of the general's immortal words, "I shall return," on the people of the Philippines characterizes the faith he can inspire in those under him and around him.

One of the most vital qualities of leadership is personal courage. Personal courage is more than superficial bravery; it goes far deeper. A person has to conquer his own inner problems and have some strong, tangible source from which to draw strength. For most this takes the form of a strong religious belief. General MacArthur certainly has a strong religious belief and he firmly believes that it is necessary in every society.

"I am absolutely convinced that true democracy can exist only on a spiritual foundation. It will endure when it rests firmly on the Christian conception of the individual and society."

The general's personal courage has been shown in his wartime exploits, when he frequently exposed himself to enemy fire.

There have been many courageous men but few great military leaders. Brave men are not necessarily good leaders. However, great leaders are brave men in every respect of the word.

---

AMERICAN HISTORY CONTEST RULES

1. The Newsday American history contest is open to students of all senior high schools in Nassau and Suffolk Counties. Members of the families of Newsday employees may not participate, but Newsday carriers are eligible.

2. Every month, October through May, contestants may submit essays on a subject in the field of American history, selected by Newsday. A new subject will be announced each month for the following month. The subject for January is "The Three Greatest American Inventions."

3. Essays must be original and not more than 600 words in length, typed or written in ink on one side of the paper. The name, address, and telephone number of the contestant and the name of his or her high school should appear in the upper left-hand corner of the first page. All entries become

the property of Newsday and any or all may be published. None will be returned.

4. Each month, a board of judges will select the best essay submitted by a boy and the best essay submitted by a girl. In all matters relating to this contest, the decisions of the judges will be final.

5. The winning essays on each month's subject will be published in Newsday the following month with pictures of the winners. Each of the monthly winners will receive a wristwatch as an immediate award.

6. During the last week of June, the 16 monthly winners of the previous 8 months will receive an all-expense-paid trip to Washington, D.C., as the guests of Newsday, accompanied by members of Newsday's staff.

7. All entries should be addressed to American History Editor, Newsday, 550 Stewart Avenue, Garden City, N.Y., and must be in the Newsday office by midnight of the last day of each month.

## Hon. Chet Holifield on Quality Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague from California, the Honorable CHET HOLIFIELD, recently was keynote speaker to the annual convention of the National Appliance & Radio-TV Dealers Association in Chicago.

Congressman HOLIFIELD, speaking as the owner-operator of CHET HOLIFIELD's store for men in Norwalk, Calif., as well as a 20-year veteran of Congress, addressed his audience of more than 1,000 merchants on, "The Essence of Competition." He directly linked this straightforward talk with the quality stabilization bill.

This legislation was sponsored in the last session by a number of House and Senate Members. It was favorably reported by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and also acted upon favorably by the Rules Committee of the House. Owing to the impending adjournment of the House and to the congested legislative program in the Senate previous to adjournment, it was decided by the sponsors to postpone legislative action until this session of Congress.

With minor changes, this legislation will be reintroduced by the original and also additional sponsors.

Under unanimous consent I include the speech in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

In previous talks with businessmen, I have asked my audience to look on me as the owner-operator of CHET HOLIFIELD's store for men in Norwalk, Calif., rather than as Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD. However, this evening, since I have a specific legislative challenge in mind, I'm going to ask you to consider me both as a dealer in men's wear and as a Member of the House of Representatives.

These two roles represent an essential need if our country is to win a desperately needed victory. That need is understanding, communication and teamwork between the business community and Congress because at stake is the health of our distributive economy—a vital part of our free competitive enterprise system.

We must remember that this country has really been built on the foundation that the Government doesn't do everything; that the neighbor helps the neighbor; and together, the neighbors help the Government. We must, in this country, be awake to the dangers of blindly relying entirely upon government. But we must be alert to the principle that government justifies itself only on the basis that it shall be the servant of the people, and not the master of the people.

When George Washington took his oath of office in 1789, Congress was elected from only 13 States and it "looked after" the national welfare of only 4 million people. Today, 173 years later, there are 50 States and over 185 million people.

Washington's time was an era of rugged individualism. A man's home State was more important than his National Government. His battle to succeed was more with nature, than with man or science.

Today we live in an unusual universe. Man is increasingly separated from all nature. As a result he himself becomes somewhat artificial. An electricity failure today is as painful for man as lack of bread. A disorder in our enconomy is the failure of his crop. Man's independence, opportunity and reward today depend on his ability to cope with manmade adversities more than nature's. Laws governing his freedom must be made, in consonance with our Constitution, to help him solve new economic and social problems as they arise. Though life today is different, the aims, ambitions and loyalties should remain the same.

The strength of any society rests, as it did in Washington's time, upon the ability and initiative of its people. If ever there was a time when the Government need responsible people and the people need responsible government, this is the time.

Yes, I wear two hats—the businessman's and the Congressman's. I hope that I wear them well. We face ideological, economic and military challenges to our way of life. The best way I know to preserve the American system is to remain militarily strong and economically strong. To keep our economy strong, we must correct the abuses in our distributive system and make it work on stable principles. If we meet the ideological challenge of communism with resolution, we need have no fear of the future.

This Nation's greatness was built on a foundation of small business. From that base the capability of continually producing and distributing more and better goods at competitive prices has developed. The small businessman has been the backbone of America since colonial days. Even with our modern giant industrial corporation, he still comprises in number about 85 percent of the Nation's business firms. The tragedy we now face is the accelerated decline of those small businesses which have formed the backbone of our free enterprise system.

It seems to me, while we agonizingly face the uncertainties of this nuclear age, we must diligently protect the basic sources of our strength. Otherwise chaos is certain, not from nuclear destruction but from our own moral breakdown. And a primarily source of our inherent strength is our free competitive enterprise system.

Everywhere we turn we find evidence that, as we move into the atomic age, the competitive price is being singled out as the dominant element in today's free competitive enterprise system.

In fact, in an increasing majority of business circles, "to be competitive" has come to mean only that one sells at the lowest price in the particular trading area. Unless quality and service is tied to price, then price becomes deceptive.

And is it any wonder when our own Federal Trade Commission in a recent case involving the Snap-On Tools Corp. said; and I quote, " 'Playing off' one dealer against another 'in the hope of obtaining a lower price' is the essence of competition."

The Honorable Paul Rand Dixon, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, last May used the platform of the National Electric Manufacturers Association to give added publicity to the above quotation.

Now I do not know whether or not the manufacturers in your industry have left the above quotation unchallenged, but I am delighted to use the platform of the National Appliance and Radio-TV Dealers Association to challenge the quotation. If we have reached the point that the "playing off" of one dealer against another in hope of obtaining a lower price is in fact the essence of competition, then we have pushed into the background all of the wonderful constructive marketing practices that have played such an important part in the growth of the most prosperous country on the face of this earth.

ESSENCE OF COMPETITION IS PROFIT INCENTIVE

To be blunt, in my opinion as a businessman, in my opinion as a Member of Congress, the Federal Trade Commission has not selected, as the essence of competition, the necessary element that must prevail in order to preserve our free democratic form of government. The essence of competition is unequivocally the incentive. I'm speaking of the incentive that causes us to do all the constructive things that we do to bring to market the splendid products of industry. I'm speaking of the fair reward for those constructive efforts.

In this way the essence of competition is tied to the right to earn a profit, with emphasis on the word "earn."

In exercising your right to earn a profit, you put forth a true competitive effort when you do those things that have built your business into a vital force in your community and have helped build your industry and your country.

As you engage in your right to earn a profit, you have certain prerogatives. Perhaps your organization doesn't exercise all of them. Some you may abandon to manufacturers who confront you with an attractive proposition, perhaps it is necessary to do so to stay in business. Some you plan to undertake tomorrow. Some are an immediate burden but a long-range necessity. By prerogatives we mean the things that you are doing, or that are possible for you to do, to earn a profit:

1. There's your investing in fixed assets.

2. There's the building of an effective personnel organization.

3. There's your investing in merchandise. You abandon your prerogatives in this area when, in order to keep up with competition, you accept floor plans, and special sales and display franchises.

4. There's the physical act of bringing merchandise to your trading area.

5. You advertise this merchandise. Guard this prerogative carefully as you accept cooperative advertising money because you are actually yielding control and authority to your resources.

6. You display.

7. You sell. Here's where the demand-creating function should be at its best.

8. You offer credit, and do so in a responsible manner.

9. You deliver.

10. You install, or take complete responsibility for the installation.

11. You clarify for your customer the warranty or guarantee involved.

12. You service for the most part what you sell.

13. Finally there is the prerogative of spending, saving or reinvesting the resulting profit.

How many of these 13 prerogatives did you exercise?

How many of them did you abandon to others?

You can measure the degree of independence you have—yes, the degree of control you have over your business by checking this list.

There is undoubtedly a trend toward eliminating the retail link in the chain of distribution. To the extent that you answer in the negative when you check these 13 points, I believe you are helping that trend. Of course it is your prerogative to commit business suicide. You can do it by gradual abandonment of the basic practices and responsibilities which justify your link in the chain of distribution. Or you can call a halt in this trend by improving your ability as a free advertiser, as an aggressive merchandiser, a real credit sales manager, a service manager directly interested in customer satisfaction and last but not least the business manager of your own business.

SUPPORT URGED FOR QUALITY STABILIZATION

On the other hand, to what extent is your disappointment with your profit directly attributed to accepting the proposition that price is the dominant element in today's competitive free enterprise system? It's at this point that I recommend that you should exercise the 14th principle, another prerogative. I recommend that you support legislation before this Congress that will restore the competitive price factor to its proper perspective; legislation that will take a big step toward helping you do all those things that you are anxious to do to earn a profit. I refer to a legislative proposal known as the quality stabilization bill.

It's not the Federal Trade Commission, nor the courts, nor the predators in the marketplace that make our laws. It is the U.S. Congress expressing the will of the people that has the power to make the laws in this area.

Congress is the only constitutional arbiter with respect to conflicting views of national economic policy. By enacting the quality stabilization bill, Congress will express its intent, that orderly marketing practices may have an opportunity to prevail, thereby countering the all out price and gimmick trend.

And, in careful study of it, I have noted that virtually every national trade organization representing consumer products, including this impressive association, has endorsed this measure which I feel, for the safeguarding of our basic business pattern, must be enacted quickly in this session of Congress.

No governmental administrative agency or bureau is involved in any way with the quality stabilization bill.

Salesmanship consists of transferring a conviction by a seller to a buyer. You are the seller. Congress is the buyer. There are 535 customers. If the sale of quality stabilization is not made this year, blame no one but yourself. I said 535 customers, but a considerable number of Congressmen are already sold on the bill.

I am sold. I am sold because I am a veteran Congressman of 20 years, who believes my solemn duty is to my constituents.

I am sold because for 35 years I have been a retail clothier in a small town, and have had personal experience in seeing small businessmen — my constituents — destroyed by unfair sabotage of trademarks and brand name merchandise.

I am sold because that which is hurting my business, is hurting every other merchant dedicated to selling brand name merchandise, and is hurting so badly that it is threatening traditional business procedures.

I am sold because I believe freedom under this legislation, would be reserved for the man who lives by his own work, and directs his own business, to protect that business from those who would destroy it.

I am sold because I proudly say I like my life in this country and I want to keep it that way for my constituents as well as my own children and grandchildren. I know it can be so maintained, only by continually defending sound business principles and by constant willingness to do more than sometimes seems necessary.

I am sold on the quality stabilization bill because this bill, studied without prejudice, is basic, simple truth, spelling out a precise remedy for a recognized malady.

I built my retail business on lines of nationally known brand merchandise. If the predators continue to acquire such brand merchandise and slash normal retail prices, I am threatened with destruction to my traditional way of doing business. Much more important than my personal business fate, is the fate of millions of producers and retailers of brand name merchandise.

TRIBUTE PAID TO JOHN W. ANDERSON

I want to take just a minute here to pay tribute to an American businessman. This country is more in need of guided leaders than guided missiles and there would be no quality stabilization bill were it not for the principles and dogged determination of one such leader. He is a man of infinite patience.

His fight for his rights as a manufacturer of high quality brand name automotive parts and for integrity in the distribution of those products has been in essence a fight for you as well. All of us, whether in manufacturing, wholesaling or retailing, or in the Congress, owe John W. Anderson, founder-president of the Anderson Co., of Gary, Ind., a great vote of thanks. He is the mainspring of the Quality Brands Associates movement.

The case for quality stabilization has been well established. The need is now. Victory is in sight. It will take work by you and the only substitute for work is a miracle. Your business cannot await a miracle.

If support comes to each Congressman from his voting constituents, Congress will express its intent for business to have the right to develop a quality product and protect that quality against the cannibalism of price debasement.

In this way, Congress will affirm that the true essence of competition, is the profit incentive. In so doing, Congress will be helping you to preserve your right to earn a profit.

## The Hanford Atomic-Steam Generating Facility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, culminating a long, hard legislative battle, the Congress voted its approval of the Hanford atomic electric facility last summer. The Congress authorized the Washington Public Power Supply System to enter into contract with the Atomic Energy Commission for the production of electric power, utilizing waste steam at the Hanford, Wash., New Production Reactor. The WPPSS, an organization of public power bodies, agreed to finance, construct, and operate the facility at no cost to the taxpayer. Today I am most pleased to request to have printed in the RECORD the text of two editorials written in prominent Northwest newspapers, the Tri-City Herald of Kennewick, Wash., and the Sunday Oregonian of Portland, Oreg., which deal with developments since congressional approval was realized.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kennewick (Wash.) Tri-City Herald, Jan. 9, 1963]

IT LOOKS BETTER ALL THE TIME

The question of "What are you going to do with all that power?" which was asked often by opponents of the Hanford steam project, has been answered.

The big plant, to be the largest atomic steam generating facility in the world, can't produce enough power to satisfy the appetites of public and private utilities. The 800,000 kilowatts it will produce have been oversubscribed.

Yesterday a big event was the long delayed announcement by private power companies that they want the 400,000 kilowatts which Congress said they could have.

During their bitter and intense opposition to the plant, private power used as one argument that there was no market for the power. It was a sham which enough Congressmen fortunately saw through and the steamplant won.

As a matter of fact a host of charges made against the project by private power have already been shot full of holes.

The further the Hanford steam plant progresses the more feasible it appears.

Last week steamplant supporters got another giant shot in the arm when bids for the plant's turbines were $12 million less than the engineer's estimate.

Those close to the steamplant picture knew its backers had been conservative in their estimates and that the plant could be constructed for less than $130 million.

But the $12 million saving in turbines wasn't entirely anticipated and it was—to use the masterpiece of understatement by Owen Hurd, managing director of WPPSS—"a very pleasant surprise."

Another pleasant surprise came a few weeks earlier with the low-interest-rate bid for interim financing. This was an expression by banking interests in the merit of the PUD's banding together to build the plant.

Many weeks ago we predicted in this column that private power would participate in the steamplant's output but that it would wait until the very last minute. The object was to first place every conceivable obstacle in the path of those who sought to construct it.

Perhaps now bygones can be bygones. Charles Luce, Bonneville Power Administrator, announced in Spokane in September that he was going to carry no grudges about private power's position and he hoped private power would do likewise.

Public power, however, would do well to always keep its powder dry.

Happily for all, the steamplant was sold to Congress on the merit basis and now the merits of the steamplant are selling the project to everyone.

---

[From the Portland Sunday Oregonian, Jan. 13, 1963]

GOOD POWER AFTER ALL

It should surprise no one that five privately owned public utilities of the Pacific Northwest who followed the national electric

utility-U.S. Chamber of Commerce line in fighting the Hanford power project are now exercising their congressional option to take 50 percent of the 800,000 to 900,000 kilowatts of energy to be produced at Hanford from nuclear-generated steam.

Where else could they buy 400,000 or more of firm power on a 30-year contract not subject to public power withdrawals at the going Federal rate of the Bonneville Power Administration?

We leave it to the public to figure out why the Northwest utilities lent their lobbying aid, though quietly, to the efforts of the national utilities and coal industries to bushwack the Hanford power project. The generators were first to have been built by the Federal Government. But that bill was killed in the House of Representatives. Now they are to be built by Washington Public Power Supply System (16 public utility districts), and ideological opposite of the privately owned utilities. WPPSS will sell $130 million in revenue bonds on the open market (to private investors, note) to finance the project. WPPSS is a competitor of four of the region's private utilities in application for licenses to build mutually exclusive dams on the Snake River—Nez Perce and Mountain Sheep. But the private utilities did not seek congressional approval to build the nuclear-powered generators at Hanford themselves. Their line was that the world's largest nuclear powerplant was infeasible.

The Federal Bonneville Power Administration will assume full responsibility for delivery of Hanford power to private and public customers. Because of congressional approval of Hanford power, BPA now has firm power to sell from the hydro supply held in reserve to meet commitments under the Federal preference clause to public agencies. But there has been no rush of big industries to establish new plants. Perhaps that will come. But whether there is an industrial surge or not, the power from Hanford as well as power from Mountain Sheep Dam will be needed in the late 1960's to meet normal demand increases.

The barely undercover fight of regional private utility spokesmen to prevent congressional approval of the use of wasted steam from the new plutonium production reactor at Hanford now has been exposed for what it was: First, an ideological fight against Federal entrance into nuclear power production; second, an ideological fight against regional public power agencies. The Portland Chamber of Commerce, which did not join the campaign in support of Hanford development in Congress, may well consider, now, the validity of the arguments which dissuaded it. The private utilities are ready and eager to sign on the dotted line.

Any needed power development which adds strength to the economic sinews of the Pacific Northwest is certain to help everyone, private utility investors included. There will be more power for everyone as a result of the Hanford victory.

## Deepwater Harbor for Northern Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution, passed by the AFL–CIO, of Lake County, Ind., comprising the great industrial Calumet region of Indiana, which I include in the Appendix of the RECORD, speaks for itself:

LAKE COUNTY, IND., CLU OPPOSES BURNS DITCH HARBOR—RESOLUTION PASSED ON INDIANA DEEPWATER PORT

Whereas the question of construction and location of a deepwater port in Indiana is of vital interest to our members and their families; and

Whereas this question of a deepwater port has been vigorously debated for many months; and

Whereas the AFL–CIO has adopted sound and constructive policy resolutions pertaining to conservation, slum clearance, and redevelopment programs; and

Whereas the basic issue in dispute revolves around the present contemplated dunes location of the port: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Lake County AFL–CIO Central Labor Union hereby goes on record advocating a local program of slum clearance, area redevelopment, conservation, and deepwater port in a package arrangement designed to implement the policies of the AFL–CIO; and be it finally

*Resolved*, That:

1. We are in favor of the construction of a port on Lake Michigan;

2. We believe it to be in the best interests of our members and their families to preserve as much as possible of the dunes that remain. This should be done in the form of a national park.

3. We believe that the best interests of our members, their families, and the taxpayers can best be served by locating the port between East Chicago and Gary so that it can serve the highly industrialized East Chicago-Gary area and will also be favorably located to service the Midwest Steel Co. and other industrial operations in Portage, thereby concurring with and implementing the resolutions adopted by the national AFL–CIO on conservation, slum clearance and area redevelopment.

The above resolution was passed by one of the biggest attended meetings of the Lake County AFL–CIO Central Labor Union Tuesday evening at the Steelworkers Building in Gary.

Will a port at Burns Ditch cure the unemployment problem or will it rob the working man for the benefit of special interests?

Will the port and the mills bring prosperity or will they destroy all possibility of developing the richest, job-producing tourist industry in the Middle West?

Jobs in the steel industry depend on two basic factors, first, the market demand for the steel, and second, the labor time needed to produce the steel. Layoffs result when market demands drop or when a new development, such as automation, cuts down the needed labor time.

Are new mills needed to satisfy new market demands? According to figures in Iron Age, existing steel mills can meet all market demands for the next 30 years. Existing mills are working at only 50 percent of capacity, producing only half as much steel as they could if they could find a place to sell it—employing only half as many workers as they would if they could market the steel.

The new, automated steel mills will take markets now held by the existing, older mills. The older mills, suffering a loss of customers, will be forced to lay off more workers. Joblessness in the older steel-producing areas of Indiana will jump to new levels.

Will the new mills hire the workers laid off by the older mills? New mills are built with advanced operating procedures and automated processes that require only a fraction of the workers formerly needed.

In a survey of the steel industry by Frank Lynn of the Armour Research Foundation, it is indicated that for every 150 workers hired by the new mills, 250 workers will be laid off by the older mills.

In order to compete with the new, automated mills, the older mills will be forced to adopt more automated operations. The older mills will need still fewer workers. Unemployment will rise again.

Since the percentage of automation in the total steel industry will be greater, the number of employed workers in the total steel industry will be less—much less.

Unemployment spreads like cancer. Decreased purchasing power means smaller markets for consumer goods and more layoffs in other industries.

But won't the Burns Ditch Port make jobs? The Burns Ditch Port will be paid for by taxes on working men and women—it will benefit only the private owners of the two steel companies it will serve.

Indiana already has four ports on Lake Michigan. If we need more ports, a bigger port in the Tri-City area of Indiana (Hammond, Whiting, East Chicago) would cover 16,000 acres—over 20 times the size of the 750-acre Burns Ditch Port—and would provide over 20 times the jobs.

Can we lose anything by building mills and a Burns Ditch Port in our Duneland? Can we lose anything besides picnics?

Steel mills and a port in our Duneland will destroy forever the greatest paycheck-producing opportunity in our State. Yes, our incomparable Duneland can make jobs—if we use it wisely.

The market demand for outdoor recreation grows bigger every year. Areas that offer outdoor recreation also develop steady, long-term employment.

In the words of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, "consumer spending for outdoor recreation is now estimated to be in the neighborhood of $20 billion annually." The Indiana Duneland offers the greatest outdoor recreation attraction in the Middle West. Our Duneland has what other States are spending millions to build—good beaches. New Jersey expects to invest $28 million to renew washed-out beaches. Our Duneland has miles of the finest, self-renewing beaches in the world.

In Jackson, Wyo., before Teton National Park was established, bank deposits were $395,000. In 1959 deposits had jumped to $4,500,000. In the vicinity of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area, trade doubled after the recreation area was established.

If we have the wisdom to establish a national park that will save all that remains of our unique Duneland and beaches, we will boost our entire State economy. Millions of tourists from throughout this country and Canada will flock into Indiana to spend their money.

Taxes? The tourist dollar is a profit dollar. The tourist spends his money and returns home. We do not pay taxes to build schools for the tourist's children. We do not provide unemployment compensation or relief for tourists. In 1960, Gatlinburg, Tenn., gateway to the Smokies National Park, had 3½ million visitors. With an assessed property investment of $25 million, Gatlinburg had a tax rate of only 85 cents.

Jobs? Jobs providing tourists with food, lodging, clothing, roads, housing, automotive and recreational facilities, and jobs providing a host of related services will raise employment levels.

## Payments in Lieu of Taxes and Shared Revenues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the National Association of Counties held its grazing, water, and revenue conference in Las Vegas, Nev., in mid-December of last year.

Mr. Robert E. Wolf, a professional staff member of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, presented an outstanding paper entitled "Payments in Lieu of Taxes and Shared Revenues."

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Wolf's paper be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES AND SHARED REVENUES

(By Robert E. Wolf, professional staff member for public lands, U.S. Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, given at the western regional district of the National Association of County Officials, December 13, 1962, Las Vegas, Nev.)

It is again a pleasure for me to come before your association to discuss with you a subject of vital interest. Before I become too deeply involved in the topic, I would like to say that the work of the county officials, your organization and your staff has been both constructive and useful on the national scene. The fact that the chairman of the committee for which I work, Senator ANDERSON, has authorized me to come here at your request, emphasizes this point.

My major staff responsibility is with our Public Lands Subcommittee and Senator BIBLE, of Nevada, your host State, is its chairman. In Washington, I have often heard it said of Nevada's two Senators, "In Nevada you have your choice of getting a job done with a CANNON or a BIBLE."

The subject which I have been asked to talk about—Payments in Lieu of Taxes and Shared Revenues—is indeed a complex one. I took the opportunity to go back to review some of the work that has been done during the last decade. When Paul Carlin asked me to operate in the cleanup position on this panel, I wanted to try my best to avoid either striking out or hitting a pop fly. I must confess, however, that I approach this turn at bat with some concern. My review establishes that while many have come up to the plate, few hits have been made.

Despite all the commission-type activities of the last decade, today all there is to show in the way of change on this subject is another relatively inactive Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations which was established in 1959.

Rather than attempt to recite figures on the vastness of the Federal holdings and their relation to State and local governments, it perhaps would be more useful to discuss the broad policy implications surrounding payments to local governments. This, in turn, may lead you to decide why this is one of those topics on which there has been so much discussion and so little action.

Over the last several decades there have been certain structural changes in Federal, State, and local governments.

Counties have grown in the responsibilities that they shoulder. The demand for services has increased and they collect more taxes. The property tax, as such, while it is up, has actually decreased in relative importance as a source of local revenue. It is this tax, or its equivalent, and the Federal-local arrangement which is the subject of our discussion today.

In addition to what the States do, the Federal Government also has developed a number of programs which distribute money to the counties and to the States. Therefore, it can be said that there is today a greater interconnection and interdependency on the part of all levels of government.

At the outset, I want to dispose of the terms "exclusive jurisdiction" and "retrocession." First, the great bulk of the Federal properties—the national forests and public lands—are not exclusive jurisdiction lands. Second, to the extent that there is private property on Federal lands, that property may be subject to local sales, use, and income taxes.

As you are aware, it is the property tax that may not be levied on private property on Federal lands, nor may it be levied against the Federal lands themselves.

With the exception, then, of the property tax, private developments on Federal properties are subject to taxation.

Your concern, just now, revolves around payments in lieu of taxes and shared revenues on Federal lands.

There are five basic policies that may be followed by the Federal Government:

1. Make no payment.
2. Pay taxes or an equivalent amount.
3. Share income or revenue.
4. Compensate local government in whole or in part for services rendered or hardship caused.
5. A combination of 2 or 3 with 4.

There are examples of all these situations in operation today. The Federal Government has devised a series of compensatory payments to States and local governments and several of these compensatory payments take into account the acreage of Federal land within the State or county. For example, both in the field of education and highways the Federal Government has also made direct payments. Various highways are eligible for up to 100 percent Federal financing.

The most common arrangement for payments directly to counties, in the nature of taxes, are shared revenues. There are numerous techniques that have been devised. In at least one minor case, the Coos Bay Wagon Road lands in Oregon, payments are on a tax-equivalent basis. In another case part of the Minnesota National Forest, payments are set at three-quarters of 1 percent of the Federal Government's estimate of the value of the lands. Usually, the Federal Government has used a system of paying a percentage of revenues to the local government.

A few pertinent figures here might be enlightening: In 1960 the Federal Government paid to States and counties property taxes, payments in lieu of taxes, and revenue-sharing payments totaling $103 million, of which $85 million came from the last category.

In addition, $516 million was paid in cash, or in kind, to supplement services commonly considered basic to local government operations.

Included here are: $258 million in education funds for impacted areas; $120 million, a credit in the Federal highway formula because of the presence of Federal lands; and at least $140 million representing the direct Federal expenditure for roads on Federal lands, such as national forests, parks, public lands, and Indian lands. The total is about $630 million. It is important to note that the indirect payments are five times greater than the direct payments for tax or tax-equivalent purposes.

You are the people responsible for conducting the affairs of local government and, thus, there falls upon you the direct responsibility for raising the taxes needed to support the local services demanded. The need for operating revenue exerts a constant pressure upon you. It is not surprising that where Federal lands are a significant part of a county you look to these lands to help supply a proportionate share of needed local revenues.

It is not unusual to hear people exclaim that Federal lands should be "put back on the tax rolls." However, this statement is often erroneous because most of the Federal holdings are original public domain lands which never have been on the tax rolls. Only the acquired lands were on the tax rolls. The submarginal lands purchased in the thirties usually were not producing tax revenue and were tax delinquent. It is only after these lands are rehabilitated at Federal expense and again productive that a "tax loss" argument begins to be heard.

In cases involving defense and other related activities, lands have been taken from the tax rolls. Where lands are acquired for Federal or State purposes, as you know, direct and indirect payments are usually made.

In almost every case of Federal acquisition there has been consultation with and approval from the local government. Nonetheless, the contention is often made that the tax roll has been reduced, despite the welcome that has often been given to the original Federal acquisition.

Another concept which is often urged is that the public lands be placed on the tax rolls through sale to private individuals. Despite the archaic nature of the public land laws, it has been possible for private citizens to acquire public lands. The fact that they are not under private ownership stems as much from the lack of sufficient private interest in their acquisition as it does from any alleged interest on the part of the Federal Government in holding these lands. There is some reason to believe, for example, that on the Taylor grazing lands, which approximate 180 million acres, it would be more costly to the ranchers to own the lands in fee than to use them under the current system of grazing fees.

A few years ago, the Senate Interior Committee was told that the woods were full of lumber companies eager to purchase one of the finer ponderosa pine forests in the West, the Klamath Indian Reservation. The great bulk of these lands were added to the national forest, due to a lack of private buyers.

It is interesting, when reflecting upon the "value" of these lands, while private buyers were hard to find, some of the Klamaths now are suing the United States for not paying enough for the lands. From the standpoint of the counties, there is reason to believe that the revenue-sharing payments will equal the taxes that would have been paid in private ownership and there is the assurance that the resource will be productive in perpetuity.

Certainly, it is evident in the field of mining claims on public lands and national forests, where there is a clear device for securing a patent, that many claims have been held, worked and dropped without ever an effort to obtain a patent. The improvements made by the claimholder may be taxed by local government because these are not exclusive jurisdiction lands.

County officials should be well aware that if citizen can get the fruit of title without the capital investment, and in the process can escape local property taxes no matter how modest they may be, he may feel impelled to do this. When one urges private acquisition he may be talking into the wind because the sum of the private interest in acquisition may be so small that nothing concrete can be expected.

There are others who talk about Federal lands and their resources in terms of an argument for "tax equality," contending that some existing shared revenue provision, such as that in the Mineral Leasing Act, is not equitable to the State or local government. This group runs into a different situation. First, the division of mineral leasing revenues is 37½ percent to the State and the balance to the Federal Government. However, 52½ percent goes to reclamation and only 10 percent finds its way into the Treasury. Any reduction of the Federal share would adversely affect the reclamation fund. Since legislation to change the mineral leasing formula must proceed through the same committee which is most concerned with reclamation legislation, the difficulties presented should be obvious. In addition, the mineral leasing revenues go directly to the States and it is up to the States to decide the extent to which individual counties receive a share of the revenues.

In fact, in most of the shared revenue formulas the Federal funds are granted to the States. They decide how the counties shall use the funds and, in some cases, they can decide whether or not the counties will receive any money.

However, the major factor to consider in something as substantial as the Mineral Leasing Act is whether there is any rationale for changing the formula. Thus, now the Western States not only ultimately get 90 percent of the mineral leasing revenue, but also they are further strengthened by the presence of this account in the reclamation fund. This ensures that this program is better able to provide the wide benefits of water resources development for the arid West.

The complex interrelationship between the Mineral Leasing Act and the reclamation fund, coupled with the fact that the Mineral Leasing Act makes a most substantial payment to the States, certainly suggests that there is more involved than a simple question of tax equality.

The public domain land and timber disposal laws provide that but 5 percent of receipts be granted to the States and counties. On the other hand, the balance, 95 percent, goes into the reclaration fund. Here again the same set of relationships exist, as is the case in mineral leasing.

On the national forests there is a direct revenue-sharing of 25 percent of receipts, plus an additional 10 percent of receipts allocated to the Secretary of Agriculture to spend on roads. The cause of some concern in western counties has been the reservation of revenues—I might add, fully authorized by law—for such things as brush control and timber stand improvement. When these revenues are kept for the purposes authorized by law they provide for substantial local investments in continued forest productivity which, in turn, protects the economic base of the communities.

If my talk, so far, seems to have rambled and is a bit incoherent, this should not worry you too much, except as to my speaking ability. The fact is that the whole system of payments in lieu of taxes rambles and is filled with inconsistencies. If you are seeking a consistent approach, you won't find it in this field. But there is evidence to suggest that the inconsistencies are not necessarily fatal.

The problem that faces the counties is finding adequate local revenues. It brings you small comfort to recognize that more direct and indirect Federal expenditures occur locally because of the presence of Federal land than is apparent in examining the shared revenues available to the counties. Your interest is in maximizing direct income. Proceeding from this thesis, I would like to lay out a few of the policy implications that you may wish to consider.

Many of the shared revenue formulas require that the money received be spent on schools and roads. This has been a continuous aggravation. But, is it a real problem? The Federal legislation usually provides that the State legislature will decide the proportion allocated to schools or roads. As you know, in each State the school and road people rather jealously guard the proportion of the particular shared revenue allocated to their function.

If, in reality, the total amount expended on either of these programs is substantially greater than the amount in shared revenues, the presence of the restriction is not damaging. It is only when such a restriction would force spending more on schools or roads than the county contemplated that a problem exists.

One of the major suggestions of the 1955 Commission in Intergovernmental Relations was that the limitations on the spending of money for schools and roads, found in many revenue-sharing formulas, be eliminated. I suggest that the counties view this recommendation in the light of fiscal reality.

Another type of suggestion is one which would result in a better definition of the funds which should constitute receipts for the purpose of determining shared revenues. Suggestions are made from time to time as to the effect of brush control and timber stand improvement programs, the effect of exchanges of land and the cost of constructing roads through deductions in the price of the timber on national forests and public lands. These are all claimed to have an impact on the payments to the counties. While it may be true that there is an impact on the payments to the counties, it is also true that these funds are spent locally and, thus, totally benefit the local economy. In other words, if it were reasonable to revise the law so that these expenditures would be treated as revenue for tax purposes, would the result be consistent with the treatment of similar private property?

This year the Federal Government will spend $96 million on forest roads and highways. In addition, $40 million worth of roads will be secured by the deduction in the price of timber which has its effect upon the counties. For reforestation and stand improvement the direct Federal expenditures will total $15 million while timber sale expenditures will be on the order of $14 million. Viewed in balance, what should be the arrangement and the proportions so as to fairly recognize the impact on shared revenues?

One of the more substantial problems in shared revenues stems from the fact that almost universally the payments are made as a percentage of income. If the sale of public land goes up or goes down, or the sale of resources—such as timber, grazing privileges or minerals—varies, the income of the county varies accordingly.

There is a paucity of information on the relation between the location of revenue production and local burdens, as well as whether there is a direct tie between economic activity and local costs which is not properly treated by present formulas.

There is also the issue of whether payments should be better stabilized and made more regular.

The only two public land formulas which produce stability of income are those on the Coos Bay Wagon Road and the Superior National Forest lands. The former pegs the payment to the two counties involved at the equivalent of taxes on comparable private land. The latter approach makes the payment on national forest land three-quarters of 1 percent of the value as determined by the Federal Government. In both of these approaches and appraisal is made every 10 years which forms the basis for payments in the subsequent decade.

There have been various alternatives offered for stabilizing shared revenue payments. One device suggested to produce stability is the use of a 5-year moving average. This would tend to smooth out some of the irregularities in payment.

There are approaches in addition to the Coos Bay lands or Minnesota lands systems. Certainly, it is a fact that a revenue-sharing formula applied to a county where no revenue develops hardly compensates that county. Five, twenty-five, or seventy-five percent of nothing is still nothing.

However, equally important is the question of whether the counties wish to examine the rationale upon which payments are made. In the case of public domain timberland, the direct payment to the countries is 5 percent of income. For the Coos Bay lands it is a tax equivalent. For the national forest, generally, 25 percent of income. All four of these classes of land can be found side by side in the State of Oregon and each of them returns different amounts to the counties in which they are located.

There is no evidence which suggests which formula, in and of itself, whether you take into account other indirect Federal benefits or you do not, produces a fair sharing of revenue with local government. The same thing can be said for the formulas dealing with other types of land and with resources.

As far as I know, while there have been many studies made by the Federal Government, the counties themselves have not made their own analysis of the situation. Despite all the studies and talk, virtually nothing has been done to change these formulas, some of which are now 60 years old.

There is no doubt that some shared revenue formulas produce hardships for some local governments because if there is no revenue or if the revenue is very small, the payment to the county is nonexistent or minute.

There is little doubt that the formulas are not only uneven in similar land and resource situations, but, also, that they are not consistent in meeting the tax needs of local governments.

Canada devised a rather interesting approach to the situation, which has been both commended and condemned because of its simplicity. Virtually all national property in Canada exceeding in value 4 percent of the total property evaluation in any municipality pays an amount not to exceed three-quarters of the amount that the local tax would be if it were privately held. In addition, the Canadians, like ourselves, have developed various additional grant-in-aid programs.

Certainly, any consideration of the national revision of our own system could well include a careful review of the procedure which Canada has apparently found meets her needs.

Where you are dealing with the concept of payment in lieu of taxes as a tax equivalent or as a shared revenue, the realities of the situation require recognition. Under the Constitution, the Federal Government is not required to make tax or tax equivalent payments to local government. It has long done so and there is virtually no Federal property which does not, in some way or other, make a direct cash contribution to local government. In 1960 these payments totaled $630 million.

The States carry the same immunity from local taxation and it is not possible for a county to tax the capitol dome in any State. It is hardly likely, within the scheme of things, to expect either the Federal or the State government to submit the property under their proprietorship to local taxation. In fact, there is some evidence which indicates that, in some instances, the States are more restrictive than the Federal Government.

Any substantial effort to achieve the ultimate goal set by some spokesmen, which would have the effect of placing all Federal

and State property on local tax rolls, probably could only be achieved if, in the process, the entire structure of other grants-in-aid were upset. This is true because the rationale for a great deal of Federal aid is that the Federal Government does not pay local taxes and supplementary assistance is necessary because of this fact.

In the years that lie ahead, local governments are going to continue to find that their sources of revenue are more difficult to tap. No doubt, one of the factors which has led to increased action in State legislatures and in the National Legislature to plow back State and Federal income through grants of various types to local government, is the recognition of the political difficulty local government has in raising taxes. Citizens who are interested in schools, roads, mental health and various other governmental functions, appear before you as county commissioners asking for these services. At the same time, they will often rebel, when you institute the necessary increases in property taxes, to provide the services they ask. In the Washington, D.C., area, in one of the wealthiest counties in the Nation, the taxpayers threw out all the incumbents because of a 37 cents tax increase announced a few weeks before election. Intuitive recognition of this possibility has led both those who want increased services by government and those who are responsible for administering local government to turn to State and National Legislatures with the request that they collect taxes and devise programs which indirectly do what is not considered feasible locally.

Particularly in our Western States where there is so much Federal land, there is always a warm interest in maximizing the shared revenues from the Federal holdings. This, too, is a natural because it represents a way to increase county income without levying a direct tax on the local voters.

What I have endeavored to do today is to lay out for you, as best I can, some of the considerations which come into play when you enter into a realistic appraisal of what may be done on payments to local government.

If this is a subject worth doing something about, it deserves a far different type of approach and effort on the part of the counties in the future than it has had in the past. Because of the complexities of the subject, it would be unrealistic to expect any results if you did not gather substantial data and facts and look at the question from the standpoint of the likely reaction from those whom you are asking for a change.

Federal lands and private developments on Federal lands are not automatically subject to property taxes. Federal land holdings, then, produce this sort of picture. Where there are private facilities on Federal lands you may collect sales, use and income taxes, if the lands are not subject to exclusive Federal jurisdiction. Purposely, I have only touched lightly upon the question of levying property taxes upon private property on Federal lands, for this broad and complex issue really is not a part of the subject before you.

Interwoven with the shared revenue formulas is the system of grants-in-aid. These are certainly related subjects.

The problems that most affect the counties with Federal lands are the adequacy of shared-revenue payments in relation to similar taxes on like lands; the stability of income; the basis upon which Federal receipts are classed as income for revenue-sharing purposes; the rationale for applying different formulas to lands which have the same economic purpose; and the question of compensating counties where no Federal income is developed to share with the counties.

To the extent there is disagreement within your ranks on what the basic issues are and what the solutions should be, your ability to close ranks and move forward together will be hampered.

The Congress usually acts in a comprehensive field such as this only when there is some agreement among the proponents for the change.

If the recent past suggests anything, it is clear that a need for more money—a greater share of the Federal revenue from these lands—has not brought about a change.

The National Association of Counties has become a revitalized organization over the past few years. There is considerable evidence to suggest that after you have considered this subject and assigned to it a priority, you will proceed in a careful and comprehensive approach. Certainly you can then expect the Congress to listen attentively to your views and to endeavor to chart a route responsive to your real needs.

## Dick Shelton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. BASIL L. WHITENER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, January 21, 1963, Richard L. Shelton, editor of the Shelby Daily Star, Shelby, N.C., passed away as the result of a severe heart attack. The passing of this outstanding citizen of North Carolina constitutes a great loss to his family, his community, and the newspaper profession.

Dick Shelton was only 37 years of age at the time of his unfortunate death. It can be accurately said that he had just arrived at his most productive stage as a member of the profession of newswriting. His work had been recognized by the North Carolina Press Association through awards for outstanding editorial and news work that he had done.

Dick Shelton was my close personal friend and his passing constitutes a great personal loss to me.

Under unanimous consent I include an editorial from Shelby Daily Star of January 22, 1963, entitled, "Cleveland Has Lost Talented and Dedicated Adopted Son," and an editorial from the Gastonia Gazette of January 22, 1963, entitled "Dick Shelton, Editor, Shelby Star," in the Appendix of the RECORD.

[From the Gastonia (N.C.) Gazette, Jan. 22, 1963]

DICK SHELTON, EDITOR, SHELBY STAR

The death of Dick Shelton, editor of the Shelby Star, left this entire area shocked yesterday.

Mr. Shelton, a personal friend of us at the Gazette, was deeply loved by those who knew him. He had fine qualities of leadership and his ability to determine the truth and follow after it vigorously do not come often to a person.

Dick was only 37 years old, young by any standards. He had proved himself a capable newspaperman in the past. His future was bright. He brought to the profession an unusual understanding of problems all the way from the community level to the international scene.

He wrote with clarity and purpose. His editorials marched along with a commanding cadence; yet, they were interesting to the point that caused continued reading and later comment when friends would meet on the street.

Shelton was an amiable man who smiled easily. For his friends, he would do anything; for his enemies, he was tolerant.

The Shelby Star and the entire area it served will miss Dick Shelton sorely.

We extend our sincere regrets to his fine family.

[From the Shelby (N.C.) Daily Star, Jan. 22, 1963]

CLEVELAND HAS LOST TALENTED AND DEDICATED ADOPTED SON

No native-born son could have felt more responsible for the overall well-being and future progress of this city and county than Dick Shelton.

His span as an adopted son was brief.

But in the few years that he called Shelby and Cleveland County home, Dick Shelton delved to the very core of this community's being, stuided its past, planned for its future, made its needs his needs and its hopes and aspirations his hopes and aspirations.

He was dedicated to the end to giving as much of himself as possible toward helping guide the community, slowly, gently, and wisely along a course of justified growth and progress.

Dick Shelton was a every inch a newspaperman.

He lived and worked clutching the deep-seated belief that a good newspaperman and his newspaper justify their existence only by accurately and fairly reporting both good and bad in the news columns and dedicating the editorial columns to unselfish public service.

He made that his unqualified goal.

First as associate editor of this newspaper and finally as editor, Dick Shelton used his uncanny ability for penetrating thought, discerning decisionmaking and powerful writing to give editorial leadership to a score of justified and successful projects.

He nurtured a profound belief that his daily mission was to make his editorial columns, as nearly as humanly possible, the printed conscience of this community.

A community victory in some prodigious undertaking could spur him to hearty, satisfied laughter. A decisive defeat of what he considered a community necessity struck sharply at the very core of his being.

There were occasions when time and events proved him wrong in an editorial stand. He was the first to say, "I goofed." But when he erred, and it was seldom that he did, it was because of a sincere misjudgment. There was nothing petty or narrow about the man.

There was nothing pretentious about Dick Shelton. He never attempted to give the impression that he was anything other than a happy, hardworking newspaperman.

His friends and associates will long remember that he also was an alert, dedicated, conscientious, strongly opinionated and colorful husband, father, editor, and civic leader.

He was a Christian gentleman who loved his church and channeled much of his energy in its direction, serving as a member of the choir, a Sunday-school teacher and as a member of the board of deacons.

He confided to those closest to him on occasion that he never took a profound interest in the church until he moved to Shelby. It was here that he made himself useful and important to his church and made it a significant part of his basic existence.

Dick Shelton's sparkling brand of writing won him statewide acclaim in newspaper circles and his earnest desire to be a part of this community placed him at the forefront of activity at his church, in the Shelby Chamber of Commerce, the United Fund, civil de-

fense, industrial procurement and community betterment projects.

Dick Shelton was a many-faceted talent.

His death leaves a gaping hole in the community which will not soon be adequately filled.

## A Legacy From George Y. Loveridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN O. PASTORE
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on the 17th of January, suddenly, in the city of Providence, R.I., George Y. Loveridge passed on.

He was a writer, and a great part of his career, after Brown University days, with the Providence Journal-Bulletin, though a goodly part expressed in books and stories sought after by national publishers.

The requiem of a writer is in the legacy of the literature born in his mind, heart, and soul. Man loves to linger on the beauty of thoughts framed in lovely language, though that language may still have the humility of simplicity and the homeliness of a hand shake.

George Loveridge had the rare gift of thinking thoughts that would echo in the reader's consciousness as something the reader himself felt but never with the poetry of the prose that George Loveridge fashioned.

His themes of yesterday will be read and reread. And we are further promised themes he had readied, but not released when the pen fell from his hand.

"I Appointed Myself To Enjoy a Tree" is just such a treat. We sense the appraisal of his fellow writers in the introduction they prepared.

That each and all may have the personal experience of wandering and wondering with the splendid mind of a splendid man, I submit the theme in its entirety, "A Legacy From G.Y.L."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LEGACY FROM G.Y.L.—I APPOINTED MYSELF TO ENJOY A TREE

(George Y. Loveridge, one of the finest writers ever to have worked on these newspapers, died suddenly Thursday night. A number of pieces on people and things that caught his perceptive eye in Rhode Island were still unpublished at the time.)

(By G. Y. LOVERIDGE)

Many men and women know what a tree is, but few, I think, have the time to stop and enjoy one, so I appointed myself, the other morning, a deputy to enjoy a tree for busier people.

There are thousands of tax-supported trees in Roger Williams Park, and any citizen is eligible to go, as I did, and look at them.

The tree I looked at was a beech, like a great silver candelabrum. It was not the most handsome tree in the park, nor the mightiest, but it was evidently the tree that destiny had directed me to, and I was well satisfied with it.

Its span, estimated by pacing, was 60 feet. Moving around it with outstretched arms, I found its girth to be about 10 feet.

Then I drew away 150 feet and sighted at the tree with a fontain pen, like an artist measuring the tree's height before sketching. Making use of some not very abstruse triangulation, keeping in mind that the product of the means equals the product of the extremes, I calculated the height of the beech at about 60 feet.

From the short, thick, silvery trunk, at a height of about eight feet, there gushed a great number of smooth branches, dividing, dividing, dividing until they ended in thin, sharp, dark reddish needles.

Some of the branches had rubbed and wounded others, some bore eye-shaped blemishes, but most of the branches were clear and vigorous. Hardly a bedraggled score of leaves remained, shivering at intervals. A few dead twigs lay under the tree.

The roots plunged into the turf like powerful fingers, performing out of sight of man their prime, mysterious function. From an orifice in the trunk, a thin liquid flowed, staining the bark.

Many a jackknife had been at work in the years of the tree's maturity. Here R.G., D.C., N.Y., N.K., and others had cut initials that have perhaps outlived them—in rectangular plaques, in hearts, some without borders, not only to the height of the first branches but up among the lower branches themselves.

Bordering the turf was a curb of concrete, in which was embedded a small bronze shield. It was the trademark of the thirties, "1935 WPA 1938."

The beech itself was asleep, and there was little life among its branches. A lone starling, staggering back from a sociable night in town, set for a few moments on a limb. A gray squirrel darted onto the trunk, changed its mind, and undulated away over the grass. Scores of cars, taking a short cut to work, swished past.

The morning sun lay warmly on the east side of the tree, draping shadows across the western limbs, leaving that side of the trunk dark; the trunk, its shadow and the lawn formed a sundial from which a person with sufficient knowledge might have read the time of day.

Through bare, innumerable twigs and branches one could see such various things as a white cloud, blue sky, Brig Gen. Casimir Pulaski seated on a spirited horse and flourishing a bronze sword, and the Betsey Williams Cottage.

On the opposite side, wild ducks skidded down onto a pond, and geese honked and swam in truculent armada. The water winked and blinked as it flowed out of the shadow of a granite bridge into the sunlight. Now an athlete appared, a boy in white pants, sweatshirt, and glasses, trotting along the margin of the pond. Geese waddled on the grass, while pigeons got out of their way.

I wondered how old the tree was. A hundred years, perhaps. I saw it as a seed, a seedling, infallibly selecting what it needed from earth and air, building itself into a splendid structure.

Like the steadfast tin soldier, it had stood in snow, in rain, in sunlight, in moonlight, through hurricanes and thunderstorms, now magnificently dressed, now naked, fulfilling an inscrutable destiny. From nothing it came, and to nothing it would someday return, but its elements would rise up again, as grass, insects, birds, flowers, other trees.

I walked once more around my beech, saluted it, and left.

## The Future of Antisubmarine Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, through the past years the Congress has been genuinely concerned with respect to the antisubmarine warfare capability of our country. One of the most persuasive advocates for increased concentration in this field has been our distinguished colleague from Wisconsin [MELVIN R. LAIRD].

Those of us in San Diego have a unique opportunity to see and hear at first hand the work being done in antisubmarine warfare and also we are very much aware of some of the shortcomings that we have in this very vital segment of our defense.

A very penetrating article has been written by MELVIN LAIRD entitled "The Future of Antisubmarine Warfare." I respectfully submit that this is must reading for all of our colleagues.

Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. LAIRD's article that appeared in the December 1962 issue of Data, the magazine of research and development management, herewith in my remarks:

THE FUTURE OF ANTISUBMARINE WARFARE

(NOTE.—Biographical sketch of MELVIN R. LAIRD, Republican Congressman from Wisconsin: A veteran of 10 years in the U.S. House of Representatives, 40-year-old Congressman MELVIN R. LAIRD, of Wisconsin's Seventh District, is considered an outstanding young national leader by Republicans and Democrats alike. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, and as a Navy veteran, Congressman LAIRD is well qualified to air his viewpoint in this undersea warfare edition of Data.

(It was LAIRD's amendment 4 years ago that increased funding for the Polaris submarine program over and above the recommendations of the Department of Defense. Without LAIRD's Polaris amendment we would currently have only two Polaris submarines instead of the eight which are on station today. But not one to favor only one service, LAIRD introduced a similar amendment for more funding for the Air Force's Dyna-Soar program during the 1962 session of Congress in order to make possible the first orbital flight of this Air Force manned military space vehicle early in 1965.)

(By Hon. MELVIN R. LAIRD, of Wisconsin)

The Congress, for many years, has stressed the need for an improved and accelerated antisubmarine warfare (ASW) effort. Unfortunately, the general public is unaware of the immense potential, as well as actual, threat the Soviet submarine poses to the United States. Nor, I am afraid, is the public cognizant of the inadequacy of our response.

Outer space today is the center of public and official attention.

Inner space, though not neglected, has not been adequately funded or explored.

In fiscal year 1963 we will spend $5.5 billion for all of the various space agencies.

Our expenditures for ASW and oceanographic research, however, will be less than a half billion dollars. (See table 1.)

It is not my intent in this article to advocate abandonment of our space effort. Rather, I am suggesting that we take a closer look at inner space from a very pertinent perspective; the long-range security and defense of the United States.

We may reach the moon and control it, but in so doing we may lose control of the seas. And as B. D. Thomas, president of the Battelle Memorial Institute, so aptly phrased it, "* * * the power that control the oceans can control the power that governs the moon."

The reasoning that gave rise to Mr. Thomas' above-quoted remark is worth repeating if only to stimulate discussion in an otherwise little-pursued direction:

"It is a sad commentary on our national support of science that much of it derives from a superficial response to Russian prodding. The Russians launch a satellite, and we rocket into a headlong race into space. It is a fair question to ask: Can this be a ruse? I am not suggesting that our space program should be whittled down; I am merely asking that we consider for a moment the hypothesis that the next war will be won not in outer space but on the bottom of the sea. The Russians boast about their missiles and their 100 megaton bombs; they are very quiet about their submarines. They make a lot of noise about their men in space; they are very modest about an effort in oceanography several times as large as ours. What a brilliant military exploit it would be to send us off to the moon, while they seize the ocean. By some logic I have never been able to understand, it has been asserted that the power that controls the moon can conquer the earth. We might add * * * that the power that controls the oceans can control the power that governs' the moon."

How pertinent or prophetic this may be must be left to future historians, but we cannot afford to deny its seeming logic today.

Our Polaris submarine has already demonstarted its potential as the almost invulnerable weapon of the present.

Almost invulnerable because we can neutralize this weapon—but only by destroying the submarine that carries it.

Thus, the very compelling reason for a vigorous ASW program.

PROBLEMS IN ASW

The problems confronted are admittedly numerous, complex, and in many cases, almost defy solution. But then, so is space complex. The phenomenal advances we have made in the space environment in so short a time however, demonstrate that if there is a solution in ASW, given proper leadership, incentive and funds—the solution can be obtained.

First however, the urgency in developing adequate ASW techniques must be demonstrated.

The tendency today is to give the ICBM first place in the litany of deadly weapons. Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara told our committee in 1961 that "* * * only a year or so ago the principal general war threat to our security was a surprise attack by large numbers of nuclear-armed manned bombers. A year or two from now our principal concern will be a surprise attack by large number of nuclear-armed ICBM's."

I would agree with the Secretary that we face a dire threat from ICBM's but I would not call this the principal general war threat for the immediate years ahead.

The reason is that the nuclear submarine—the so-called absolute submersible—wedded as it is to a ballistic missile that can be launched from almost any position or any direction in the 70.8 percent of the world's surface that is ocean, is harder to detect, defies surveillance, and is highly mobile.

Further, it must be assumed that—

1. The Soviets have our hardened missile sites pinpointed and under constant surveillance.

2. The Soviets can track such a missile when launched, and either now or soon bring it down.

3. The Soviets have inaugurated a crash program in the U.S.S.R. to improve the quantity and quality of their Polaris-type nuclear submarines.

Ladislas Farago, in his recently published "The Tenth Fleet" (Ivan Obolensky, Inc., New York, 1962) tells us that "* * * the most significant new development in the Soviet Navy, that began in 1958, was a shift of emphasis from the quantitative buildup to a qualitive improvement."

Today, although we have the edge because of our Polaris submarines, it is quite conceivable that we will lose this edge.

In my new book, "A House Divided: America's Strategy Gap" (Regnery, Chicago, 1962), I pointed out that the cries of "missile gap" in the 1958–60 period were without foundation, but that a gap could develop if the Soviets got a breakthrough in their missile and missile defense development programs before we did.

This also holds true for any antisubmarine warfare gap. There is little likelihood that the Soviets will overtake us in offensive submarine warfare in the immediate future. But on the defensive side, the picture is not so reassuring.

In our committee report for 1961 we stated: "It is obvious that in this field, as in others, offensive capabilities have far outstripped the known defensive measures."

In that same report of our Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, we quoted what Adm. John T. Hayward, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Development), told us in his testimony that by 1970 "every submarine, not only special submarines such as the Polaris, will be able to carry a missile and thus pose a substantial threat to our homeland against which defense methods must be developed."

If this is true, and there is little reason to doubt it, the present Soviet fleet of some 497 submarines (see table 2) will pose an almost intolerable threat, if by then we have not developed adequate ASW measures. This is particularly noteworthy when one realizes that our submarine force, by the end of 1962, will number just over a hundred not counting the Polaris and Regulus.

As I pointed out earlier, a submarine-launched ballistic missile poses a more complex, and therefore greater threat to our defenses than the ICBM. Without knowing the precise location of the launch point, the mathematical computation of the trajectory becomes extremely hard to determine. In fact, it cannot be solved within the short time a submarine-launched missile will be in the air.

R.D.T. & E. TO COUNTER THE ASW THREAT

How then do we counter such a threat? Obviously, by increased efforts in ASW, especially in the area of research and development. We cannot rely solely on developing an effective antimissile missile in time to defend against the coming Soviet proficiency either in ICBM's or in submarine-launched Polaris type missiles.

The first major problem—one in which my committee has long been interested—is proper management of a coordinated ASW program. I was, and still am, convinced that the best solution would be to have a single manager similar to that provided for the Polaris system. According to the Navy, however, this could not practically be implemented. Instead the Navy came up with a compromise in the establishment of the Office of the Diretcor for ASW research and development programs within the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations. The highly qualified Rear Adm. William H. Groverman was assigned to this position to act as czar fo the R.D.T. & E. aspects. I am sure our committee will give Admiral Groverman its full support.

Procurement too is a major problem. Modern ASW equipment is costly to procure and difficult to operate. Even with expanding defense budgets, we cannot afford all of the funds required to equip fully all of the ASW forces needed to combat the submarine threat. But substantial increases should be in order.

In fiscal year 1962, the total ASW budget in R.D.T. & E. and procurement amounted to $236 million and $1,734 million respectively. In fiscal year 1963 they both increased to $293 million and $1,924 million.

By themselves, these are substantial amounts. And the fact that we have added funds in this area in recent years shows that we are not complacent; but at the same time, the total amounts allotted have not sufficiently demonstrated the urgent concern such a threat should give rise to.

Alongside the space effort, ASW figures pale in comparison. For fiscal years 1960 to 1963 inclusive, we will have spent approximately $12 billion for space research, development, and procurement as opposed to just under $1 billion for our ASW efforts.

Surely, if what was pointed out earlier about the submarine threat is true, we can afford to devote more than one-twelfth (8.3 percent) the amount given to space for an adequate defense against the great threat from the sea, especially when we allude to the fact that $4 billion of the $5.5 billion in our space budget is devoted to the nonmilitary aspects of space. This fact should give rise to a searching dialogue on priorities within the total defense picture.

To date, however, even operating under the handicaps imposed both by a lack of sufficient R.D.T. & E. funds and the diversified efforts in the Naval Establishment, now partially corrected, our advances in ASW have been impressive and gratifying.

PROMISING WEAPONRY

A year ago, Representative GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, of California, and myself took part in Operation Slamex, which was the first full-scale testing of our newest ASW equipment. We were extremely pleased with the development we witnessed, but the fact remains that this new equipment will do our ASW efforts little good if they are not introduced into the fleet at a fast enough rate.

One of the problems that costs time is testing new equipment. The instrumented test ranges being constructed, such as AUTEC, will do much to improve and expedite our evaluation techniques, and hopefully will speed up introduction into the fleet.

The primary purpose of ASW is to detect, classify, locate and destroy enemy submarines. Destruction is the easiest part. In the field of weapons development we are making excellent progress. New propulsion techniques combined with new sensors for acquiring and following a target enable us to destroy submarines at ranges compatible with the new increased sonar ranges we have developed. Our new weapons will include Asroc, Subroc, Dash, MK–46 torpedo, and a complete variety of ASW mines.

I have been highly interested in the MK 46 torpedo because of its versatility. It is a lightweight torpedo, still under development, that will provide both our ships and air ASW forces with a weapon payload designed to cope more effectively with the predicted threat of potential enemy submarines. Our committee added $7 million to the funds requested for the MK–46 to insure successful completion on schedule.

As to the Asroc and Subroc programs, I was fortunate enough to take part in the first firings and evaluations of these systems against nuclear submarines. The antisubmarine rocket system (Asroc) has already reached completion and is being installed

in our surface ASW ships. With this system, they can attack and destroy submerged enemy submarines many miles away as soon as they are detected and identified. Its payload can be either a nuclear depth charge or a lightweight homing torpedo.

One other weapon, especially current today, is the Drone antisubmarine helicopter (Dash). It will be introduced into the fleet this month. Dash can be launched within seconds from a specially constructed platform on the deck of a destroyer. It can then be swiftly and accurately guided to the immediate vicinity of the enemy submarine, drop a homing weapon and then return to the controlling ship. Though it has been likened to a guided missile, it has the unique feature of being recoverable with its weapon load intact. This simply means that the tactical commander has a degree of flexibility unavailable in any other system. He can react instantly without being committed to attack. With this capability of destroying an enemy submarine before it is within torpedo range of our ships, Dash provides the fleet with a revolutionary ASW weapon.

However, no matter how sophisticated our ASW weapons, no matter how accurate, they are without utility if our detection, classification and localization systems are deficient or inadequate. Even in this obstacle-ridden area, we have made significant progress. The sonars being developed, as I mentioned above, have a tenfold increase in range over those now in the fleet. Helicopter-towed sonars, as well as fixed and mobile installations are being developed which will tremendously improve our present capabilities. Unfortunately however, when we go for longer ranges, environment becomes a controlling factor. For example, an increase in power will give an increased range but only up to the point of cavitation. Beyond this there is no gain to be achieved by using increased power. Another crucial point in this regard is that oceanic conditions such as changes in salinity or temperature between the attack ship and the target will bend the sound ray by presently unknown amounts. We must therefore continue to improve our support of an increased oceanographic effort so we can learn just what effects the oceans will have on our future systems.

MORE TIME AND MONEY NEEDED

What can be done to improve our ASW capabilities? The two most important ingredients are time and money. Our Nation has the resources and our Navy has the technical competence to develop, evaluate and procure the systems necessary for an adequate ASW defense. To date, however, we have not been giving the ASW program proper support.

A long-range plan is an absolute must to develop and procure the weapons and associated equipments required for future ASW. Such a plan should delineate in great detail our present capabilities and our future fleet requirements. Once these are known a program should be developed which will meet the fleet's requirements and at the same time be capable of implementation within our available technical and manpower resources.

Too often in our planning do we let available funds determine the actual program. This results in a hodgepodge of unrelated projects that are designed to meet a certain budget. In my opinion, once a program is established, the only thing that will change it are new developments which modify the state of the art or new requirements to meet a different type threat. Funding limitations control only the rate at which the program is to be accomplished, or in other words, the schedule. If a job can be completed in 1 year with $1 million but R.D.T. & E. only get $500,000 for that year, then it will obviously take 2 years to complete the project. In such a case, the program is not changed, only the schedule.

But in the area of ASW, if a project that will add to our ASW capabilities can be accomplished in a certain period of time, fund limitations should not be allowed to interfere with the most accelerated schedule possible. For in this area we are not dealing with desirable items, but with necessities for our very survival.

In my book I advocated the establishment of a priorities review board for defense matters. A realistic priorities system that cuts across all of our defense efforts is the only meaningful way to get the necessary job of defense done. Many programs in the Defense Establishment get top priority rating. ASW, the Navy assures me, is one of these. And yet, in last year's hearings, Adm. George Anderson, Chief of Naval Operations, told our committee that "* * * we see no major breakthrough on the horizon for antisubmarine warfare, no panacea to solve our problem."

We were also told by Admiral Anderson earlier in last year's hearings that "the particular threat which we recognize as increasing—and I would not minimize in any degree the fact that this threat is increasing—comes from the Russian submarine." He then said that in his opinion this means that "we have a limited period of time in which we can greatly increase our own antisubmarine capabilities, particularly as they pertain to coping with this threat of the missile launching submarines."

Clearly then, accelerated, improved, and inspired efforts in the areas of ASW are needed now. The Navy has done an outstanding job as far as they have gone, but they have had neither sufficient funds nor the proper official and public support to give to their efforts the inspiration and urgency so vitally needed to produce the miracle of an adequate antisubmarine capability.

A reorientation of our thinking in this area is long overdue.

TABLE 1.—*Space appropriations contrasted with oceanographic appropriations*

SPACE APPROPRIATIONS

| | 1960 | 1961 | 1962 | 1963 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| NASA | $523,575,000 | $964,000,000 | $1,671,750,000 | $3,787,276,000 |
| Supplemental | | | 156,000,000 | |
| AEC | (1) | 63,200,000 | 120,100,000 | 192,900,000 |
| DOD | 560,900,000 | 793,800,000 | 1,147,200,000 | 1,517,700,000 |
| Total | | 11,698,401,000 | | |
| Total (1963) | | 5,497,876,000 | | |

[1] Not available.

TOTAL OCEANOGRAPHIC EFFORT

NAVY

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| R.D.T. & E. | $13,900,000 | $16,900,000 | $22,000,000 | $31,500,000 |
| SCN | 8,600,000 | 4,300,000 | 13,600,000 | 17,600,000 |
| O. & M. | 21,000,000 | 23,000,000 | 23,700,000 | 25,200,000 |
| Other Navy procurement | | | 100,000 | 2,500,000 |

OCEANOGRAPHIC EFFORT BY AGENCIES OTHER THAN NAVY

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| National oceanographic effort | $23,494,000 | $30,997,000 | $59,000,000 | $68,000,000 |
| Total | 66,994,000 | 75,197,000 | 118,400,000 | 144,800,000 |
| Navy ASW budget request | 174,692,000 | 180,459,000 | 235,810,000 | 286,000,000 |
| Congressional action | 45,000,000 | 50,000,000 | None | 7,000,000 |
| Total | 219,692,000 | 230,459,000 | 235,810,000 | 293,000,000 |
| Total 1963 | | 437,800,000 | | |

TABLE 2.—*Soviet submarines* [1]

| Class | Number of class | Propulsion | Displacement | Length | Radius | Complement | Submerged speed | Armament |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | (*Tons*) | (*Feet*) | (*Miles*) | | (*knots*) | |
| Atomic powered | 3 | Nuclear reactor | 3,000 | 328 | Unlimited | | 25 | |
| "Z" type | 50 | Diesel electric | 1,850 | 310 | 26,000 | 70 | 16 | 40 mines or 20 torpedoes. |
| "W" | 120 | do | 1,050 | 245 | 16,000 | 60 | 16 | Do. |
| Research | 1 | do | 1,050 | 245 | 16,000 | 60 | 16 | None. |
| "Q" | 50 | Diesel | 650 | 180 | 7,000 | 40 | 16 | 6 torpedo tubes. |
| "K" | 13 | do | 1,457 | 282 | 10,000 | 62 | 10 | 20 torpedoes. |
| Ex-German type XXI | 4 | do | 1,280 | 252 | 11,000 | 57 | 17 | 29 torpedoes. |
| Type VII | 4 | do | 595 | 220 | 6,500 | 45 | 7 | 19 torpedoes. |
| Type XXIII | 1 | do | 233 | 114 | 1,350 | 13 | 12 | 4 torpedoes. |
| SHCH | 69 | do | 620 | 190 | 4,000 | 40 | 8 | 10 torpedoes. |
| "S" | 32 | do | 780 | 256 | 9,800 | 50 | 8 | 6 tubes. |
| M-V | 63 | do | 350 | 167 | 4,000 | 24 | 5 | 2 tubes. |
| M-IV | 87 | do | 205 | 147 | 3,400 | 20 | 3 | Do. |

[1] The Russian submarine effort as delineated in "Jane's Fighting Ships, 1959-60," shows the Soviets to have the vessels shown above totaling 497 submarines of which over half are capable of extended operations at great distances from their home ports. Approximately 50 submarines are now under construction, all of which will be equipped with schnorkel and include the following classes: (1) Large long-range nuclear powered; (2) large high speed with guided missiles; (3) long-range patrol type (antishipping); (4) high-speed mine layers; (5) long-range, killer type subs (antisub HUK-type).

## House Agriculture Committee Republicans Urge Action on Common Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important problems facing American agriculture today is the threat to our export markets in Western Europe. It is in this regard that I joined with my 13 Republican colleagues of the House Committee on Agriculture in urging the chairman of our committee to take some immediate steps to promote U.S. farm exports and to offer our complete cooperation on the minority side of the aisle in a unified effort in behalf of the American farmer. I therefore under unanimous consent include at this point in the RECORD a copy of the letter which the minority members of the House Agriculture Committee sent to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], this week, as follows:

JANUARY 21, 1963.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,*
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We, the undersigned members of your committee, would like to take this opportunity to express our concern about current economic trends in the European Common Market and the discrimination against American agricultural exports and to offer our full cooperation in a unified committee effort to meet this serious challenge to our agricultural economy.

As you know, the full impact of the loss of substantial dollar markets for farm commodities in Western European markets goes far beyond the interest of the agricultural community alone and presents a serious threat to the Nation's balance-of-payments problem.

As the President pointed out in one of his recent budget messages to Congress, "During recent years this country has paid more abroad (for imports, investments, military expenditures, and other Government programs) than it has received from abroad (for exports, earnings on its investments, and repayments of loans)."

If American agricultural exports for dollars are materially diminished the result will be not only an aggravation of our balance-of-payments situation, but also a direct and immediate loss to American farmers who now raise 1 acre out of 7 for export markets.

It has of course been generally acknowledged by administration spokesmen and been extensively reported by the press that the restrictive and protectionist variable import fee tariff plan of the Common Market is already costing American poultry farmers a $50-million annual market in addition to shutting the door of opportunity for the development of new Western European poultry markets. Serious and immediate threats also exist for American wheat, feed grains, and certain fruits and vegetables, and there exist many ominous implications for the long-term growth of European markets for cotton, soybeans, tobacco, and a host of other U.S. farm commodities.

We therefore recommend that in order for American agriculture to hold and expand its markets in the Common Market (which in 1961 took 23 percent of the total U.S. exports to all destinations and accounted for 31 percent of all U.S. agricultural exports sold for dollars) that the Committee on Agriculture take these immediate steps:

First. Give this serious situation immediate and intensive study, starting with a thorough review of the developments which have led up to the present conditions.

Second. Keep a continuing account of these developments and trends, particularly in regard to the economic trade posture of Great Britain.

Third. Emphasize by committee resolution the urgent need for vigorous and effective agricultural representation not only on the President's Committee To Review Foreign Aid, but also and more importantly at the highest levels of tariff negotiations conducted by representatives of the United States and the European Economic Community.

Looking forward to your cooperation in this effort, we remain,

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES B. HOEVEN, PAUL B. DAGUE, PAGE BELCHER, CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE, CHARLES M. TEAGUE, ALBERT H. QUIE, DON L. SHORT, CATHERINE MAY, DELBERT L. LATTA, RALPH HARVEY, PAUL FINDLEY, BOB DOLE, RALPH F. BEERMANN, BEN REIFEL.

## The Return of the "Square"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, to preface the following remarks with concurrent comments of my own would be as futile as trying to gild the lily. It is enough to say that the message falls into that category of things I wish I had authored. It is from a speech by Charles H. Brower, president of the advertising firm of Batten, Barton, Durstine & Osborn, Inc., as it appeared in the January issue of VFW, the monthly magazine of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. Under unanimous consent, I insert the following speech in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE RETURN OF THE "SQUARE"

Back in Mark Twain's day, one of the finest words in our language was "square." You gave a man a square deal if you were honest. And you gave him a square meal when he was hungry. You stood foursquare for the right, as you saw it, and square against everything else. When you got out of debt, you were square with the world. And that was when you could look your fellow man square in the eye.

Then a lot of strange characters got hold of this honest, wholesome word, bent it all out of shape and gave it back to our children. Convicts gave it the first twist. To them a square was an inmate who would not conform to the convict code. From the prisons it was flashed across the country on the marihuana circuit of the bopsters and hipsters. Now everyone knows what a square is. He is the man who never learned to get away with wrongdoing. A Joe who volunteers when he doesn't have to. A guy who gets his kicks from trying to do something better than anyone else can. A boob who gets so lost in his work that he has to be reminded to go home. A fellow who laughs with his belly instead of his upper lip. A slob who still gets choked up when the band plays "America the Beautiful."

His tribe isn't thriving too well in the current climate. He doesn't fit too neatly into the current group of angle players, corner cutters, sharpshooters and goof-offs. He doesn't believe in opening all the packages before Christmas. He doesn't want to fly now and pay later. He's burdened down with old-fashioned ideas of honesty, loyalty, courage and thrift. And he may already be on his way to extinction.

He and all the rest of us are living in a country today that is quite different from the one that we were taught to love. Parents have successfully defended in court their children's right to ignore the flag salute. Faculties and student bodies have found it distasteful to publicly take an oath of loyalty to their country. And the U.S. Military Academy has found it necessary to place a sign beside its parade grounds at West Point reminding spectators that it is customary for men to remove their hats at the passing of the banner that was once unashamedly referred to as "Old Glory."

What has happened? I think we have changed from an exporting country to an importing country.

I do not mean that we have let the world drain all of our gold away, although that is bad enough. I do not mean any imbalance of trade, as threatening as that may be. I mean that we have been importing, instead of exporting, ideas.

The United States of America was once the greatest exporter of ideas the world had ever known. We created and sold abroad the idea of individual dignity, responsibility and freedom. We created and sold the idea of government of the people, by the people and for the people—an idea that is still being bought today. We exported the idea of freedom of worship * * * the idea of an unfettered press * * * the idea that those who are taxed should be represented. * * *

It is hard to find a basic idea that America has recently exported. We have bought in the bazaars of Asia Minor the idea that an honest man is either a fool or a liar. From our most mortal enemy we have bought the idea of a strong government for weak people. We have bought abroad the ideas of "Let George do it"—or "What's in it for me?"—and the gesture of the neatly shrugged shoulder.

But, most significant of all, most of us have been gullible patrons of the export firm of Sigmund Freud, who has sold us the idea that all men are born feeble, that we should abandon our ancient disciplines as too stark for the poor souls that we are, and seek our salvation through group support. Freud's discovery that man was not adjusted to his world, and could never be truly adjusted, seemingly justified the lazy cynic and condemned the square. For if you can't win, what is the use of trying? And here was the first great authority who said, You cannot win.

This country was discovered, put together, fought for, and saved by squares. It is easy to prove that Nathan Hale, Patrick Henry, Paul Revere, George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, and almost anyone else you care to include among our national heroes, were squares. This can be proven by simply thinking what they might have said had they not been squares.

Nathan Hale: Me spy on those British. Are you trying to be funny? Do you know what they do with the spies they catch? I'll give you a news flash, chum. They hang them.

Paul Revere: What do you mean—me ride through every Middlesex village and town? And in the middle of the night, yet. Why pick on me? Am I the only man in Boston with a horse?

Patrick Henry: Sure, I'm for liberty. First, last, and always. But we've got to be a little realistic. We're a pretty small outfit. If we start pushing the British around someone is going to get hurt.

George Washington: Gentlemen, I am honored. But I do wish you would try someone else. Let's say, General Gates. I'm just getting things organized at Mount Vernon.

Benjamin Franklin: Who we really need, for Ambassador to France, is a young man. I'm 70 years old. It's time a new generation took over.

It is perhaps a significant fact that what such men actually did say has been quietly sneaked out of our schoolbooks. This Week magazine made a survey recently of school history books issued before 1920, compared with those issued since. That Nathan Hale said, "I regret that I have but one life to lose for my country," was in 11 of the old texts, and only 1 of the new texts.

Patrick Henry was quoted: "Give me liberty or give me death," in 12 of 14 earlier texts, and in only 2 of 45 more recently published ones.

But John Paul Jones set the record. His once famous reply to a British demand for surrender: "I have not yet begun to fight."—is in nine of the old books, and in none of the new ones.

Maybe cutting down a cherry tree is a square thing to do, and maybe throwing a dollar across the Rappahannock River is a waste of money rather than a test of strength, and maybe nobody stands up in boats anymore (especially in midwinter), but there are lessons to be learned in all of these acts by George Washington and schoolbooks are for learning.

Maybe aggressive and nationalistic statements by our country's early heroes have gone the way of contact games and sports. They have been largely abandoned on our school grounds. Maybe the educators thought our children would be more interested in Peter Rabbit, who goes hippety-hop.

Or maybe it is just because our national heroes, and their ideas, are square.

When Dwight D. Eisenhower was President, he appointed a Committee on National Goals to decide where we were all going. Perhaps a first step should be a commission on national heritage, to make sure that some of us at least remember where we have been.

Arnold Toynbee, the famous historian, says, that of 21 notable civilizations, 19 perished, not from external conquest, but from the evaporation of belief within.

Today, our country still has a choice. I believe it has already begun to make that choice. I believe it is going back to its old beliefs in such things as ideals, pride, patriotism, loyalty, devotion, and even hard work.

We have a whole new set of heroes. Their names are Glenn and Grissom, Shepard, Carpenter, Cooper and Schirra. They are named Crews, Bock and Twinting; Smith, Sorlie and McIntosh; Knolle and Hoover. The towns they came from have nice, small town names, like Sparta, Boulder, East Derry, Mitchell, Shawnee and Brownwood.

These lads apparently lived too far from the big city and grew up to be squares. For who but a square would volunteer his life for his country's good?

They are not even ashamed of their feelings.

John Glenn says he gets a tingling feeling down inside when he sees the flag go by. Imagine that.

He is proud of his small town and proud of his small college. He is proud that he belonged to the Boy Scouts and the YMCA.

I hope that some of him rubs off on the next generation.

The forces of conformity are still strong. Too many of us are still sitting it out instead of sweating it out. Too many of us haven't got the guts to stand up straight and dare to be square. Because the opposite of square is round, and being round is so much simpler. Responsibilities and problems roll off nice and easy. And we can just roll down the path without any bumps, being careful to stay in the middle, because that's where the most comfortable ruts are.

How shall we fight for personal independence? How shall we avoid the group poop; the vortex of mediocrity; the great nothingness of cynical sophistication and bored nonparticipation?

I suggest that we all joint the S.O.S. The S.O.S. is the Society of Squares. It doesn't exist, but it could. Not a leftwing organization. Not a rightwing organization. Just an organization with wings.

We might have to go underground for awhile to avoid being trampled to death by the coast-to-coast, rat-packs of cynical saboteurs and the canned-wit commando whose devotion is to destruction.

But we would come out.

We might even have a secret handshake—grabbing the other guy's hand as though we really meant it, and looking him squarely in the eye.

We would be for participation and against sitting life out, for simplicity and against sophistication, for laughter and against sniggering, for America and against her enemies, for the direct and against the devious, for the honest way and against the easy shortcut, for a well-done job and against the goof-offs, for education and against the tearing down of ideals.

We have, at least, the satisfaction of knowing that our problem is not new.

When Benjamin Franklin was told that the war for independence was over, he said:

"Say, rather the war of the revolution is over—the war for independence has yet to be fought."

And today—179 years later—this war has still to be fought.

## The FBI Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am happy to submit an editorial which appeared in the January 3, 1963, News-Press, of St. Joseph, Mo., concerning the FBI's annual report. If the efficiency of J. Edgar Hoover and his Bureau would be emulated by other agencies of the Federal Government, our problems would greatly diminish.

The editorial follows:

THE FBI REPORT

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has presented his annual year-end report to Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy. The statistics show that in FBI operations last year marked increases were recorded in all major categories of FBI accomplishment.

There were more than 12,700 convictions in FBI cases compared with 12,418 the previous year. The apprehension of some 11,400 FBI fugitives topped last year's 10,668. Fines, savings and recoveries totaled well over $200 million compared with $148,421,690 in 1961. The sum far exceeds the amount of money spent to operate the FBI during 1962.

Director J. Edgar Hoover cited the steep increase in violations of the Federal bank robbery and incidental crimes statute. Last year saw a 25-percent increase over the number committed in 1961. One of the FBI's notable achievements in 1962 was the smashing of an international narcotics ring. The seizure of illicit drugs at that time brought in a cache of more than $20 million.

In presenting a résumé of the FBI's past year's work, Mr. Hoover expressed appreciation for the assistance accorded the FBI by other law enforcement agencies. And this is a compliment that well could be turned around. Law enforcement officers, including Police Chief Edward C. Burke's men here in St. Joseph, always have high praise for the wonderful cooperation given to them when the FBI is called in to help on a case.

We are truly proud of the FBI and its law enforcement activities. It is a credit to our Nation and credit for this goes to its Director, the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover.

## James Patrick McGrannery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the recent death of the Honorable James Patrick McGrannery has removed from the Washington scene one of the finest gentlemen that ever served his God and country.

Judge McGrannery was a personal friend with whom I had the great privilege of serving with in this distinguished body, the House of Representatives, as well as on our State Democratic Committee of Pennsylvania.

Judge McGrannery was a humble man, always interested in helping others, regardless of his or her social standing in a community.

Much of his time had been spent in the service of his church. Repeatedly he was recognized by the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church including two pontiffs, Pope John XXIII and Pope Pius XII.

After he served in the House of Representatives, from the 75th through to the 78th Congresses, Judge McGrannery became an Assistant Attorney General of the United States. He later served as a Federal district judge and still later as the Attorney General of the United States during President Truman's administration. For the past 8 years, until the time of his death, Judge McGrannery maintained a general practice of law here in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, here was a great man, James Patrick McGrannery, who served his fellow man and served him until his death. I join other Members in heartfelt condolences to his family and pray that God will comfort his wife and children in their loss as only He can do.

## George Maurer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, we embark on a new session of Congress without a familiar voice to intone our names on roll calls, or to read the contents of the bills brought to the floor.

Since adjournment of the preceding Congress, death has taken from our midst George Maurer, whom all of us regarded as a close friend aside from being a highly competent reading clerk in this great body.

George's sudden death indeed was a shock to all of his friends around the Capitol, but possibly the blow was a bit more severe to me as he had been a resident of my hometown and there naturally were close personal ties.

George came to Washington with his wife and two small children, leaving employment as a stenographer and bookkeeper in his hometown to become a Government employee.

He served for a time at the Library of Congress and later was assigned as a clerk in the office of the late Speaker Bankhead.

While working at the Capitol, George attended George Washington University and there received both his bachelor's degree and doctor of laws. It was a protracted and weary road George took to achieve the goal that was reached May 28, 1952, when he received his doctorate of laws degree.

While sandwiching in his law studies after working hours, George continued to move forward here in the House of Representatives.

To improve as a reading clerk, George attended special voice training classes. He was a perfectionist in every sense of the word.

His death prompted Geoffrey Gould, Associated Press reporter, to write:

The voice of the House of Representatives for nearly 20 years is gone.

The death of George Maurer, 56, senior reading clerk of the House, left a gap that may not be filled for a long time, at least not with such an authoritative and melodious voice as his.

Maurer died in Westfield, N.J., Friday night while making arrangements for his mother's funeral.

The voice of George Maurer was the voice remembered by the average visitor to Congress.

It was deep and penetrating. One old-timer who predated the present microphone system in the House said Maurer could be heard just about as clearly before electronics as after.

Maurer developed a flair and style that others complimented by copying. He could call the roll of the House—435 names—faster than anyone who had gone before him, completing the chore in less than 20 minutes, then swinging into a second call for those who didn't answer the first time.

As each Member voted, Maurer repeated either "aye" or "no" and his way of intoning "Noooo" became a byword in the House galleries. He could hold the note as long as necessary to let the tally clerks catch up.

A dialy ritual at the beginning of each session of the House is the reading of the Journal, a brief summary of the previous day's session.

As Members milled about and a hum of talk filled the Chamber, Maurer would read the Journal and then serve notice that things were about to get started by a little trick at the end.

The Journal always ends with the words, "And then, at such and such o'clock, the House adjourned." Maurer always leaned into the words "and then" with such emphasis and loving enunciation that it served as a signal.

Maurer was noted for the lightning speed with which he could plough through a 90-page bill, reading only a few words from each section, but so smoothly that a casual listener would think he was hearing every word.

Since he became a reading clerk in 1943, his associates never heard him stumble. "He was a perfectionist," said one. "He was like a machine that never made a mistake," said another.

But the reading clerk's job is more than mechanical proficiency at reading. He must have a deep knowledge of parliamentary procedure, and he must know the face of every Member instantly.

Maurer spent long hours before each new session of Congress poring over photographs of new Members, and often was the first House official to greet the new arrivals by name.

Another associate recalls that Maurer had an uncanny knack for identifying persons by their voices. As he bent over his rollcalls, he could place without fail a muffled shout from the back of the Chamber.

Maurer read state of the Union messages to joint sessions of Congress for three Presidents—Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman and Dwight D. Eisenhower. President Kennedy read his own first messages to Congress.

I extend to his lovely wife and his two fine daughters my deepest sympathy. Husband and father, George was an extraordinary man, a man of great brilliance, but more than anything else, a deeply religious person.

## Ozark National Rivers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. EDWARD V. LONG
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, on Monday, January 14, my colleague, the senior Senator from Missouri, and I joined in the introduction of S. 16 to establish the Ozark National Rivers. This proposal would bring under the control of the National Park Service 94,000 acres of rare natural beauty. The area would extend along 100 miles of the Current River and 39 miles of the Jack's Fork River.

For the sake of our children and our children's children, the Congress must act quickly to insure the preservation of the wooded beauty of this Missouri area with its springs and free-flowing streams.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that editorials recently published in the Columbia Tribune and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch relating to this bill be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Columbia (Mo.) Tribune, Jan. 14, 1963]

TO PRESERVE OZARK BEAUTY

It is to be hoped that Missouri's two U.S. Senators, STUART SYMINGTON and EDWARD LONG, and central Missouri's Congressman, RICHARD ICHORD, have struck upon a feasible plan in the legislation which they are scheduled to introduce in the Congress today for preserving the native beauty of a considerable Ozark area along the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers. If their compromise of the controversy over the project, which now leaves out parts of the Jack's Fork River in Howell County, the lower part of the Current River in Ripley County, and the Eleven Point River in Oregon County, but includes the Jack's Fork and Current in Carter, Shannon, Dent and Texas Counties, succeeds, they will have saved for posterity a sizeable area of Ozark beauty. The project would include 100 miles of the Current and 39 miles of the Jack's Fork and 94,000 acres bordering the two streams.

The legislators worked out the compromise, which includes a change in the proposed name to "Ozark National Rivers" and if approved it will be the first of several national scenic regions envisaged by the Park Service. The new plan provides for easements rather than purchases, which would make it possible for present owners in the area to keep their property while at the same time retaining the natural beauty of the Ozarks.

The project seems to be an important step in saving nature's beauty from the inroads of commericalization which could range from honky-tonks to high level dams and include ruthless destruction of its forest areas. Missouri, for all of its natural resources, has lost much of the beauty of its forests, fields and streams to so-called progress. What we have left should, so far as possible, be preserved. When it is gone it will be too late to do anything about it.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Jan. 14, 1963]

FOR THE OZARK NATIONAL RIVERS

A rose by any other name still would sweeten the air, but that is no reason for being indifferent to the suitability of a name. So Senators SYMINGTON and LONG and Representative ICHORD get an extra clap of the hands for substituting "Ozark National Rivers" for "Ozark Rivers National Monument." The latter does have overtones of the firm, the fixed, the rocklike—not quite right for flowing streams.

The heavy applause, however, is for the reintroduction of legislation to preserve Missouri's scenic treasure. There is a bow, too, for the good work which has enhanced its prospects in Congress. Representative CURTIS gets credit for deference to the amenities which call for sponsorship of the bill by Mr. ICHORD, who represents the river country. Support by Mr. CURTIS would be logical since he wrote the original bill to entrust the area to the National Park Service, though he later sought to transfer it to the Forest Service. The new bill also recognizes his advocacy of scenic easements by making this device available to the Park Service.

A united stand by the Missouri delegation also is more likely due to the elimination of the area in the district of Representative JONES, who says his constituents oppose the project—contrary as this may be to their longrun interests.

All this comes within the bounds of practical political compromise. It is deplorable, however, that the 34-mile reach of the Eleven Point in Oregon County is excluded. Of all the rivers, this stream and its bank most nearly retain their wilderness beauty, and the adjacent land is sparsely populated. There should be long second thoughts about the Eleven Point.

Also helpful will be the enthusiasm of Interior Secretary Udall, who has jurisdiction over the Park Service. And Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman has instructed the Forest Service, which is in his Department, to refrain from bureaucratic competition for the project. Productive as its multiple-use philosophy may be, it is not suited to these narrow strips of land. They call for management under the Park Service policy of preservation in the face of population pressure.

The Ozark rivers cannot be given back to the Indians. Nor can their increasing attraction for visitors be reversed. They cannot be contained in a barricaded refuge for the few. They must be guarded for the people, not against the people. Missouri Governors and legislators have recognized that this can be done by the Park Service. Surely Congress, persuaded by its Missouri Members, will issue the mandate.

## Private Power Comparison Backfires—TVA Is National Asset; Skybolt a Dud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROSS BASS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, a rather ridiculous comparison has been made in the Nashville Tennessean relating Tennessee Valley Authority and Skybolt. A thought-provoking propaganda game is once more being played; the pawns being used are public power and private power.

Again the offender has proven its inability to compete. In the immediate editorial I would like to call to your attention the ludicrous collation:

PRIVATE POWER COMPARISON BACKFIRES—TVA IS NATIONAL ASSET; SKYBOLT A DUD

The private power interests have renewed their age-old attacks on public power, using their unlimited cash resources to manufacture phony charges and circulate uninformed criticism. As usual, the propaganda peddlers have singled out the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Year after year TVA continues to serve its customers, neither feeling the need nor having the funds to engage in propaganda warfare with rich private power. But this time the antipublic power crusade has backfired demonstrating the low level to which its promoters are willing to stoop.

In current issues of national magazines a full page color advertisement appears showing missiles on the wing of a bomber. The accompanying text reads:

"When Skybolt rides a bomber your tax dollars buy defense, but when your tax money is used to build more Federal-Government-owned electrical plants and transmission lines it is spent needlessly."

This obviously was to have been the mighty opening gun in a winter offensive against public power. It also represents a little flag waving and a degree of false patriotism on the part of private power interests.

It is a wrench of logic to compare a resource development program with a missile project, but the tricksters employed by the wealthy power corporations didn't hesitate to invent a comparison, pitting the value of Skybolt against the value of TVA.

Therefore, let the real values speak for themselves. Skybolt was a flop. Obviously it did not represent a good investment of tax dollars. The administration wisely canceled Skybolt after many unsuccessful tests, concluding that any future outlays of funds would be spent needlessly.

The Government during two administrations already had poured $353 million into Skybolt.

It is ironic that since its beginning in 1933 TVA has returned to the Treasury of the Federal Government $348 million from power revenues and $42 million from nonpower revenues. This total of $390 million is enough to have paid for the now impractical Skybolt with $37 million left over for some worthwhile defense project.

This $390 million, incidentally, does not include payments of $190,500,000 TVA has paid in lieu of city, county, and State taxes during its lifetime.

Interesting too is the fact that the Skybolt development project calls for a thousand missiles for the Air Force and another 100 for Great Britain—at an estimated total cost of $2.5 billion.

Again ironic, since the effort to compare missiles and resource development has been made, is the fact that during the 30-year history of TVA, appropriated funds for all valley projects—dams for navigation, dams for flood control, power itself, experimentation, fertilizer production and the rest—amounted to $2.5 billion, or precisely the amount estimated necessary to make Skybolt operational.

Even these figures ignore many other facts about TVA: Resource development creates a climate favorable to industry. This means more jobs and more productivity for the area affected. It brings about general growth and added revenue to State and local governments as well as to the Federal Government. In addition, atomic energy plants and other Federal defense agencies use electricity from TVA at a special reduced rate, saving taxpayers millions of dollars each year—$50 million last year alone.

If the power interests want to make comparisons they should take note that the savings the Federal Government has realized from this reduced rate during the last 9 years have amounted to enough money to have built the U.S. portion of the St. Lawrence Seaway, or more than all the funds spent thus far on Skybolt.

The reason private power interests launched these bitter and frequently uninformed blasts at TVA is because TVA rates force them to hold their own electric power prices down. Millions of electricity users elsewhere in the country are paying lower electric rates because of TVA's "yardstick" policy.

Surveys show that residential electric rates grow progressively higher as the distance from TVA increases.

Yet private power blithely asserts "when Skybolt rides a bomber, your tax dollars buy defense, but * * *."

The truth is that Skybolt was a skyburst and the private power interests, not realizing it, fell into their own pit of quicksand.

From the beginning, the people of the Tennessee Valley have seen through the gross huckstering and stupid misstatements of fact of the rich utility corporations. Now perhaps others will recognize the brainwashing tactics for what they are—hogwash.

## Ukrainians and Their Struggle for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, January 22, 1963, marked the 45th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine. The history of the Ukrainian people in modern times is the story of a large group of gifted, gallant and industrious people ceaselessly struggling for their inalienable birthright, their freedom and independence. These hardworking and tenacious folk of the fertile steppe land in Eastern Europe tilled their bountiful farmlands for centuries, and enjoyed the fruits of their labor in full freedom when they were masters of their destiny.

After enduring the czarist autocracy for some 2½ centuries, they witnessed the birth of the independent Ukrainian National Republic early in 1918. January 22 of that year, the birthday of that Republic, was just as momentous in the history of the Ukrainian people as was the 21st of November of 1920, when the Red Army overran the country and ruthlessly put an end to the Ukrainian National Republic.

The last tragic event took place 42 years ago, and since then these devotees of freedom and liberty, these dauntless and daring fighters for their national independence, these tough and tenacious toilers of their fair and fertile homeland have not known freedom. They have been fated since then to suffer under Communist totalitarian tyranny. Misery and misfortune, oppression and endless suffering have been the lot of these helpless and innocent Ukrainians for centuries. Long before the rise of czarist Russia, they had suffered under Asiatic invaders, and their country was ravaged by these hordes, but when the wave of these invaders receded late in the Middle Ages, the Ukrainians had managed to recoup some of their losses, had succeeded in rebuilding their ravaged homeland, had real hope of enjoying some peace.

In 1918, after attaining their national goal, when they were about to embark upon the task of creating anew a free and independent life in their homeland, their hopes and their dreams were shattered by the aggressive and oppressive policy of the Soviet Union. Today these people, living in one of the most fertile parts in Eastern Europe, are denied their most cherished birthright, the freedom to live according to their wishes and to work for their own welfare in their historic homeland.

It is paradoxical and tragic that some 45 million Ukrainians, brave and courageous fighters as they are, have been forced to submit to the ruthless regime of ungodly Communists for so long in their homeland. But in this age of paradoxes, full as it is with human tragedy, the unhappy Ukrainians, unarmed,

helpless, and living in constant terror of the agents of the Kremlin, are unable to cope effectively with the massive might of the Soviet Union Government. That is a sad legacy of our age.

In observing the 45th anniversary of the independence of Ukrainians, this event will also serve as an excellent occasion to urge the formation of a desperately needed Special House Committee on Captive Nations in the 88th Congress. Such a committee—in stature and purpose appropriate to the scope and value of all the captive nations—would strongly symbolize to the world the determination of the American people never to forget the captive nations and their struggle for liberation and independence.

## Shameless Extraction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to believe that the Kennedy administration and its lackeys could remain silent and unconcerned about the coercive tactics that were used in the shameless extraction of funds from career Federal employees for the Democratic Party's political coffers.

As of this date it is clear that neither President Kennedy nor his brother, the Attorney General, who ostensibly is in charge of the Department of Justice, is interested in ascertaining whether this brazen fund-raising drive is in violation of the Hatch Act, the Corrupt Practices Act, and destructive of the civil service system.

The silence of almost all Federal employee organization leaders is also incredible.

The apparent attitude is that "the King can do no wrong."

In the Washington Evening Star of January 18, 1963, are two excellent articles on this subject. One is from the column, "The Federal Spotlight," written by Mr. Joseph Young, who daily covers the field concerning Federal employee activity in the Nation's Capital, and the other is an editorial entitled "Down the Hatch."

I submit both for printing in the RECORD:

EMPLOYEE GROUPS' SILENCE VIEWED AS STRANGE IN $100 TICKET PRESSURE

(By Joseph Young)

Perhaps the strangest aspect of the entire spectacle of unashamed Democratic pressure on Government career employees to attend tonight's $100-a-ticket gala is the complete silence of Government employee unions and the National Civil Service League on the matter.

Not a peep has been heard from any of the major unions or the nonpartisan league, which came into being 80 years ago to uphold the merit system, since this reporter and the Star on December 6 first disclosed the pressure on career employees to purchase the $100 tickets.

The employee leaders appear too intent on such unattainable pie-in-the-sky objectives as a 35-hour work week, etc., to bother with the unprecedented pressure on career employees by the Democratic National Committee and officials of the Kennedy administration. Only the recently formed National Society of Federal Engineers, Scientists, and Allied Professionals have criticized the goings-on.

The unions' excuse is that not many career employees in the upper-middle and top grades are members of their organizations, and hence they don't want to get into the fray. The long-range adverse implications on the merit system seem to escape them.

The silence of the National Civil Service League is even more puzzling. The main purpose of the nonpartisan business-supported league is ostensibly to protect and support the merit system.

The failure of Government employee unions to protest the situation may stem from the close relationship the groups have with the Kennedy administration, and their reluctance to do anything to endanger this alliance. Under President Kennedy, the unions have won formal bargaining rights, pay adjustments, support for a union dues checkoff, etc.

Another reason may be the unionists' indifference to groups of career employees who generally aren't found in their memberships.

This could be very shortsighted on the part of the unions.

The Kennedy administration won't last forever, and the next administration—if it is Republican—isn't likely to forget how the unions backed the Democrats by their silence.

This year's pressure was put on grade 12 and above career employees. Next year the pressure could be put on employees in grade 9 and above, and on even lower grade employees in the years ahead. The Kennedy administration is not bashful in telling employees it is responsible for their latest pay raise and the upcoming one next year, and probably doesn't have many qualms in "selling" $100 tickets to as many career employees as the traffic will bear.

As for the Civil Service Commission's silence until now on the situation, this is rather understandable. CSC officials privately are most unhappy over the situation. But there are only two men in Government who could have done something to stop it—President Kennedy and his brother, Attorney General Robert Kennedy, who could have ordered such practices stopped on threat of Justice Department prosecution under the Corrupt Practices Act. Under the circumstances, the CSC could do little but remain silent.

Meanwhile, the performers at tonight's gala—stellar stars though some of them may be—will have to be extra good to get any kind of ovation from the many Federal career employees who have reluctantly shelled out their $100 to attend. And without Frank Sinatra yet.

DOWN THE HATCH

An undetermined number of unhappy civil service workers having put up $100 for the greater glory of the Democratic Party, will toss down a drink or two tonight as guests of their bosses.

The Civil Service Commission, with no pun intended, says that it cannot treat this thinly disguised form of coercion as a violation of the Hatch Act unless it receives complaints from Government workers. We would rather doubt that any worker who has sense enough to find his way in and out of the building is going to be foolish enough to file such a formal complaint. So this throws the whole shabby business back into the realm of the Corrupt Practices Act, which is enforced by the Department of Justice, not by the CSC. Of course, one may always be mistaken in a judgment. But it is our guess that no Justice Department bloodhounds will be sent off on the trail of Democrats who have resorted to this device to raise funds for other Democrats. And if our estimates in this respect should be erroneous, we are willing to bet Robert Kennedy a $100 dinner that any bloodhounds unleashed in this cause will not be young and eager, but, rather, will be of that variety which is old, tired, and quite ready to call it a day.

All of this has prompted some Republicans to rise up in righteous wrath, a circumstance which, we think, should be put in some perspective. In former administrations, both Republican and Democratic, there has been a certain prodding of the Federal worker to kick into the party coffers. But nothing in the past has rivaled the brazenness or the scope of what the New Frontiersmen have been doing. As our "Federal Spotlight" reporter, Joe Young, puts it when speaking informally: "The civil service worker is damned if he doesn't, because his promotion prospects may be adversely affected. And, should the Republicans come in, he is damned if he does, because his new GOP bosses are not apt to look with understanding and tolerance on the fact that he tossed a hundred bucks into the Democratic war chest."

By tomorrow this affair will be over and done with. But the bad smell will linger on. People who make a career of working for the Government ought not to have their shins kicked or their arms twisted to force them to put their money on the line. Nor should they be subjected to the slightly more subtle pressure of not having a drink with the boss unless they pony up.

The Kennedy administration speaks in noble terms to the American people of virtue, dedication, high purpose, etc. If the President, by chance, doesn't know what has been going on recently, he ought to take time out for a closer look.

## Teachers' Salaries for 1962–63

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., was recently the author of "Survey of Teachers' Salaries, September 1, 1962." He wrote a summary for the American Teacher, which was published this month under the title "Teachers' Salaries for 1962–63." Because of the great national interest in salaries of teachers and programs for further improvement of same, under unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include Dr. Reuter's summary:

TEACHERS' SALARIES FOR 1962–63

(By Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., research director American Federation of Teachers)

INTRODUCTION

The study this year of teachers' salaries includes 853 districts and 4 territories, or a total of 857. Of the 853 districts of the United States, 233 are in the Northeastern States, 381 in the Central States, 106 in the Southern States and 133 in the Western States. The four territories included are Puerto Rico, Guam, the Canal Zone, and the Virgin Islands.

TABLE I.—*National averages*

| | 1961 | 1962 |
|---|---|---|
| Bachelor's | $4,328–$6,228 | $4,428–$6,468 |
| Master's | 4,567– 6,819 | 4,730– 7,083 |
| Master's plus year | 4,839– 7,256 | 5,135– 7,724 |
| Doctorate | 5,124– 7,887 | 5,366– 8,126 |

Salaries have increased on an average throughout the Nation during the past year. The average salary of all types of public school teachers, ranging from the bachelor's degree through the doctorate, is currently $6,133, with the average bachelor's salary of $5,448, which includes all teachers in the bachelor's area. Using the same measurement for the master's it is $5,907; for one year beyond the master's, $6,430; and the doctorate, $6,746.

Table I shows the complete breakdown for 1961 and 1962. Fairbanks, Alaska, has the highest beginning salary in the United States, which is $6,780, and the lowest is Anniston, Ala., with $3,100. For the master's degree Fairbanks, Alaska, leads again with a beginning salary of $7,340 and the lowest is Columbia, S.C., at $3,336.

MAJOR CITIES

Thirty-four major cities with a population ranging from 401,500 to 7,781,984 are considered separately. Also, Phoenix, Ariz., is divided into two parts, as they have separate elementary and secondary schools with varying salaries.

TABLE II.—*Major cities*

| | 1961 | 1962 |
|---|---|---|
| Bachelor's | $4,500–$7,176 | $4,753–$7,404 |
| Master's | 4,953– 7,659 | 4,997– 7,928 |
| Master's plus year | 5,186– 8,285 | 5,396– 8,456 |
| Doctorate | 5,274– 8,309 | 5,560– 8,888 |

Table II shows an increase in average salaries in all categories for 1962. This is true for each beginning salary as well as each ceiling. New Orleans, La., is the low city for the beginning bachelor's salary, which is $3,600 and Chicago, Ill., is the high city in this category with $5,350.

REGIONAL SUMMARIES

The Western States lead the Nation in regional averages. This section is composed of 13 States. The central region, which is composed of 12 States, is in second place, and the northeastern region, which is composed of 9 States, is in third place. This leaves the southern region, which is composed of 16 States and the District of Columbia in the lowest category. Table III shows the regional breakdown for beginning salaries.

The highest State average for a beginning teacher with a bachelor's degree is Alaska, which is $6,456. This is an improvement of $259 over 1961. The lowest average is Alabama with $3,344, which is $103 higher than last year.

TABLE III.—*Regional averages*

| | 1961 | 1962 |
|---|---|---|
| Northeastern States: | | |
| Bachelor's | $4,181 | $4,337 |
| Master's | 4,455 | 4,634 |
| Master's plus year | 4,733 | 5,027 |
| Doctorate | 5,015 | 5,385 |
| Central States: | | |
| Bachelor's | 4,399 | 4,592 |
| Master's | 4,734 | 4,913 |
| Master's plus year | 5,031 | 5,191 |
| Doctorate | 5,408 | 5,504 |
| Southern States: | | |
| Bachelor's | 3,848 | 3,986 |
| Master's | 4,168 | 4,298 |
| Master's plus year | 4,581 | 4,962 |
| Doctorate | 4,866 | 5,057 |
| Western States: | | |
| Bachelor's | 4,582 | 4,698 |
| Master's | 4,913 | 5,074 |
| Master's plus year | 5,009 | 5,365 |
| Doctorate | 5,205 | 5,518 |

TABLE IV.—*Average gains of States*

| | |
|---|---|
| Alabama | $103 |
| Alaska | 259 |
| Arizona | 139 |
| Arkansas | 8 |
| California | 73 |
| Colorado | 145 |
| Connecticut | 198 |
| Delaware | 200 |
| Florida | 134 |
| Georgia | 61 |
| Idaho | 31 |
| Illinois | 210 |
| Indiana | 108 |
| Iowa | 342 |
| Kansas | 108 |
| Kentucky | 272 |
| Louisiana | 100 |
| Maine | 105 |
| Maryland | 210 |
| Massachusetts | 143 |
| Michigan | 106 |
| Minnesota | 173 |
| Mississippi | 13 |
| Missouri | 561 |
| Montana | 205 |
| Nebraska | 258 |
| Nevada | 67 |
| New Hampshire | 67 |
| New Jersey | 157 |
| New Mexico | 227 |
| New York | 277 |
| North Carolina | 38 |
| North Dakota | 75 |
| Ohio | 165 |
| Oklahoma | 240 |
| Oregon | 166 |
| Pennsylvania | 125 |
| Rhode Island | 156 |
| South Carolina | 617 |
| South Dakota | 40 |
| Tennessee | 179 |
| Texas | 65 |
| Utah | 23 |
| Vermont | 175 |
| Virginia | 106 |
| Washington | 113 |
| West Virginia | 59 |
| Wisconsin | 162 |
| Wyoming | 57 |

Table IV shows the breakdown of the 50 States concerning improvement over 1961. The average increase is $156. The State with the highest increase over last year is South Carolina with $617, but the State average is still only $3,433. At the other extreme, Hawaii was the only State reporting no change, which keeps the average salary at $4,020.

OTHER FEATURES

The new edition of the "Survey of Teachers Salaries" includes a summary of a recent study by past American Federation of Teachers vice president, Charles E. Boyer. Mr. Boyer's complete study is entitled "Report of the School Fiscal Survey in Major Cities," and was done for the Minneapolis Federation of Teachers. This feature is cited so that various locals of the American Federation of Teachers can more nearly determine how the tax dollar is spent.

The second feature includes a breakdown of the major educational foundations by States for the year 1960, which includes the latest data available. It shows a total net worth of $9,810,467,852. This feature is cited as a possible source for securing additional finance for public education.

The third feature is entitled "Points for Discussion," and is a quotation from data prepared from the American Federation of Teachers workshop in Connecticut. This feature is cited so that the best possible presentation can be made of the salary issue.

Finally, the minimum wage laws for certified teachers, by States, are included again this year.

## Your Money and You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. BURT L. TALCOTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I recommend to my colleagues the reading of two editorials from the January 15, 1963, edition of the Salinas Californian discussing fiscal policy. Particular attention should be paid to the final outcome of deficit financing. So-called benefits to our citizens which are purchased with deficit dollars actually cost us more by reducing the present value of our money. Those hardest hit are our older citizens living on pensions and fixed retirement incomes who generally are not in a position to bargain for a larger income.

Placed in proper prospective, Government spending programs may not be quite so alluring.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the editorials, as follows:

AT LAST J.F.K. RECOGNIZES SPENDING

Although he still has a long ways to go, President Kennedy yesterday finally made a tax cut proposal which recognized, at least on the domestic side, that spending is related to revenue trimming.

Although increased spending for defense, space, and interest on the national debt will mean an increase in total Government spending next year, the President has called for a cut of all other Federal outlays. The latter fact, though not decreasing the total picture, unless Congress acts itself, is heartening in the battle to make fiscal responsibility out of overspending.

No interested person, except possibly a welfare-stater, can be displeased with the President's stated intention of budgeting less spending, for domestic programs for the next fiscal year. Such a plan long has been sought by groups interested in the fiscal condition of the U.S. domestic spending, not defense spending, contrary to popular belief, in recent years has been the inflationary factor via its leapfrog increases.

Defense spending, actually, hasn't risen at the same rate as domestic. In fiscal 1954, military and related national defense items cost $46.9 billion. Seven years later, in fiscal 1961, military and related defense items cost $47.3 billion, up only $500 million. For the period, all other items of Government rose $16.2 billion.

It is this 80 percent hike in nonnational defense costs in 8 years that most smart-thinking citizens have been shooting at. We are pleased the Government, and particularly the President, has recognized this economic fact of life. And, if through some Merlin-like power, we can lop off some defense and space costs, we don't even want to talk about the interest on the debt, through superior administration and voidance of duplication, we really will have begun to solve the plague of deficit financing and fiscal irresponsibility.

WHERE THE MONEY'S COMING FROM

The pattern is clear. From the power centers of Washington, D.C., and Sacramento, Calif., the word is that taxes are going to be lowered, not raised, and that Government expenditures are going to be raised, not lowered.

Both President and Governor are offering a variety of new spending programs. The

President proposes to finance his by cutting the income tax; the Governor says he will honor his "no new tax" campaign pledge and that something must be done to relieve the property taxpayer.

In this Alice in Wonderland atmosphere, there are a few voices of commonsense to be heard, to be sure. Democratic State Senator George Miller, for example, asks: "It's nice to make local property tax payers happy but where are we going to get the money?"

If the past is prolog to the future, the answer isn't too hard to discern. We'll get the money by cheapening the value of what we already have, by a new round of inflation by dipping in the pockets of pensioners, widows living on annuities, and old-fashioned frugal folks who try to save for their old age.

## Time for Sober Reflection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, irrespective of our economic status, whether we are a lowly wage earner or whether we are shareholders of a large corporation, I feel all of us should soberly reflect on the three messages which have been sent to Congress in the past 2 weeks.

First, the President's state of the Union address, then his budget message, and finally Monday of this week his message on the economy of this great country.

As a newcomer to this illustrious body I must admit I have become somewhat befuddled. Likewise, I am sure, the senior Members of this 88th Congress must share with me some deep concern as well as considerable confusion.

We were led to believe in the state of the Union message that while the seas are not completely calm, by and large, we are on a safe course, and we shall be guided safely into port.

In his budget, incidentally, the largest ever proposed in time of peace—reaching the astronomical figure of $98.8 billion—his excellency proclaimed a vigorous Federal job economy program. Then, upon careful perusal I find a request for 36,500 more Government jobs. This, added to the 200,000 increase in Federal workers since the New Frontiersmen came into power, gives considerable cause for alarm.

The question may well be asked, has not the President proposed any cuts in Government jobs? In all honesty I must answer this question in the affirmative. He is asking an overall reduction of 30 jobs out of the Army's present 345,284 civilian employees. Big deal—instead of 345,284 employees there would be 345,254. Then I find the Agency for International Development is going to eliminate 48 jobs from 16,588—down to 16,540.

I merely point out these examples to call attention to the inconsistency of this administration's fiscal policy.

Most certainly the proposal for tax cuts is a noble purpose and I am sure all of us would like to see substantial cuts in our income tax. It is, however, difficult to reconcile a $13 billion tax reduction and at the same time increase our deficit by $12 billion.

It is my honest feeling that this program should be approached with honesty and candor, and if we propose substantial tax cuts, then like reductions should be made in Government expenditures.

I am afraid that under the program proposed by the President what we make on the popcorn we shall lose on the peanuts.

## Federal Tax Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following three editorials dealing with the current Federal tax problems facing the country:

[From the Shelbyville (Ind.) News]

AS THE YEAR BEGINS

There's always much for which we can be thankful as this new year begins and, as the old saying goes, things are never so bad that they couldn't be worse. But still, we can't very well avoid reminding ourselves, unless we choose to live in some kind of fool's paradise, that, financially speaking, the situation with the Federal Government is about as close as it can get to national bankruptcy without actually tumbling over the brink.

We're about $8 billion short of a balanced budget in the present fiscal year and the national debt is at a peacetime record high. And it's proper to point out once more that the interest we're paying annually on that debt is around $9 billion—a sum that would have covered the entire cost of the Federal Government not too many years ago.

But still, and aside from the big cost of national defense, we're continuing to spend increasingly huge amounts of tax money for a whole passel of welfare state domestic items, a few of which may seem desirable but all of which we could do very well without. But does this bother official Washington? No, sir, not in the least. On the contrary, the welfare staters are preparing a brandnew packet of goodies for congressional consideration when that august body opens its new session in a few days.

But for immediate consideration in the realm of the public purse, come what may, you're going to take a sizable pay cut with your first paycheck of the new year—your social security tax is going up.

Beginning today, for an employee, the social security tax in 1963 goes up from 3½ to 3⅝ percent on the first $4,800 of salary or wages. That is matched by the employer. This means that the total increase is a full percent. Thus, the maximum tax in a year rises from $150 to $174 each for employee and employer. That's an increase of 16 percent.

There's a similar increase in the tax on the first $4,800 of earnings of a selfemployed person. The rate rises from 4.7 to 5.4 percent. Thus the maximum tax increases by nearly 15 percent—from $225.60 to $259.20.

The increase effective with the first paycheck in January, is the ninth since the social security program was adopted, and two more increases are scheduled even if the law is left as it is. The rate on employer and on employee is due to rise to 4⅛ in 1966 and to 4⅝ percent in 1968. The rate for a selfemployed person will go to 6.2 percent in 1966 and to 6.9 perecnt in 1968.

But just keep in mind that any increases in benefits, of course, would require rate increases beyond those now scheduled. And the proposal to provide hospital care for the aged under social security, which was defeated by Congress last summer but which will come up again this year, would hike the rate on employee and employer by one-fourth of 1 percent and the rate on the selfemployed by four-tenths of 1 percent—just at the beginning. And it also would have applied the entire tax on the first $5,200 of earnings instead of $4,800.

Now we don't want to make you feel bad on the first day of the year. But it's a mighty good thing to have your feet on the ground at the beginning of anything. You might even want to let your Congressman (RALPH HARVEY) and your two Senators (VANCE HARTKE and BIRCH BAYH, Jr.) know how you feel about things. Congressman HARVEY can be reached at the House Office Building and Senators HARTKE and BAYH at the Senate Office Building, both at Washington, D.C.

HERLONG-BAKER BILL FOR TAX REDUCTION GAINS WIDE APPROVAL—CAN THE CHAIRMAN OF HOUSE COMMITTEE BLOCK CONSIDERATION?

One way of cutting taxes sure to come before House Ways and Means Committee at the 1963 session of Congress is a proposal for a progressive reduction in rates over a 5-year period. The idea has long been pressed and has the approval of leading business groups. Its most attractive form probably is the so-called Herlong-Baker bill.

Representative A. SYDNEY HERLONG, of Florida, and Representative HOWARD H. BAKER, of Tennessee, both are members of the Ways and Means Committee; BAKER is the second ranking Republican. Their plan is to reduce personal income tax rates from the prevailing 20 to 91 percent range to a range of 15 to 47 percent. For the first bracket, up to $2,000 of taxable income, the rate would drop 1 percentage point, from the present 20 percent, each year for 5 successive years. Similarly, the rates in higher brackets would be reduced progressively, with the maximum rate going from 92 to 47 percent.

At the same time, the 52 percent corporate tax rate would be reduced by 1 percentage point a year, reaching the 47 percent level at the end of 5 years. In previous years the Herlong-Baker bill also would have permitted faster depreciation of business capital investments, eased capital gains taxation for individuals, and reduced gift and estate tax rates.

The First National City Bank 3 years ago described Herlong-Baker as "forward looking" and observed: "The essential goal, upon which everyone should be able to agree, is to lighten the burden of taxation on the creation of income and wealth, to bake a bigger pie for all to share." Last year the bank's survey repeated this recommendation, calling the scheme "the most imaginative plan to reform personal income tax rates."

Two years ago the authors of the bill estimated that the tax cuts would amount to $17 billion over the 5-year period. They insisted that national production resulting from accelerated investment in plant and equipment and higher productivity would offset the tax cuts with new revenue.

President Kennedy in his appearance before the Economic Club in New York on December 24, repeated his pledge of last August of a substantial tax cut in 1963. In reply to a question which quoted, in part, rates similar to those of Herlong-Baker, he said: "I would suggest that details of the tax reduction should wait on the presentation to the Ways and Means Committee."

There's the rub, for Herlong-Baker or any other reduction this year. Chairman WILBUR D. MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas, made clear his opposition in a recent copyrighted interview: "I've been unable to conclude that the situation at the moment justifies a rate reduction alone, with the resulting increase in deficit * * * and the public debt."

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 23, 1963]

CHALLENGE TO THE CITIZEN

We realize that many people are by now inured to heavy Government spending, but that is no excuse for anyone's shrugging off the new Federal budget. It is a challenge not only to Congress but to everyone who believes citizenship entails responsibilities.

That is so not only because of the towering spending of just under $100 billion and the promised deficit of nearly $12 billion. Such monstrosities a rich nation can perhaps tolerate for a time.

A budget is more than figures; as President Kennedy says, it is a plan for the conduct of the public business. And what the Nation may not be able to tolerate indefinitely is the philosophy behind the planning.

It is, to begin with, a philosophy of deliberate, planned deficits, not just for fiscal 1962, 1963, and 1964 but seemingly for always. The Secretary of the Treasury, presumably the guardian of the people's money, does not even think in terms of a balanced budget much before fiscal 1967, and that faint hope rests on nothing more than anticipation of some kind of super-boom in business.

In fact, the deficits could grow much worse with the greatest of ease. If the President were to get his tax cuts exactly as he wants them to apply in the 1964 period, and if business does not improve as he hopes, the planned deficit would almost automatically go to $15 billion or more. If a recession occurred, it would be likely to go to $20 billion or more.

In such circumstances there is every reason to believe that the Government prescription would be still bigger deficits. For nothing this Government has ever done suggests that it is aware of any answer to economic problems, whether of inflation or of economic growth, other than more spending and larger deficits.

As befits a philosophy of deficit, this is also a philosophy of waste. The Government, for a glaring example, promises to add billions to the military and space budgets. The Director of the Budget proclaims, as though it were a virtue, that these agencies got every nickel they asked for.

Such an attitude is a blank check for waste and hence weakness in areas vital to the national security. There is already appalling waste in these areas; in the considered opinion of experts who have studied the Pentagon, the only way to cut the waste, get the place under control and strengthen it is to slap a flat ceiling on defense spending and tell the military to start giving the taxpayer real value for his dollar.

But that is not the way of this Government, for its philosophy is also one of nonpriority, of everything for everybody all at once. Defense and space are privileged preserves, but so, it turns out, is the whole sprawling, messy, wasteful political-welfare-spending program. A Mack truck can be driven through the contention that these projects are being held back; the budget itself belies the claim.

Plainly it is directly up to Congress to begin getting the Government down to earth, and this budget is such a thoughtless hodgepodge that Congress may conceivably put its spending foot down. The chances of that happening will be immeasurably increased if the citizen at last finds his too-long-silent voice.

## Kings Point: The Story of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted, under unanimous consent, to insert in the RECORD "The Story of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy," located at Kings Point, Nassau County, Long Island, N.Y.

This article, together with the accompanying pictures of the Academy and its campus, was published in the October issue of the magazine called the Compass, published by the Mobil Oil Co.

Those of us from Long Island are very proud of Kings Point, and the young men it has turned out for the U.S. merchant marine. The record is a splendid one, and I am sure all Members of Congress can feel proud that they have had a part in securing permanency for this great institution.

The article follows:

KINGS POINT: THE STORY OF THE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

On the southern shore of Long Island Sound, not very far from the narrow neck that separates it from New York's East River, is Kings Point, locale of one of the United States famous service academies, the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy. Actually there are five Federal Academies—the others being West Point, Annapolis, the Air Force and Coast Guard Academies—all run by their respective services. Kings Point, on the other hand, is maintained by the U.S. Department of Commerce, under the direction of the Maritime Administration. The setting is superb—a 65-acre campus that slopes gently from a knoll to the waterfront where docks and blue water provide atmosphere and egress to the sea lanes of the world.

Kings Point, as the Academy is more familiarly known, can well trace its origin to a survey conducted in 1931 by the then National Conference on the Merchant Marine. The Conference polled America's maritime industry on the subject of officer training; the responses from more than 6,000 interested people indicated a definite need for such training and that a national system should be created to handle it. But those were depression times. Ships were laid up and many licensed people were on the beach scrambling for the bare necessities to survive.

For 5 years, the concept lay dormant. Then after final passage of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, the Federal Government provided the necessary funds that established the U.S. Merchant Marine Cadet Corps, March 15, 1938. The first young men who applied were sent to sea for their training. Then, a little later, temporary establishments were set up ashore. But war clouds were gathering and the need for an expanded Academy, fully equipped to handle the job of furnishing trained officers for American flag merchant vessels, became an absolute necessity.

Shortly after war broke out, the U.S. Government acquired the magnificent Walter P. Chrysler estate plus a few other choice properties on Kings Point and started building the Academy's physical plant. Construction was completed during the fall of 1943. The simultaneous creation of the entire physical structure, even though wartime built, provided a simple uniformity of design that is maintained to this day. The only architectural variation is the old Chrysler mansion. It became the administration center. Since then, another building has been added at the Academy. It is The U.S. Merchant Marine Memorial Chapel, dedicated May 1 as a national memorial to the more than 6,000 officers and men of the U.S. Merchant Marine who gave their lives at sea in wartime.

It is an interfaith chapel with a revolving altar. Of early American design, it can accommodate 500 people. President John F. Kennedy, in his dedication day message said, in part, "it is fitting that the interfaith chapel, in memory of the American seamen of all faiths who gave their lives at sea, be established at Kings Point."

Candidates applying for admission to the Academy must obtain a cong ressional nomination and then take rather searching entrance examinations designed to test both their aptitude and physical fitness. Once admitted, they are subjected to strenuous academic training, rigid military discipline and a rugged physical conditioning program. The average "on board" enrollment at the Academy is about 750 not counting some 250 cadet-midshipmen who are at sea aboard U.S. flag merchantmen, working out what is called the "sea year."

The Academy offers a 4-year technical training program in nautical science or marine engineering. Cadets make the decisions as to whether they will become either deck or engineering officers and then follow the prescribed courses in the field chosen. While professional education makes up a significant part of the curriculum, cadets also receive a good general background in the humanities, social, and physical sciences plus special courses pertaining to operations within the shipping industry.

After finishing their plebe or first year at the Academy, cadets go to sea for their "sea year." They are assigned to merchant ships for practical experience and are fitted into each vessel's bill to develop the technical skills that will be required of them as officers. In essence, the ship serves as a seagoing laboratory where the cadets learn what comprises the day's work and routine of a ship. In addition the student-officers are given a laboratory manual known as the "Sea Project," to guide them in their investigations concerning the ship's structure, equipment, and practices. The manual, after completion, check, and grading becomes a vital part of each student's future reference material—material that he will use continually during his professional career. As a sidelight of this year at sea, it is not uncommon for some cadets to log 40,000 nautical miles and serve aboard three or four different vessels. And they receive pay, $111 per month, from the shipowners for this sea duty.

During the final year, cadets spend some time in making field trips to various offices and industries where they see first hand many of the things they learn in their classroom work. Your editor had the pleasure of addressing a small group of them last year, a group that was spending some time with Socony Mobil Oil Co.'s marine transportation department to see how our company operates its tanker fleet.

The balance of the 4-year course, which runs for 11 months each year, is spent "on board" following a full professional and academic curriculum. In addition, there is a program of extracurricular activities plus intercollegiate and intramural sports.

Upon graduation, cadets receive a bachelor of science degree, sit for the U.S. Coast Guard licensing examinations, and are commissioned ensigns in the U.S. Naval Reserve.

The Academy's physical plant is first class. A great deal of attention has been paid to

setting up and equipping a wide variety of laboratories and shops where cadets spend much of their time. Besides the usual chemical and physical laboratories there are laboratories and shops covering all phases of marine engineering and the nautical sciences plus a waterfront training area for practical seamanship. Of particular interest is a laboratory placed in operation just last year. In it is a small atomic reactor that is used to instruct future officers, some of whom may well serve aboard an atomic powered ship. And all the buildings are named after men whose deeds brought fame to the U.S. merchant marine or to the Academy.

The U.S. Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point is performing a very special mission and doing it superbly. The highly trained and extremely capable men it graduates every year are to be found in virtually every facet of the maritime industry, serving in what rightfully has become known as America's "fourth arm of defense." What is more, they are in an industry that has many exceptional career opportunities which they are well equipped to vigorously pursue. Indeed, any young man who is lucky enough to attend this excellent institution can consider himself extremely fortunate; for Kings Point is one of America's great schools whose graduates are much in demand by the entire U.S. maritime industry.

## An Editor Views the Alliance for Progress in History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, we are fortunate in Arizona to have available to us every day the observations of one of the Nation's best informed authorities on world affairs, Mr. William R. Mathews, editor and publisher of the Arizona Daily Star in Tucson. Recently Mr. Mathews addressed the Agricultural Men's Club of the University of Arizona on the importance of the Alliance for Progress in advancing the security and welfare of the United States. I found his speech so stimulating that, under unanimous consent, include it in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues who may have doubts about continuing a program which admittedly has only modest accomplishments to its credit at this moment in history. The text of the speech follows:

When President James Monroe proclaimed the Monroe Doctrine in 1823, he made Latin America a matter of primary interest to the United States. A matter involving national security. The record through the next 113 years, to 1936, reflects this. Never was this doctrine comprised. To the contrary, it was enforced. While our Government had to accept the French invasion of Mexico in the 1860's, as soon as the Civil War was over, we used our influence to bring an end to that French expansion of imperial power.

Under President Grant we toyed with the idea of annexing what was then Santa Domingo, but which is now known as the Dominican Republic. In 1896, President Grover Cleveland spoke out emphatically declaring that our word was flat on international matters affecting the Western Hemisphere. Two years later we went to war to break Spain's power in Cuba, and also in the Pacific.

We acquired the Guantanamo Naval Base from Cuba. We made Puerto Rico a kind of principality which might become our 51st State. We bought the Virgin Islands in 1915 to keep them from falling into the hands of imperial Germany.

We built the Panama Canal primarily as a naval effort. We intervened in numerous Central American Republics, including Cuba, Santa Domingo and Haiti.

The Panama Canal is an artery of life, whose security should never be compromized. It should never be internationalized. Never should we tolerate any interference in its operation, in an effort to please some hungary politicos of Panama. Our record in making certain concessions in recent years has not made us any better liked. Respect for us has been reduced, rather than enhanced. The time has come to stop such trifling with its security and without any apologies to anyone, let the world know that it belongs to us, and that we are going to keep it and protect it.

In 1936 President Franklin Roosevelt sent Secretary Hull to Buenos Aires to negotiate what became known as the Treaty of Buenos Aires. It forbade intervention in any form, either direct or indirect, unless it was done after receiving full consent of the various signatories.

This Treaty was an unfortunate one. It It compromised a matter of primary interest which has through time become clearly recognized as the Caribbean area, as distinguished from Latin-America. Today in Cuba we are paying the penalty for the compromise this Treaty imposed on both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations. Not until the danger assumed the proportion of threatening our destruction, did our political leaders feel free to mobilize our military power and challenge Moscow with a timed ultimatum.

For the future it seems to me that we Americans should distinguish between the Caribbean Sea area, and South American south of the equator. The former is vital to our security, while the latter has relatively little strategic importance. We must never compromise our control of the Caribbean and the Panama Canal.

This brief outline of the impact of the past on what we face today is necessary as a background to answer that question, "Where does America go from here in her relations with Latin-America?" Our first task is to take care of our security.

Events of the past few years have spectacularly emphasized that we Americans, as a part of our destiny, have a job to do in the whole of the Western Hemisphere. The Alliance for Progress is our first organized effort. The job is a difficult and delicate one. It must at all times acknowledge scrupulously the independent sovereignty of all of these nations, large and small. At the same time it requires a huge aggregation of capital, and the best brains and administrative ability to make the mountains, jungles, deserts and plains yield the hidden resources of this vast area.

Any discussion or planning on what we should do, or can do, must be based on the stern realization that it is the job of a lifetime. It will probably last as long as we are a great power. We might as well realize that there is no miraculous quick solution that mere money can buy, although billions of dollars will be needed. Latin America is not a vending machine where one can drop in some coins, press a button or pull a lever, and get what we want to buy.

Two basic challenging facts confront us. We must deal with people who have a different culture, heritage, ambitions, and outlook than our own. Secondly, we begin this job at a tough period in history when throughout the world a great historic change is taking place, and particularly in Latin America. What has been a civilization, based largely on an agricultural economy with aristocratic governments of a relatively few people doing the governing, is now going through a transition into an industrial civilization, governed by a rising middle class.

There is a wide variation of this transition in the many governments of Latin America. Such a situation means that governments in Latin America are going to go through many phases of instability as they strive to meet this change. Their cultures reflect wide differences in literacy, competency, ambitions, aptitudes, and skills. No one rule can be laid down that can be applied uniformly to all of them.

Bolivia, for example, is a relatively primitive nation composed largely of Indians with only a small intelligentsia of Spanish origin. We Americans with our know-how could make Bolivia bloom because we have the know-how and the capital to make the jungles and the mountains of that country yield their hidden wealth. The first thing we would do would be to start educating the Bolivians by training and educating them, while we went ahead with development projects by the efforts of individuals, rather than government. As it is we have been in Bolivia for 10 years, but so far we have little to show for what we have done.

Uruguay on the other hand is a highly developed social welfare state that needs no help whatever. Its people have probably the highest standard of living in all of Latin America, and the most stable government. But the Uruguayans are a nation of homogeneous people of Latin heritage. They have no Indians. As a nation of well educated people they can take care of themselves just as easily as Switzerland does.

Peru has nearly 5 million Indians living in the High Andes. That is nearly one-half of Peru's population. Who are we to tell the Peruvians how to treat their Indians? The American Indians are not integrated in the life of our Nation despite all of the money we have spent on them.

We must not be too gullible in swallowing that old, old issue of "agrarian reform." Certainly large, unproductive estates, whether they are owned by the Catholic church or private individuals, should be broken up. On the other hand, should large areas of productive land be broken up into small plots, experience eleswhere in the world shows that productivity will decline sharply. As we Americans have proven, the greatest productivity comes from large scale production. Since the vast eastern areas of Columbia and Bolivia, which are nearly uninhabited, do offer an opportunity for development, the lack of initiative, lack of willingness to adventure and pioneer, creates the ironic situation of poverty amidst a potential abuandance. If agrarian reform is to better the peasantry and the country as a whole, it must be carried out by agricultural experts and not by political experts, or do-gooder reformers.

These wide desparities in a basic culture we will be compelled to recognize. We must remember to be cautious about assuming that perfectly constructed and other legal institutions and reforms, that work well with us, will not necessarily bring peace, stability, democracy and prosperity to these many nations.

The fact that most of their constitutions have been modeled after our own, but have failed to work continuously should caution us that we cannot impose American ideas of government on them. We must expect ups and downs with periods of democratic gov-

ernment followed by periods of dictatorial government.

Since the education of most of the intellectuals has been European, the doctrine of socialism has wide acceptance as a guiding gospel to follow. Too many of the intellectuals think in terms of national socialism as a means of national independence. Freedom means national freedom as distinguished from the individual freedom we cherish. We will have a difficult job inspiring the free enterprise that we take for granted at home.

Latin culture has a different standard of morals than our own. It teaches respect for authority and by implication teaches that the will of a majority is so righteous that it can scorn the rights of minorities. Most of the people do not know how to make a parliamentary government work. They respect strength and have only contempt for weakness. Too often they take generosity and extreme patience as a sign of weakness.

Because socialism has the reputation of promising the ideal society of abundance for all with peace and prosperity, it naturally makes a moving appeal to politicians in search of a campaign issue, and masses of people looking for an easy answer to their ills. Therein lies the appeal of communism with its promise to build Socialist societies, but instead of doing it peacefully, do it by creating the dictatorship of the proletariat. Its glorification of the use of dictatorial power makes an attractive appeal to Latin American politicos.

We must foster public education as a basic necessity in developing workers who can take their necessary place in the development of modern industrial societies. The same muscle and energy that have gone into the building of churches should now be called upon to build schoolhouses.

The increase in wealth production must be our main goal. Only by that means can the lot of the masses be improved. That will require not only enormous aggregation of capital from abroad, and the best technicians and administrative talent, it will require much harder work on the part of the people themselves. It cannot be achieved with a 6-hour day, and 5-day week that prevails today in too many places in Latin America.

We can no longer tolerate expropriation of wealth creating American investments. Such action nullifies the fact that unless foreign capital is attracted, the Alliance for Progress program will languish. All help should be withdrawn immediately from any nation that carries out expropriations. It is just as necessary to help create a climate that will attract foreign capital as it is to furnish help by our Alliance for Progress program. The latter cannot do the job alone.

We must see that all funds granted by our Government or its agencies be wisely spent. It is not enough to make grants and assume that each government will spend such money wisely.

The population explosion that has been going on throughout the world is taking place in Latin America with more increase than perhaps any other locality in the world. That means increased number of mouths will have to be fed. Increasing importance requires the means to earn a livelihood, which must come from increased industrial production. Certainly, there are needs that will require the toil of every adult worker available.

Where is the capital and technical and administrative ability coming from to make this possible? Without an enormous increase in productivity 30 years from now people will be less better off. We will have to run in order to stand still, as Alice would say.

Consequently, if the Alliance for Progress is to be successful we must approach this job with a fair but firm attitude and our eyes open. We must expect, and have, full cooperation of those whom we plan to help. We must take steps to see that the dollars we provide are not used to finance the flight of monetary wealth of wealthy people of these countries. There is good authority for the statement that some $10 billion have been sent by the wealthy people of Latin America to Switzerland.

The most encouraging thing I can say about the Alliance for Progress is that so little appears to have been done during its first year. That is a welcome sign that we are making progress. It will take time, several years, for wealth-creating projects to take form, and still more years to make their productivity available to the masses.

All of what we might try to do, in both the economic and social welfare fields can be defeated, unless the political and intellectual leaders of Latin America zealously assume a financial responsibility that can bring the widely present inflation under control. Only where this is done should funds be advanced to finance economic development. Unless we are willing to act with such realism, we will be wasting our taxpayers' money.

Spending a few billion dollars as a kind of dole to individuals would be spectacular while it lasted, but it would obviously be unwise and harmful. Our job is a tough one but it is a wonderful challenge to our own heritage. Out of it we can hope will emerge the American substitute for what in the past has been known as imperialism. We will not be plundering. We will not be colonizing. We will be trying to prove that by helping others we will help ourselves.

## Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, before World War I, tens of millions of people in Europe found their homelands under foreign control, among them the Ukrainians who for some 250 years suffered under the autocratic regime of czarist Russia. Then in the course of the Russian Revolution in 1917 the czarist regime was overthrown and the chains holding its subject peoples in check shattered. The Ukrainians broke free, proclaimed their national independence on January 22, 1918, and founded the Ukrainian Republic. But oppressed and helpless Ukrainians were ill-prepared and unable to fend off all their powerful foes to safeguard their new state. In 1920 the republic was destroyed by the Red army and the Ukrainians robbed of their freedom.

Sinec the destruction by the Red army of that short-lived Republic 45 years ago, the people of the Ukraine have suffered even more than their ancestors had under the cruel agents of the czars. They have been dispossessed of their worldly goods and reduced once again to the status of serfs. They have been denied all forms of freedom, and have been sealed off from the free world. And they are being driven to work for the benefit of their alien overlords.

In the midst of all this misery and misfortune, however, the Ukrainians have kept faith with their tradition. They still fervently cling to their ideals and cherish freedom in their homeland. In the sad history of the Ukrainian people during the last several decades this is the one encouraging fact. On the 45th anniversary of their independence day we in the free world wish them fortitude and power in their struggle for their righteous cause, for their freedom and independence.

## The Congo Civil War and Our Connally Reservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, one of the most controversial issues for the past few years in this country has been our support and encouragement of the armed intervention by U.N. forces into the Congo civil war.

Aside from the Cuban affair or, as some term it, "debacle," the Congo-United Nations issue has been the most divisive issue in that our American citizens have more or less ranged themselves into opposing camps when the subject has come up.

Many feel the United Nations was justified in its action, that is, becoming an armed and active force rather than merely a guiding force through debate and vote in the U.N. On the other hand, many of our American citizens feel the United States not only should not have joined in support of the action because it was interfering in the internal affairs of the Congo after it had won its independence from Belgium—but that most of all, we should not have allowed ourselves to be placed in the position of almost singlehandedly financing this armed intervention.

One of our North Dakota editorials, written by Haakon Stockman in the Williston Plains Reporter of January 16, 1963, makes some rather pungent statements in the article entitled "This and That." Some of the points Mr. Stockman made are well taken. Would we deny the privilege of self-determination to the Congo Government, when we enjoyed this privilege in our own country? Would we have been allowed to break away from our mother country, England, had the United Nations been in existence at that time? What would have been the end result of our own Civil War had the United Nations been in existence at that time?

Many have expressed the belief that if we were not careful we might one day

find ourselves in the position of having the United Nations vote on some of our internal domestic affairs, and the prospect of this taking place in a United Nations dominated to a large extent by the Soviet bloc is not very cheerful.

As far as I can determine, the only thing that might prevent such a catastrophe is the Connally amendment, or reservation, which has been the subject of many legal debates concerning whether it should be weakened or entirely eliminated. There have been many who have beaten the drums for such elimination.

The Connally reservation, for those not familiar with its provisions, in effect protects the rights and liberties of 185 million American citizens, and future generations of Americans yet uncounted. On August 3, 1946, by a 51 to 12 vote, the Senate of the United States wrote into the resolution of adherence to the International Court of Justice—the World Court—eight words which are "as determined by the United States of America."

This means that adherence of the United States of America to the jurisdiction of the World Court contains the complete reservation that "it shall not apply to disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States of America, as determined by the United States of America."

Those last eight words are, in essence, the Connally amendment.

Opponents of the Connally amendment insist that the wording which they supported—which I have quoted above—should not have added on the last eight words "as determined by the United States of America."

Supporters of the Connally amendment, on the other hand, feel that those eight words are our safeguard against future interference by the International Court of Justice in our domestic affairs.

The mere fact that legal debates have been waged over these eight words makes it clear that they are important to the United States. Let there be no mistake about that.

I believe I can truthfully state that the majority of the people in the United States do not wish to trust the United Nations with the safeguarding of our domestic legal rights.

The International Court of Justice advisory opinion, handed down on July 20, 1962, to the effect that the United Nations financial obligations should be borne by all member nations, has been ignored by the Soviet bloc, and others as well. This should be warning enough that we should not let those eight words which safeguard our legal right to determine what matters fall within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States be either weakened or eliminated.

We do not want to become a Congo at some time in the future. We do not want to become a divided Korea. And we have no intention of ever becoming a Soviet satellite, such as Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Rumania, Bulgaria, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, and last, but not least, Cuba, have become.

Therefore it appears our salvation lies within ourselves, and I do not feel it is a matter of national pride for us to hold up the United Nations victory over the Katanga Province of the Congo as an example of our clear thinking and fairness as a nation.

In fairness, however, we must grant that the United Nations indeed launched its operation in the Congo at the express request of the legal Congolese Government. The Security Council resolution to send a U.N. force into the Congo was indeed taken without a dissenting vote on July 14, 1960, and reaffirmed by the Security Council on July 22, 1960, August 9, 1960, February 21, 1961, and November 24, 1961, and this was upheld as far as legality is concerned by the International Court of Justice. All this we grant.

But this does not change our personal gratitude that we have a Connally reservation which will preserve our right to self-determination in domestic matters. Indeed, it should increase this gratitude, and cause all of us to inwardly and outwardly thank those Members of the Senate who so wisely voted on August 3, 1946, to include those "eight words" in the World Court resolution.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I ask that the editorial I mentioned, "This and That," written by Haakon Stockman and published in the Williston Plains Reporter of January 16, 1963, be included with my remarks as an expression of the feelings of many American citizens on the Congo affair.

The editorial follows:

[From the Williston (N. Dak.) Plains Reporter, Jan. 16, 1963]

THIS AND THAT

(By Haakon Stockman)

Congo was given its independence some years ago and was supposed to be left alone to work out its destiny as best it could. It wasn't.

As several factions in the liberated country rose and part of it succeeded, from the Central Government, wanting to become an independent part of it, certain foreign countries found this undesirable and the United Nations interfered by sending troops to Congo to fight the rebels.

I happen to be one of those perhaps misguided people who think that Congo should have been left strictly alone to settle its disputes, even if it seemed as the Congolese weren't as yet fully ready to do so. But what if so—it is through trials and errors that nations as well as individuals find themselves at last.

When the United States declared its independence some 187 years ago, if there at that time had been a United Nations sending its troops here to mix into our country's internal affairs, wouldn't that have been as uncalled for and as highly resented as the present foreign interference with the Congolese secessionists is?

Or if when the Southern States in the United States in 1861 seceded from the Union, what about it if European powers had sent powerful forces to fight either for or against secessionists?

It would have been an intolerable interference.

Belgium, after having exploited the Congo for so long, although in doing so also civilized and developed it greatly, was finally obliged to give it self government and from there on it should have been left strictly on its own.

Civil warring is of course a most deplorable thing, but if part of the Congolese found it to their advantage to secede, why shouldn't they be allowed to do so without interference by foreign powers? Doesn't independence give certain factions the right to rebel against what they find is an objectionable form of home rule by the central government?

What has been accomplished in the Congo so far, but unnecessary bloodshed and destruction, and what about it if Katanga is forced for the time being to capitulate? Surely its desire for home rule will blaze up again as did the Irish when they were fighting for home rule and finally got it.

Isn't it about time to let all Africa do as it pleases and find its own way around? For hundreds of years the so-called civilized world has taken advantage of the African continent and hated to let go of it, but had to.

If the many new countries there shall have their internal differences and many a bloody fight occur, let them handle their affairs as best they can—they are on their way and should be left alone.

And if they in striving to form the government they desire should have to shed a lot of blood—why, that is what the whole cockeyed world has been doing since the beginning of time, and presumably always will.

---

## Corn Flakes to Caviar to Bologna—The Economic Collapse of Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Alice Widener, which appeared in U.S.A. of January 11, brings out some very interesting comparisons. We are constantly being told of the great progress of the U.S.S.R., which is usually pictured as being many percentage points ahead of the United States.

Of course, what we are never told is that 10 percent above zero is not quite as much as 5 percent of a hundred. It also ocurs to the student of Russian history that it is strange and interesting that in the days of the czars, Russia was a great exporter of wheat, whereas today she can barely feed her own people.

While it is probably quite true that the U.S.S.R. is amply supplied with missiles, they still lag, even according to their own figures, behind the United States. They spend far less than we do on defense, $24,025 million at the official rate, whereas we will spend roughly $53 billion to keep up. This appears to be their one big success—to get us to spend ourselves into bankruptcy.

CORN FLAKES TO CAVIAR TO BALONEY—THE ECONOMIC COLLAPSE OF SOCIALISM

(By Alice Widener)

In a report from Moscow which appeared June 1, 1959, in the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, W. Averell Harriman wrote, "New apartment buildings, bright cheerful clothing, shop windows filled with food and household goods make Moscow all but unrecognizable. * * * In the grocery stores the wooden hams and sausages, which were the only decoration a decade ago, have been re-

placed by attractive displays of a variety of foodstuffs from corn flakes to caviar, which, though expensive, are more abundant than at any time in Soviet history."

This glowing Harriman report is only one of thousands such naive and superficial estimates from which the myth of Soviet economic and agricultural might was created.

Probably, it has been the costliest myth ever propagated. American belief in it created a sense of urgency to meet the threat of alleged Soviet economic and agricultural competition. In turn, this feeling was largely responsible for our Nation's having incurred a national debt of $302 billion—the most colossal financial obligation ever put upon any people in the history of the world.

How did the myth of Soviet economic and agricultural might come to be believed in our age of science, when, one would logically assume, economic assertions should be based on provable evidence?

There is only one credible explanation. The Communists achieved indisputable mastery in the field of propaganda. Through this mastery, they used sympathetic socialists as collaborators and dupes. These intellectual supporters were able, in turn, to persuade extremely prominent men and women, who should have known better, that things were thus and so because the socialists said they were thus and so.

The closed socialist society was kept tight shut, except for peek-a-boo inspections conducted by circus-barker guides calling out pink balloon statistics of projected but never fulfilled 5- and 7-year plans.

It is acutely embarrassing for an American to dig into files and take a look at the U.S. historical record. Yellowed clippings from newspapers and magazines tell a tale of big mistakes made by big men in high places.

"I have a suggestion," Neil McElroy of Procter & Gamble said to John Scott of Time magazine, in Cincinnati, spring 1960. "Why don't you look into the question: When are the Russians going to begin to compete with us selling soap?"

To find the answer was John Scott's 1961 assignment for Time. In an introduction to his final report—"The Soviet Economic Offensive," issued November 1961 by Time—Mr. Scott wrote, "Before I had gone far in my early studies, I saw that on the surface at least my assignment would be an easy one. Even before I left on my trip, I could have answered Neil McElroy's question. Soviet soap would not compete with Procter & Gamble in the world market for at least a decade. Indeed, the entire Soviet trade picture was singularly unimpressive. * * *"

What about Mr. Harriman's "corn flakes to caviar" Moscow observation of 1959?

"I had not been in Moscow many hours," reported Time Writer John Scott about his 1961 visit there, "before I encountered what Nikita Khrushchev later referred to in an official speech as 'certain difficulties in food supplies. * * *'. Indeed, on a number of occasions Moscow stores had run short of meat, milk, vegetables * * *. Several times I ran into block-long queues for meat, and several times I was told that 'there is no milk at all in Moscow now'."

The city of Moscow—Scott reported—is the home of the Soviet "elite." In 1961, Mr. Jacquet-Francillon of the Paris newspaper Le Figaro reported, after a trip to nonelite places such as Soviet Siberia, that the food stores were guarded at night by women with shotguns.

RED DEAD END

What about Soviet trade?

It was not until 1957 that the Soviet Union furnished figures to the United Nations. Unreliable as Red figures are, they appeared in the U.N. Yearbook of International Trade Statistics for 1957 (published in 1958), and showed, even so, that the Red bloc was doing less than 2 percent of world trade. Yet a few years earlier, on March 30, 1953, the New York Times had headlined, "Red Nations Show Big Gains in Trade—U.N. Report Also Notes Sharp Rise in Their 1952 Production—World Output at Peak."

On seeing this Times headline, how many people took the trouble to read what followed it? Those who did read the text found out that the Reds' "big gains" were confined to trade among themselves, and East-West commerce had shrunk to one-half or less of prewar volume.

All during the 1950's the myth of Soviet superiority was engendered by American and British intellectuals and by politicians pleading for billions of U.S. dollars to hand out in bilateral and multilateral foreign aid. Anyone questioning Soviet Socialist supremacy was described as a "know nothing" or "isolationist" or "ostrich."

On March 23, 1957, the Washington (D.C.) Post and Times Herald reported that "Max F. Millikan, economist and foreign affairs specialist," was the first witness to appear before a special Senate Committee on Foreign Aid. The late Senator Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island, asked Mr. Millikan (who urged Congress to appropriate $10 billion for a 10-year loan-and-grant aid program to underdeveloped nations) what would happen if the United States were to end all its development aid for such economic essentials as transportation, electric power, and the like. Professor Millikan, director of the MIT Center for International Studies and coauthor of the Millikan-Rostow (Walt W.) report, replied that underdeveloped nations "would turn increasingly to the Soviet bloc," and would be encouraged to adopt "totalitarian methods" of government to squeeze more resources from their own subjects.

Not a single hint was offered to the Senate commtitee by Economist Millikan that any turning for aid by underdeveloped nations to the Soviet bloc would be a turn leading to an economic dead end. Of course, Mr. Millikan disagreed entirely with Mr. Benjamin Fairless, who had advised President Eisenhower that private capital could take over a main share of the economic development load.

Only a month after Mr. Millikan's mumbo-jumbo, Ned Rochon of the New York World Telegram & Sun said in a report culled from United Press and Associated Press dispatches:

"A most compelling argument in behalf of superabundant foreign aid in these casual days of the $72 billion budget runs like this: Russia is spending vastly more than we are.

"Let one moderate among Senators question the enormity of America's outlay and a strident congerie of internationalists arises in full bellow across the land. They depose fierce testimonials to the generosity of Russia's effort. Estimates soar into the stratosphere to trigger clouds of inflated statistics, and the economy advocate is drowned in a rain of 15-digit statistics.

"It was in this atmosphere that a British publication dared to take a look at actual Soviet aid, and what it found was revealing indeed. A Royal Institute of Affairs publication, the Chatham House Review, disclosed that Russia's total program for undeveloped nations amounts to $1.4 billion for the next 5 years. That's about one-fifteenth of the rate at which U.S. spending is running in neutral lands.

"The analysis further revealed that no more than one-tenth to one-fifth of Mr. Khrushchev's aid is being delivered, and that is in commodities, not cash."

BETTER BLIND THAN DELUDED

On May 3, 1958, Dean Acheson, former U.S. Secretary of State, delivered a Jefferson-Jackson Day address in Detroit and called on our country "to export capital" to the underdeveloped nations. "Peoples everywhere demand an expanding life," said Mr. Acheson. "Khrushchev promises the faithful and the uncommitted that Communist economics will produce this result. Only a blind man can doubt that it is turning out an impressive performance."

Yet on December 24, 1962, only a few years after Dean Acheson's tribute to socialist economic accomplishment, Barron's Financial Weekly carried the front page headline, "Bankrupt Socialism—State Planning, the Kremlin Has Confessed, Is a Failure."

Perhaps the most ardent and characteristic of all socialist minded American mythmakers about soviet economic might is Pulitzer prize winning historian Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., the man who publicly called the brilliant Henry J. Taylor an idiot.

In 1960, a pamphlet marked "For Private Circulation Only" was issued with the title "The Big Decision—Private Indulgents or National Power?" by Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. The Harvard historian wrote that "the American people are growing restlessly aware that the United States is losing ground in the great world competition with the Soviet Union. We are still ahead in many ways, but this is mainly because we had an excellent start. As fast as we continue to move, the Communists seem to be moving even faster. As a result, they are steadly narrowing the gap between us. Even more alarming, in certain decisive categories of national strength—in new weapons, in the contest for space, in technical education, and in the rate of economic growth—the Soviet Union appears already (in Prime Minister Khrushchev's favorite phrase) to have 'overtaken and surpassed' us."

Not content with this, Professor Schlesinger—who was a top adviser to Mr. Adlai Stevenson and became a White House advisor to President Kennedy—went on to the following hysterical assertion in his privately circulated 1960 pamphlet:

"This decade of American decline has equally been the decade of Soviet rise. What accounts for the extraordinary progress made by the Soviet Union in the fifties? The gross national product of the Soviet Union is still only about 45 percent of our own. Yet it has been making faster relative progress than we have in nearly every critical field of national power. There is here no 'riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma.' The answer to the Soviet success is as plain as day. It lies in the power of the Soviet Union to focus its national energies. The visitor to Soviet Russia finds it frightening to see what energy a great nation can generate when it allocates its talent and resources according to an intelligent system of priorities."

Two years after this Schlesingerian punditry, which contained several references to the missile gap, Vermont Royster, editor of the Wall Street Journal and an educated, perceptive visitor to Soviet Russia, testified before the Joint Economic Committee of Congress:

"The Soviet Union, by the standards of advanced Western industrial countries, is an economically backward country. This is so, I believe, whether the test be industry, agriculture, technology, labor skills, or the standard of living of the people. * * * Soviet economic power today is actually less than that of many other countries with a smaller potential: West Germany, for example, or France."

On January 5, 1963, Richard L. Strout, Washington correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, reported that President Kennedy is seen as "emerging into a more mature second wind."

Part of this new-found maturity may come from Presidential discovery of "Junior" Schlesinger's immaturity. Mr. Strout went on to report that coupled with President Kennedy's mature second wind "is the discovery that the so-called missile gap, which played so large a part in the 1960 election

speeches, does not exist. While perhaps embarrassing to a politician, the misjudgment probably renews confidence in the American defense position to a president."

You see?

The missile gap was all a matter of misjudgment by Professor Schlesinger and his very intellectual associates, such as Walt W. Rostow, now a policy planner in the State Department, and others. The truth is that the Soviet Union was not ahead of us militarily, economically, agriculturally, industrially or technologically.

Wherein, then, does Soviet strength lie? The correct answer seems to be—

(1) In nuclear blackmail, i.e., the publicly expressed and reiterated Soviet willingness to strike first and without warning against the West.

(2) In socialist propaganda.

Of these two Soviet assets, the second is much the more useful.

After all, it is a neat trick to be able to dupe Harvard University's most eminent historian into believing that failure is success, especially when the dupe is able to progress from a campus classroom to a White House inner sanctum.

BUTTERED-UP TALES OF BUTTER, GUNS

It is interesting to analyze a case history of myth-making about the Soviet economy. Though Khrushchev was forced in the summer of 1962 to announce a 25 percent increase in the price of Red butter, several leading newspapers in New York City (including the New York Herald Tribune) carried a story June 20, 1962, headed, "A Red First—Butter." This story asserted that the Soviet Union leads the world in butter production. The tale was based on a single statistic taken out of edible fats context from the United Nations Statistical Yearbook for 1961.

As all serious economists know, Red production and consumption statistics in the U.N. Yearbook are furnished by the Soviets themselves from within their tightly shut society, are unverified by outside sources, and are cited at entirely fictitious official ruble-dollar exchange rates.

The U.N. Yearbook carried the following relatively meaningless figures for butter production in 1960 in thousand metric tons:

| | |
|---|---|
| U.S.S.R. | 737.0 |
| U.S.A. | 622.7 |

The United States has a total area of 3,628,130 square miles; the U.S.S.R. total is almost 2½ times greater—7,877,598 square miles. The Soviet population is at least 20 million greater than ours. In America, only 5 percent of the population are farmers; in the U.S.S.R. 40 percent or more of the population are at work tilling the soil.

A much truer picture of relative United States-U.S.S.R. agricultural strength is in the following table compiled by this writer from the U.N. Statistical Yearbook for 1961:

*Edible fats production for 1960*

[Thousand metric tons]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| U.S.S.R. | butter | 737.0 |
| U.S.S.R. | margarine | 431.0 |
| Total | | 1,168.0 |
| U.S.A. | butter | 622.7 |
| U.S.A. | margarine | 619.7 |
| Total | | 1,242.4 |

So—in an area less than half as large and with a much smaller population, 5 percent of Americans outproduced more than 40 percent of Russians in edible fats during 1960.

But this is not by any means the world picture. The real one shows clearly why Khrushchev shouts diatribes against a European Common Market (EEC) which is reducing to absurdity his claims of Socialist economic superiority. EEC figures in the U.N. Yearbook for 1961 show:

*Edible fats production for 1960*

[Thousand metric tons]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| France | butter | 398.0 |
| Do | margarine | 115.0 |
| West Germany | butter | 406.0 |
| Do | margarine | 588.0 |

The French and West German total of 1,507 is much more than that of the Soviet Union, though the combined area of the two Common Market countries is only 212,659 square miles as compared with the Soviet area of more than 7 million. Moreover, the combined population figure of France and West Germany is less than half as great as the Soviet total.

When the butter production figures for other Common Market countries are added to those of France and West Germany, the total shows that the EEC outproduced the Soviets in butter by 1½ times. Also, France and West Germany produced almost twice as much as the combined production of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, East Germany, Poland, and Yugoslavia.

PHONY RUBLE-DOLLAR FIGURING

As in the case of butter, a lot of baloney figures about Soviet military expenditures have been issued to the American people by the press and to Congress by scholars and U.S. Government officials.

On December 6, 1961, the Soviet Government announced revision of its 1961 military defense (aggression) budget. Next day, the New York Times reported on its front page, "Last July, Premier Khrushchev disclosed that military appropriations budgeted for 1961 had been increased by 3 billion rubles ($3,300 million) because of growing East-West tension in the Berlin dispute. The Soviet Union's defense expenditures, which had been gradually decreasing in recent years, thus jumped from 9,300 million rubles ($10,323 million) originally planned for 1961 to 13,400 million rubles ($14,874 million) for 1962. This represents an increase of 44 percent."

How frightening. And please note that the Times converted all ruble figures into dollar figures at the fictitious official Red exchange rate of 1 to $1.10.

Now let us consider this: On October 28, 1959, UPI cited the Soviet-issued defense budget figure for 1960 as 96 billion rubles or $24.025 billion calculated at the then official Red exchange rate of 4 rubles to 1 U.S. dollar.

A comparison of the 1959 figure with that for 1961 would indicate, at first glance, that the Soviet military budget decreased (in round figures) from $24 billion in 1960 to $14 billion in 1961. Of course, this was not the case. On January 1, 1961, the Soviet Union devalued its currency by taking the artificial 1961 tourist ruble-dollar exchange rate of 10 to 1, dividing it by 10, adding a 10-cent gold content, and declaring 1 ruble equals $1.10 of U.S. currency.

When the 1960 Soviet ruble defense budget figure is converted at the 1961 rate, then the comparative ruble figures are:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1960 defense total | 9.6 billion |
| 1961 defense total | 13.4 billion |

Thus the ruble increase for 1961 seemed to be 3.8 billion or 28 percent over 1960.

But what is the dollar figure?

There is none. The Soviet currency is not convertible outside the U.S.S.R. The so-called official rate of ruble-dollar exchange is purely arbitrary and is not established according to supply and demand on the international money market. There is, however, a somewhat indicative way of figuring out an approximate value based on the extremely limited but highly significant black or free market in rubles outside the Soviet Union. Reputable foreign exchange firms in Switzerland, the United States, and elsewhere engage in negligible but nevertheless actual ruble-dollar transactions.

In 1960, the reliable foreign exchange firm of Perera & Co., Inc., New York City, said that a conservative ruble-dollar rate was 24 to 1. On December 7, 1961, Perera's rate was 35 cents in exchange for one new (devalued) ruble.

Now let us take a look at the Soviet military defense (aggression) budget (which does not include sums for Soviet scientific research and many other items of a kind included by the United States in its defense budget):

*Soviet military budget*

| | |
|---|---|
| 1960 in rubles | 96,000,000,000 |
| 1960 in dollars at official 4=1 rate | $24,025,000,000 |
| 1960 at Perera's 24=1 rate | $4,004,166,666 |
| 1961 in "new" rubles | 13,400,000,000 |
| 1961 in dollars at official 1=$1.10 rate | $14,874,000,000 |
| 1961 at Perera's rate of 1=35 cents | $4,690,000,000 |

The foregoing table shows—at the black or free market ruble rate—a Soviet 1961 increase in military defense (aggression) budget of only 17 percent over 1960, not of 44 percent as claimed in The New York Times.

If it be taken for granted that the Soviets concealed a military expenditure equal to what they revealed, i.e., of approximately $4 billion, it nevertheless appears that the Soviet outlay of $3 billion was about one-fifth of ours. And this Soviet outlay imposed such a heavy strain on the Soviet economy that Khrushchev was forced to declare that for 1962 his country could not invest any capital in new industrial undertakings.

SALIENT FACTS FOR 1963

Indisputably, the Soviet Union has a first strike nuclear capability. Indisputably, too, the Soviet Union has an almost unlimited propaganda capability. These two capabilities are the only substantial Socialist successes.

The first of these could be better frustrated now and for the near future by an American announcement that since the Soviet Union never has pledged itself not to start a nuclear war, the United States cannot be bound by a pledge not to start such a war if its vital interests are endangered. (In essence, this is what President Kennedy said and did when he covered the Soviet nuclear bet in Cuba last October.)

The second successful Soviet capability—that of propaganda—can be thwarted only when American taxpayers quit subsidizing it. They do this mostly through their Congress. It swallows all the corn flakes to caviar baloney about Socialist economic successes fed to it by Socialists and their dupes. As a result, Congress appropriates billions upon billions of dollars to fight a mythical economic challenge, thus seriously weakening the financial structure of the United States, bastion of capitalism.

As the year 1963 begins, there emerge some salient facts about the second half of our century:

1. Marxism is a dead-duck theory everywhere except in some academic and intellectual circles. Even European Socialists have renounced Marxism.

2. Only those national economies in which there is substantial private capitalist enterprise are thriving.

3. The collapse of Socialist economics will cause upheavals within the Socialist bloc countries leading their rulers to embark on intensified programs of military aggression and political subversion abroad.

4. The Achilles' heel of the West is U.S. fiscal folly.

George Saintsbury, essayist and author, said, "Poor scholarship is the endless repetition of other people's mistakes."

Unfortunately, the American Congress has heeded too many experts of poor scholarship endlessly repeating Socialist mistakes.

Members of Congress would do better in 1963 and thereafter to heed their own good commonsense and innate patriotism.

## Why Does the President Seek Advice From Socialist Economists Regarding Our Way of Life?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, for what purpose does President Kennedy seek the advice of a Socialist in planning our economy? For that matter, why does the President continue to base his economic planning for the United States on the advice of Walter Heller who contributed greatly to the prosperity and economic growth of West Germany when that nation refused to adopt his program. Under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD and I commend to my colleagues the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal to show what lies ahead for the American economy if we continue to follow the economic theories of President Kennedy and his Socialist advisers:

ROAD TO CONTROL

Whenever the subject of price controls comes up in Washington, the customary reaction is to deny any intention of imposing them. That sounds all right, but maybe we should listen to some other views.

The Swedish economist, Gunnar Myrdal, for example, pays a lot of attention to the American economy and his thinking parallels that of the advisers in Washington. He emphatically advocates greatly increased Federal spending, and in a speech excerpted in the New Republic he concedes this course runs a real risk of inflation.

The danger could be minimized or removed, however, particularly if the Government is prepared to extend its controls over investments and, perhaps, over prices. In regard to price control, I sometimes ask myself whether the American Government should not be prepared to tone down its rather fruitless fight against monopoly but instead ask for a share in controlling administered prices, which are so decisive for the general trend of prices.

The prices Mr. Myrdal has in mind are in basic industries, which some people mistakenly allege to be administered without regard to market conditions. What he implies is that Government control of these prices would be tantamount to control of all prices, and that is to be desired. In short, we don't have to worry about inflation because we can always go to price controls.

Such controls historically do not work, of course. They do not attack the inflation itself; in practice they do not necessarily even put a lid on the rising prices which may be a symptom of the inflation. They do distort the economy and place it under burdensome regimentation. They represent by definition the antithesis of the free-market economy.

But the interesting thing is that if anyone were trying to get the United States back to price controls, the present policy of unlimited spending and deficits charts the right course. For an ensuing inflation would then become the justification for the controls.

Mr. Myrdal, at least, is honest enough to carry the theory to its logical conclusion. And what a dismal one it is.

## Cuban Appeasement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, because of the apparent deceit with which this administration has explained the Cuban invasion failure, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD an article, "We Were Betrayed," written by one of the veterans of the Cuban invasion, as it appeared in the U.S. News & World Report of January 14, 1963.

It is hard to believe that Mr. Penabaz and the all around expert, Bobby Kennedy, can both be right. The article follows:

CUBAN APPEASEMENT

(How do Cubans who fought at the Bay of Pigs feel about the U.S. role in that fiasco? This is the story of one Cuban invader, told in his own words. Manuel Penabaz tells of assurances made by representatives of the U.S. Government that the invasion against Castro would have U.S. support. Then, he relates, just when the invaders needed help most—and might have won—they were told: "We cannot give you any further support." Many veterans of the invasion, just ransomed from Castro prisons, say they hold no rancor against the United States. But Penabaz says: "We did not fail. We were betrayed.")

(By Manuel Penabaz)

"Keep advancing. Keep advancing—and wait."

So long as I live, I shall never forget those words. They sounded out from an American ship, from the officer who directed our landing operations at the Bay of Pigs on the coast of Cuba, where 1,500 of us Cubans offered our lives in the hope of liberating our beloved country from the rule of the bearded despot, Fidel Castro, on April 17, 1961.

"Keep advancing and firing. Take the area ahead—and wait."

To us who had struggled ashore from our landing barges, the words "and wait" meant only one thing: "Help is on the way."

When we were recruited for this perilous mission, and during our exhaustive training in Guatemala—even while on the slow, ancient freighters that brought us from our embarkation port in Nicaragua—we were promised the support of the armed forces of the United States.

"Over you will be air cover," we were told, "and back of you the Navy and land forces of the United States and other free nations of the Americas. You cannot fail."

We did not fail. We were betrayed.

After 3 days of fighting, we heard again that same American voice that had exhorted us to "keep advancing—and wait." Only this time it said:

"We cannot give you any further support."

The whole invasion operation that had been planned and directed by agencies of the U.S. Government had been abandoned by that Government at the moment when victory could have overthrown Fidel Castro.

Of the 1,500 who began the assault at the Bay of Pigs on that warm April morning, about 100 were killed; 60 later died of wounds, starvation, torture and executions; most of the others were captured.

I was among the lucky. I escaped. Four of my comrades and I found a raft and, after 5 days afloat, were rescued.

Now my surviving comrades of that invasion also have been freed—ransomed from Castro's prison cells. Many of them have told me since their arrival in Miami that their lips are sealed because they have relatives still in Cuba. I, too, have relatives in Cuba. But my lips are not sealed. I will tell the story of what happened at the Bay of Pigs, because I believe that such a mistake must not be made again by any government or people of the free world.

For me, the story of the invasion began in Miami, Fla., when I heard the words: "Recruits are needed—recruits to overthrow Castro."

The Central Intelligence Agency of the U.S. Government, headed by Allen Dulles, was the recruiting and training group for our volunteers.

Several officers of the Central Intelligence Agency were operating in the Miami area, seeking out the leaders among the Cuban exiles and encouraging them to select the likeliest young men for the adventure. I was told that there would be an invasion of Cuba "fairly early in 1961," backed and supported by the United States.

The first airlifts of volunteers to training camps began in late summer, 1960. Any recruits who doubted that the United States was back of the operation were assured that, when we reached our training camps, we would find American officers in charge and there would be the best of American weapons to carry into battle.

Sure enough, when we arrived at Trax Base, high in the mountains of Guatemala, American officers were in charge of the camp, and our weapons were among the best the United States had to offer.

At Retalhuleu, Guatemala, a splendid airstrip had been laid down by American engineers. All about were huge accumulations of war material—aircraft, mortars, tons of bombs and other ammunition.

Over the whole operation, there was an air of great secrecy. Our instructors, American officers, wore only fatigue uniforms, with no markings. We knew them only by first names. But it was apparent that they were experienced and efficient.

It did not take us long to learn that "Frank," the man who gave the orders for both Americans and Cubans, was a colonel. The American subordinate officers were all experts in their fields. "Ray" was our rifle and pistol instructor. It leaked out that he was from California and a pistol champion. "Sam," chief trainer of the parachutists, was plainly a veteran of many combat jumps. "Nick," from New Mexico, was our instructor for intelligence operations. "Bob" demonstrated all there was to know about mortars and machine guns. "Pat" was a security officer.

There was no secrecy about the CIA man in charge at the camp. He was Frank Bender, a man of German descent who had fought in the French underground during World War II. Bender was everywhere—shuttling back to Miami to check on recruiting, going to Washington and New York to try to bring all the Cuban exile leaders together into one united front.

Trax Base was a regular little city, built by the U.S. Government. It had modern paved streets, electric lights, and barracks for about 500 men. As our numbers grew, we had to disperse to four other training bases.

All the training bases were leased from Roberto Alejo, brother of the Guatemalan Ambassador to the United States and a

trusted friend of Guatemalan President Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes.

For rifles, we had that infantry workhorse, the M–1 Garand, firing eight shots. Officers carried carbines. We learned to use machine-guns and bazookas, 57-millimeter guns and 4.2-inch mortars.

One prized piece of equipment was an electronic communications-control center—a device so new that it had never been used in combat. It was manned by six men, who could relay messages to artillery, aircraft, and other combat units. The American officers warned us that it should be destroyed rather than be permitted to fall into the hands of the enemy.

Training was rugged, but we endured it cheerfully. We were preparing to free our land of Marxist dictatorship. We understood that our brigade would be the initial attacking party backed by the might of the United States. There would be ample ammunition to stop Castro's tanks and his land forces. Every effort would be made to win the support of the Cuban people. Exile leaders would be formed into a provisional government and would receive the recognition of the United States and of Latin American countries. Such were our assurances.

Our brigade commander, Col. José Perez San Roman, and his headquarters staff hoped that, before embarking, they could have printed thousands of leaflets to be dropped all over Cuba by planes calling upon the people to rise against their oppressor, Fidel Castro.

At the last moment San Roman was informed that the U.S. Government could not approve this plan.

On the morning of April 10 we were flown to Puerto Cabezas, Nicaragua. At the dock we saw the invasion fleet that the CIA had mobilized. There were six ancient craft. Three were Liberty ships of World War II vintage. The other three were old fishing yachts. Most of the officers were Spanish or Cuban, with crews filled out from men of the U.S. merchant marine—among them many drunkards and misfits. We soon discovered that the crews did not want to mix with their live Cuban cargoes, and couldn't have cared less whether the expedition succeeded or failed.

"We carry you, land you and leave you," a crew member explained. We took this as added assurance that we would be covered by air and naval support, for it was unthinkable to us that any civilized government would send men to battle without ample means either for complete victory or honorable retreat.

On the night of April 11, in moonless darkness, we sailed. On the fourth day at sea, we were given our final briefing on our invasion plan. Each man received a mimeographed copy of the operation in detail. The landings would be made on April 17 at Bahia de Cochinos, the Bay of Pigs, about 90 miles southeast of Havana. Battalions 2 and 5 would land first, at Playa Larga, deep in the bay, under command of Eneido Oliva. All other units would land at Playa Girón. Soon after our landings, the parachutists would drop some 12 miles inland to seize the airport of Jagüey Grande.

On the morning of April 15, planes from the Nicaraguan bases would begin bombing Castro's airfields and hangars, to be followed by heavier strikes on the sixteenth and seventeenth. Some of our units would move southeastward to join rebel groups in the Escambray Mountains, and others would move westward to take Havana.

Most important of all, our leaders had been assured of U.S. air cover, the backing of the U.S. Navy, and—if needed—of U.S. land troops as well. No one expected our 1,500 volunteers alone to conquer Castro's forces of 300,000 militia and regulars.

But we did expect that, with our American equipment plus American battle support, we would move inland steadily until we had cut Cuba in two. Castro's forces would then realize resistance was hopeless. Defections would begin and rise like a tide.

Soon we heard the Cuban radio announcing angrily that several planes were bombing the airports of Santiago and Havana and various military bases. We were elated. The bombings by our planes from Nicaragua had gone off on schedule. But Castro's broadcast was followed by a rebroadcast from the United States that chilled us to the bone. It was a speech by President Kennedy in which he affirmed that the United States would maintain a policy of strict neutrality in Cuba's internal affairs. Specifically, said the President, his Government would not intervene in the events shaping up in that island.

"He must say that, to deceive Castro," we finally decided, for all of us had heard Mr. Kennedy, during his campaign for the Presidency, advocate full support of Cubans opposing Castro. Yet doubts assailed me. It was the President speaking now—not the candidate.

On the morning of the 16th we were heartened by the sight of two U.S. destroyers, one on either side of our slow-moving flotilla. They were greeted with cheers. At least, we thought, we would have naval support. And in case of setback, we would be evacuated and saved from capture.

All through that April 16 we waited for news of the second bombing strike. No news came.

That night we saw the lights of Girón Beach, Bay of Pigs, on the horizon, like shimmering pearls. The ships carrying Oliva's units had veered to our right, and his men would be landing soon. As the first shots from Playa Larga sounded, I looked at my watch. It was 20 minutes past midnight, April 17. The tragic invasion had begun.

Oliva and his two battalions met little resistance on their landings—only a small patrol of Castro's militia.

Our ships drew up about 1 kilometer—0.6 of a mile—from the shore and anchored. Landing barges were quickly floated, and all hands began unloading the weapons.

The firing on Playa Larga had ceased. Back and forth from all the ships shuttled the motorized landing barges. As dawn broke, our radios picked up the first message of the American officer, stationed farther out at sea on a U.S. warship. He said:

"The whole bay is ours. The enemy has disappeared."

We learned later that morning that the officer was on the aircraft carrier *Boxer*. How comforting to know that the might of the greatest navy in the world was standing by to support this blow for freedom.

Our ship's captain stuck his head out of his cabin and shouted: "The sky is ours, too." Every man raised a cheer, for surely this meant that the bombing of the 15th had destroyed Castro's air force.

"WE CHEERED TOO SOON"

But we cheered too soon. At 6 a.m., a B–26 bomber flew toward us at low altitude. We supposed it came from our Nicaragua base. But suddenly it swooped low and began firing at the barges unloading their cargoes on the beach.

"Shoot," I shouted to the men still on my ship, the *Atlantico*. There was also firing from other ships. The B–26 sped away. It had given our men their first baptism of fire. But, most important to Castro, the pilot had learned that there was no air cover for the landing.

Two other B–26's appeared from over the sea. Several of our guns started firing. Then the planes identified themselves as ours, from the Nicaragua base. They circled over our landings for a while. Then, with feelings of despair, we saw them head back toward Nicaragua. The pilots said they had fuel enough to cruise over the Bay of Pigs for only about 20 minutes.

Suddenly a Sea Fury appeared. I recognized this British-made fighter plane at once, for Batista had used them against us when I was fighting with Castro in the hills. This one made a pass or two, then zoomed away.

As our landing barge was on its way toward the beach, another Castro B–26 appeared, swooping directly over us. Our guns fired. The plane plunged into the sea.

We waded ashore, through the warm Cuban waters, onto the beach of our native land. Soon we were under terrific fire from several enemy aircraft. Flat on our bellies, many of us crawled into the village of Girón. Some of the inhabitants had fled. Many others ran toward us with welcoming shouts.

HOW "PRECIOUS CARGO" WAS LOST

I looked back toward our ships. One was in flames and sinking rapidly. It was the *Houston*—with most of its precious cargo still unloaded. The stacks of mortar shells, the armored trucks, the electronic communications-control center—all were going down. Another ship burst into flames. It was the *Rio Escondido*. Soon it, too, sank. All the other ships were moving rapidly away. We watched a Sea Fury bring down a B–26 from our base. We asked:

"When will our air cover come? When will those fast U.S. jets go into action?"

The news from Playa Larga was good. Oliva had moved inland; destroying seven enemy tanks and numerous trucks, along with hundreds of enemy soldiers. The news from the parachutists was less hopeful. They had dropped early in the morning, but, for the most part, had landed in the swampy terrain north of the bay. Now they were fighting their way back to join our main force. By midafternoon, we were moving steadily forward.

"Keep advancing. Move inland—and wait" the American officer's voice kept broadcasting.

Late in the day we encountered the first battalions of Castro's militia, advancing among 10 or 12 tanks. How we needed those antitank mines that went down with the *Houston*. But our mortars were ready. We let go our barrage. Our fire was devastating. Castro's poor militiamen fell in heaps. Men? The majority were mere boys—many no more than 14 years of age. Only an insane sadist would have drafted those adolescents to fill his military machine.

As one after another of their tanks were knocked out, the Castro infantry ran like crazy from side to side. Our men got tired of shooting at them. The butchery that went on is impossible to describe. By nightfall, the survivors of Castro's forces were in full retreat.

The U.S. radio "Swan" had kept up a constant chatter all during the day, filled with exaggerated statements that I can now brand as deliberate lies. It said:

"The invaders are steadily advancing on every front."

"Throughout all Cuba, people are joining forces with the underground rebels fighting Fidel Castro."

"Castro's forces are surrendering in droves."

"It is reported that Raúl Castro has committed suicide."

That night our men slept in the open, close to the soil of our Cuba. Next morning we ate what rations we could gather from the villagers. We were set for another battle. But all was quiet for a time—except for the quarreling of vultures over the bodies of Castro's slain militiamen.

From Playa Larga, Oliva and his battalions had advanced more than 12 miles, fighting all the way. They had stopped 3,000 of Cas-

tro's militia, flanked by Russian tanks and covered by British-made Sea Fury planes. Our units had advanced almost that distance to the northeast. Realizing that our lines were too extended, San Roman ordered them pulled back.

Oliva began his withdrawal to join our forces north of Girón.

By noon of that second day, all officers and men realized it was then or never for victory. We had demoralized Castro's infantry with our deadly mortar and machine-gun fire. A few more days of pounding like that, and his forces would be surrendering in droves.

Colonel San Roman communicated with the American ship: "Where is our support?" he asked. "We must have jet cover immediately."

The answer he got was nothing new—simply that we should advance and wait.

"WE LOOKED IN VAIN FOR AIR SUPPORT"

All afternoon the enemy B–26's strafed and bombed us, while we looked in vain for the air support that could have knocked Castro's planes from the sky.

By nightfall, our forces had retreated from the Jagüey Grande area. Despite the terrific punishment from the air, we still held the terrain for 6 miles north of the bay, including the road junction at San Blas. We still stood guard over the airstrip on Girón Beach.

But we were running out of ammunition. Every battalion reported it was running short of mortar shells, and even the small-arms bullets would soon be exhausted.

Meanwhile, from our advanced sentinels, we learned that Castro's forces were concentrating in huge numbers, with scores of tanks, hundreds of cannons and armored trucks, forming a ring of steel around the Bay of Pigs and getting ready to mount an attack.

Not a single plane from our bases had engaged the enemy during that second day of fighting.

At midmorning of the third day, we saw two of our B–26's winging in from over the water. Two Cuban planes zoomed out to met them—one a Sea Fury, the other an American-made jet fighter—and within seconds our planes fell into the sea.

Soon afterward, three more of our planes flew over the beach and across the battle area. Two left quickly, but the third swooped down and began strafing the advancing Castro columns. Antiaircraft shells converged on that plane and it crashed. We found later that the pilot was Leo France's Berle of Boston, an American instructor from the Nicaragua base. Early that morning he had learned that the invasion forces were to be abandoned to their fate. Apparently, in anger and frustration, he had determined to uphold his own honor, at least.

One of Oliva's radiomen kept repeating this message: "This is Cuba calling the free countries. We need help in Cuba—now."

Like the coils of a great python, Castro's columns, with thousands of men supported by Russian tanks and bombing planes, were encircling our units and pressing them back toward the beach. We were outnumbered 40 to 1.

There can be no adequate description for the emotions that gripped us as we thought of what those planes on the U.S.S. *Boxer*, those guns on the two destroyers that had escorted us, and all our sunken mines and ammunition could do for us.

Manuel Artime Buesa and I were close by Col. San Roman during the final hours of our defeat. We heard him make his last anguished plea for help.

"Where is our support?" he asked.

From far away in the ocean came the reply:

"We cannot give you any further support. You are on your own."

Quickly, in the anger of a leader forsaken, San Roman replied:

"And you, sir, are a ———."

As the coils of Castro's python strangled us, one of our men shouted: "Headquarters says it's every man for himself."

I had resigned myself to being captured when I ran into Rene Salvia, a boyhood friend from my hometown. "Follow me," he shouted. We ran to the beach. Several lifeboats were filling with men and pushing out to sea. Howitzer shells were falling all around us. We spied a rubber raft floating near the shore—one used by frogmen to mark the route for our landing barges. It had an outboard motor and three oars. Rene and I piled into it, followed by Pepin Casals, Gardo Orlando, and Perez Jemenez. The motor refused to start, so we rowed out to sea.

For 4 days we paddled and drifted. About 5 o'clock on the fifth afternoon a freighter, the *Luisse*, bound for Corpus Christi, Tex., plucked us from the sea. Eventually I returned to Miami.

Since then, I have learned much from my friends in the revolutionary council about the invasion at the Bay of Pigs. I have learned that no preparations were made for our cooperation with the underground in Cuba. No campaign of civilian uprising and sabotage had been planned.

Both the U.S. military chiefs and the CIA blandly assumed that there was enough opposition to Fidel Castro inside Cuba to overthrow his regime, once the movement had been sparked by our invasion.

Our exile leaders reflect with great sorrow upon the fact that the U.S. decision to cancel the promised help to our invading forces included also a refusal to rescue our men and prevent their capture. Not even those in lifeboats or struggling in the water could be rescued. American naval personnel at Guantanamo heard our pleas for help, but, on orders from Washington, they could not move a vessel to assist.

It is known that Castro salvaged every item that went down with the *Houston* and the *Rio Escondido*—including our new secret communications system which, doubtless, now has been duplicated by every Communist military command in the world.

"NO RANSOM WAS NECESSARY"

Fidel Castro convicted 1,179 of the captives of treason. Now his demands for ransom have been met.

From my comrades of the invasion I have had my belief confirmed that no payment of ransom was necessary. The cowardly dictator had his plane all warmed up and waiting during the recent missile crisis, ready to flee the country at the first military move by the United States.

For me and for my comrades, the question still remains unanswered:

Why were we denied the help that would have uprooted the seedbed of Communist power in the Western Hemisphere?

## Dr. Frank L. DeFurio, Distinguished Surgeon and Educator of Auburn, N.Y., Announces His Retirement From the City of Auburn Board of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, last week Dr. Frank L. DeFurio, a distinguished physician and surgeon from Auburn, N.Y., in my new congressional district, announced his intention to retire from the board of education of the City of Auburn after a long and distinguished service of 15 years.

Dr. DeFurio has long been an active and outspoken leader in the great city of Auburn. His wisdom, his energy, and his dedication have been reflected in the schools of the city.

In tribute to Dr. DeFurio's service on the board of education, the Auburn Citizen-Advertiser saluted him in its editorial page, and under unanimous consent I include herewith a copy of that editorial, which appeared on January 19, 1963.

The editorial follows:

DR. DEFURIO RETIRES

With the retirement of Dr. Frank L. DeFurio from the Auburn Board of Education, the Auburn board will lose a man who has been a strong supporter of good schools for Auburn.

The doctor has served on the unsalaried nine-man board for 15 years, and these have been busy years for the board. During this time Herman Avenue School, Genesee Street School, Owasco Elementary School, Auburn Community College have been built. Thornton Avenue School is under construction. The way has been cleared to start construction on Casey Park School and a new library for the college. Plans are being made for a new junior high school.

As a professional man Dr. DeFurio has appreciated the importance of good education and has been willing to spend money to see that Auburn children received this kind of education.

## A Complaint Against Postal Regulations Inaugurated January 7, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to H. W. Brawley, Deputy Postmaster General, which was sent to me from the Voice of St. Matthews, a very highly respected newspaper in my congressional district, in which they outline a complaint against postal regulations inaugurated January 7, 1963, which complaint I feel should be brought to the attention of this body:

THE VOICE OF ST. MATTHEWS
AND THE HIGHLANDS,
*Louisville, Ky., January 21, 1963.*

Mr. H. W. BRAWLEY,
*Deputy Postmaster General,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. BRAWLEY: We would like to call your attention to what we believe to be a grievous wrong caused by your issuance of Post Office Services Transmittal Letter 120, of January 7, 1963.

The particular wrong is section 134.82 and the wording "All sealed pieces mailed at the third-class postage rates must be legibly marked with the two words, 'third class.'"

Millions, perhaps billions, of shipping labels have been printed for general use during the past years with the wording: "Postmaster, contents, merchandise. This parcel may be opened for postal inspection if necessary. Return postage guaranteed."

To our own knowledge third-class matter bearing this slogan is now being marked postage due at the first-class rate. The most grievous part of this is that the postage-due balance is being collected from the intended recipient.

Clearly this is an injustice. This section of the Postal Manual hamstrings post offices throughout the Nation into the legal thievery of charging postage-due rates for all such third-class matter including any sealed packages up to 1 pound.

Sealed bulk mail which does not carry the marking "third class" is likewise charged, even though it is obvious by the very use of the bulk mail permit that the intent of the sender is to post the pieces third class rather than first class.

It is our deep conviction that this little-known section of the postal regulations is being used to glean untold amounts of moneys deviously milked from unsuspecting business firms and general patrons of the U.S. postal service.

Sincerely,

AL. J. SCHANSBERG,
*Publisher.*
C. ROGER GERNERT,
*Circulation Manager.*

## The Sculptor of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. JENSEN, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I wish to express what I believe to be the satisfaction of this House that a citizen of this country, Oskar Hansen, after whose name we appended a noble phrase, "sculptor of liberty," on the cornerstone of the monument to the alliance and victory, at Yorktown, Va., has now been accorded similar, signal honors, abroad.

His name has been inscribed among the Immortal Four Hundred, as a life fellow of the International Institute of Arts and Letters.

I have long felt that Oskar would inevitably bring this, and other similar honors, to add luster to our country. In order to underscore the many reasons why this should be so, I extend my remarks by including in the RECORD quotations from the book, "Beckoning Desert," Prentice-Hall, Inc., publishers, by the distinguished critic and author, on the staff of the Los Angeles Times, Edward Maddin Ainsworth.

I include the quotations from the writings of Edward Maddin Ainsworth in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STALLION'S HEAD

At the entrance, in the place of honor, where every visitor to the gem room of the Smithsonian Institution in Washington must see it, stands a special pedestal with a glass case upon it. In the glass case is the head of an Arabian stallion, carved in turquoise. The large size of the carving, to those who know turquoise, is unbelievable. Yet there it is, the fiery embodiment of the king of horses, nostrils flaring, great eyes ablaze, the inward curve of the face emblematic of the breed, the whole statue bespeaking the bursting arrogance of the triumphant male from the ancient deserts of the Mohammedan world.

I know a story about that piece of turquoise.

Oskar J. W. Hansen, for me the peer of American sculptors and a transplanted Norseman of such gargantuan attainments that I often wonder whether he leaped through space to our century from a more heroic age, was catapulted into my vision for the first time on a day of splendid sunshine in the Arizona desert in 1939–40. I say catapulted advisedly. Oskar Hansen cannot merely move. He projects himself. He becomes a missile. Life is his target.

As he was catapulted into my sight, at Boulder City near Hoover Dam on this particular summer day, he was heading with our mutual friend John Hilton for an obscure spot known as Chloride, Ariz. Into the whirlwind preparations for this impromptu expedition I was sucked as into a vortex. Before I quite realized what was happening I was introduced to Hansen by Hilton, provided a seat in a truck, handed a miner's pick, and whisked across the countryside through Joshua trees toward our objective. Oskar Hansen, with his large, animated face, flashing eyes, expressive tongue and slight accent, swept us along in a torrent of conversation.

It developed that we were in search of mineral specimens.

As we proceeded, I began to become aware of the stature of the man whom I had just met. His booming laugh and devastating wit alone were enough to inform me that I was in the presence of no ordinary mortal. When he lapsed into serious discussion it was as though he walked through the wide doors of the world's knowledge and handed out largess to his listeners with kingly gestures. Never have I met one who so humbly shared the greatness of his spirit with those around him. Never have I seen him condescend, never seek to shame one who knew less than he.

He was engaged at that particular moment upon two projects of extraordinary nature. One was the completion of the placing on the Navada side of Hoover Dam of two 32-foot winged bronze figures typifying the American Republic and the achievements of the engineering profession in creating the dam and Lake Mead. These figures, the largest single-cast bronzes in history, he had created after winning a national competition of U.S. leading sculptors.

His other undertaking was the making of a bronze and marble "Timetable of the Universe" at the base of the statues, to anchor for posterity the exact moment at which Hoover Dam had been dedicated. * * *

Chloride itself is situated at the entrance to the so-called Mineral Park between Boulder City and Kingman. Mineral Park is one of the Nation's most productive areas, boasting the possession of gold, silver, lead, zinc, copper, turquoise, amethyst, and other metals and gems, all within a few miles of each other. Many of the turquoise mines are said to have been worked by the Aztecs, and even perhaps their predecessors, way back in prehistoric times.

The combination of so many minerals and gems, all raw materials for sculpture or figure casting, had stirred the artistic feelings of Hansen despite the unromantic nomenclature of Chloride itself. On this day he was scouting for any sort of material which might look promising for sculpture.

As we drove through the increasing heat, Hansen disclosed to us his concept of basic sculpture.

"I can always see the figure I want to carve inside the stone," he said. "It is just a matter of peeling the outside, like taking the skin off an orange."

I was trying to absorb the simplicity of this idea, incidentally trying to make up my mind whether Hansen was serious or joking. * * * We embarked with added enthusiasm on the search of sculpturing materials. I had no idea what we were looking for, but by now I was beginning to enter into the spirit of the occasion. * * *

Within an hour we were hot on the trail of something which sounded too fantastic to be true. A grizzled ex-miner, who had lost all his teeth but not his powers of description, told us he knew where there was a piece of turquoise as big as a football. Allowing for the inevitable exaggeration expected from the mining gentry, we were still intrigued enough to ask its location. * * *

It all happened within 5 minutes then.

Hansen spoke to the resident of the shack, a patriarchal character who looked as if he should be playing Moses in a film rather than living in Chloride. The old fellow nodded, went to some secret hiding place and came back with a burlap sack.

From this he carefully extracted an object. It was the turquoise, living up to advance billing. Here it lay, before our eyes, gleaming with that unmistakable color halfway between sky and sea. It was as large as the two doubled fists of a large man. * * *

The patriarch was reasonable under the Hansen persuasion. Money passed. We reentered the car.

"Drive like hades," urged Hansen in a whisper, "before he changes his mind."

Fondly, Hansen held the unbelievable piece of turquoise in his hand and looked at it with a faraway expression on his face. Hilton and I watched him curiously.

"I see the head of an Arabian stallion in here," Hansen said, almost to himself. * * * This is what he saw. It is now in the place of honor in the national gem collection. * * *

The next day I saw the two heroic bronze sculptures at the Hoover Dam. Set against the sky and rocky cliff which serves as a backdrop, they are identical, Hansen explained, because "they represent the rulers and the people, and in this American democracy the rulers and the people are the same."

The figures look down on the astronomical chart.

This amazing creation, spread out over a large marble mosaic floor was intended to anchor in time the exact moment of the dedication of Hoover Dam, September 30, 1935, so that future astronomers could tell the conjunction of the planets and stars and, from them, calculate the date. The dedication, though, was far from being the only event chronicled. Every important happening for 5,000 years of recorded history, including the age of the pyramids, the beginning of the Christian era and other "time spots" was included. In addition, the course of the earth for the next 20,000 years was charted.

The mosaic floor on which the stars and planets were laid out was made up of black, white and grey marble and the heavenly bodies were represented by bronze castings made by Hansen himself. The path of the earth during a platonic (or great year) was traced in relation to events, planets and solar systems. A platonic year consists of 25,694.8 ordinary years.

Hansen had made hundreds of thousands of intricate astronomical calculations during the 5 years required to evolve the map of the heavens. He explained that at the end of a platonic year the earth would be in the same relative position as on the date of the dedication of the dam.

I was curious to find out why a sculptor also was so avid an astronomer. Hansen gave most of the credit to his longtime friend, the late Dr. Albert A. Michelson of Chicago, who was internationally known for

his experiments in calculating the speed of light. * * *

Naturally, I did not obtain the full story of Oskar Hansen in the few days of my assignment at Hoover Dam. Even now, after nearly three decades, I still have not been able to absorb all the multitudinous details of his crammed and achievement studded career. Through those decades, though, I have learned enough to list him as the only genius I have known. * * *

Then, before long, the desert interlude did indeed come to an end for all of us. Each went back to his own task, regretting that there were no more opportunities to participate in desert trips and campfire sessions. * * *

Oskar returned to Virginia to take up other creative tasks. He acquired a vast tract of ground of tremendous historical and sentimental value, a mountain portion of the original Thomas Jefferson estate, across the highway from Monticello. He designed and largely built a futuristic structure containing delicate electric ovens for the gem work which he liked to do, such as enameling on gold with pulverized gems—a virtually lost art dating back past medieval times. * * *

Included in the decorations were cacti of all kinds from the Arizona desert, nurtured in a huge solarium.

I heard of his works and his progress through various channels, but the years slipped by without the opportunity presenting itself for us to meet again. At last I heard that Oskar was embarked upon the most prodigious undertaking of his career. He had been granted a contract, by the Congress of the United States, to create a gigantic new figure of liberty for the top of the monument to the Alliance and Victory, at Yorktown, marking the successful conclusion of the American Revolution on the site of the last battle where General Cornwallis surrendered.

On a trip East I went to see Oskar in his studio to observe the almost unbelievable task of the carving of Liberty from two solid blocks of granite, one weighing 23,000 pounds, the other 11,489.

I asked him to put down in writing what Liberty meant to him. This is his reply, penned in the solarium amid the desert cacti:

"I like to remind you that the brute strength of this granite block from the primal crust of the earth which we quarried at Mount Airy is also the result of the thought and spirit of the Great Sculptor and was fashioned by His mind while 'darkness lay over the bosom of the deep.' A granite block is, therefore, more than just a large stone; it is a form of capital asset of the spirit, His spirit, which remains with us always.

"What is the face of Liberty? What character molds her features? On this Pantop Mountain in the Albemarle, on soil once hallowed by the feet of Patrick Henry and Thomas Jefferson, it is more likely that the true nature of Liberty may be perceived than on any similar spot on earth, outside Mount Sinai.

"The victory at Yorktown was a victory of the spirit. There is spirit in the face of the Liberty which will stand again at Yorktown.

"This figure of Liberty which I am bringing out of the granite is larger than Michaelangelo's David. One may accomplish, out of this 4-billion-year-old matrix, only that which has made a well-nigh indelible impression upon one's own mind.

"It is not completed, in a moment of sudden inspiration, with a line of the pencil or the stroke of a brush. Required is the iron will of a consistent and wholly dedicated purpose. Day by day and chip by chip, one must grow to the stature of the image one brings into form. The emotions which she may evoke in the beholder must be questioned in turn.

"When the Liberty of America again graces her shaft at York, it is my prayer that every American may search her face and find there the suggested presence of his own mother and of the mother of his sons. In the face of that reality men have ever sought reassurance for doing that which life requires and for the approval which shapes our conduct for that day when we may stand with clean hands and a shining face before the Great White Throne of God."

Hansen did not elaborate upon his mention of Michaelangelo's David, but he could have done so. Actually, "Liberty" was the largest single figure carving ever undertaken by one man alone in the history of the world, according to any historical records now known. Liberty measured 14 feet and 2 inches. Her completed weight was 25,000 pounds. She weighed much more than stated, in the rough.

When I heard Oskar speak of what Liberty meant to him, when I sensed the full force of his mental and physical powers going into the creation of the symbolic statue, I realized fully for the first time what genuine freedom has meant to Americans who have come here from other lands and gained citizenship in our Republic.

I went up to Washington from Oskar's studio and took time for a visit to the Smithsonian Institution.

At the entrance to the gem room I encountered the Arabian stallion.

It, too, spoke of Liberty in its own way. The proud, unconquered head burst upon view as the embodiment of freedom in the desert, the incarnate spirit of the untamed.

I closed my eyes and seemed to be transported at once to the brilliance of an Arizona day—to be surrounded by sun and sage, hearing the booming laugh of Oskar.

Then, once more, I gazed upon the stallion's head.

I knew a story about that piece of turquoise. * * *

## J.F.K.: The Job Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. DON EDWARDS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, there is a most thoughtful editorial analysis of the President's state of the Union message in the January 15, 1963, edition of my hometown newspaper, the San Jose Mercury.

Under unanimous consent, I present the editorial for inclusion in the RECORD herewith and commend it to the attention of my colleagues and other citizens throughout the country:

J.K.F.: THE JOB AHEAD

President Kennedy's state of the Union message lived up to its advance billing; it dwelt heavily on the necessity for a tax cut this year and for maintenance of cold war military strength.

This, it seems to us, reflects a reasonable reaction to the state of the world and of the Federal Union as they exist today, not as theorists might wish them to exist.

It is, of course, too early to criticize the President's program in detail; it hasn't been submitted in detail. But the hints contained in yesterday's state of the Union message provide reason for cautious optimism.

For example, President Kennedy appeared to recognize that congressional conservatives will give his tax cut proposals short shrift unless there is a companion effort to reduce Federal spending. He promised, therefore, to keep domestic programs for next year under this fiscal year's spending levels. This is a step in the right direction.

It is also a step in the right direction when the President says, as he did in the state of the Union message, that labor pressure for a shorter workweek is inimical to economic growth and will not receive White House support.

In this regard, President Kennedy noted that his proposed net tax reduction of $10 billion over the next 3 years would "mean tens of billions of dollars more each year in production, profits, wages, and public revenues.

"It would mean an end to the persistent slack which has kept unemployment at or above 5 percent for 61 out of 62 months—and an end to the growing pressures for such restrictive measures as the 35-hour week, which alone would increase hourly labor costs by as much as 14 percent, start a new wage-price spiral of inflation, and undercut our efforts to compete with other nations."

We concur most heartily in these sentiments.

We concur, too, in the President's observation that internal strife in the Communist world gives the West cause for hope which must be tempered with caution.

"A dispute over how best to bury the free world is no grounds for Western rejoicing," is the way the President put it. We agree.

In light of this, it is sensible that the budget to be submitted later this week contains an estimated $50 billion for defense expenditures out of a $99 billion total.

And the President spoke sense, too, when he in effect urged our NATO allies to concentrate on developing their own conventional forces as a complement to the U.S. nuclear strike capability. In the President's words:

"Threats of massive retaliation may not deter piecemeal aggression—and a line of destroyers in quarantine or a division of well-equipped men on a border, may be more useful to our real security than the multiplication of awesome weapons beyond all rational need."

Take it all in all, President Kennedy's state of the Union message is a hopeful statement.

All Americans hope the President's optimism proves to be justified. A more meaningful appraisal must await the details.

## Robert S. Kerr

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the sudden death of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, the Honorable Robert S. Kerr, has left a deep mark on all of us.

This past session of the 87th Congress, all of us marveled at the stamina and skill of this great Senator as he directed the fate of the most important pieces of legislation to come to the floor of the other body.

There is no question that Bob Kerr was a self-made man, a go-getter. At times his foes sharply criticized his actions, but Bob Kerr feared no man.

He was, as one newsman wrote, "beyond doubt, the most powerful single Senator—and by himself more powerful than most of them in groups."

It did not take one long to know where Bob Kerr stood on a certain piece of legislation. All he needed was an explanation of the legislation and he would form his own opinion on its merits, and immediately would become its champion if he thought the bill was worthwhile.

This was brought home repeatedly in my own personal dealings with Bob Kerr. In the 1st session of the 87th Congress, Senator Bob Kerr, as chairman of the Public Works Committee, became one of the strongest advocates for the Delaware River Basin compact and helped lead the fight for its enactment by that body when it was threatened by a battle over public versus private power.

Outside of the Halls of Congress, Bob Kerr was a personable, knowledgeable individual who commanded the respect of a multitude of friends.

His every action was made in behalf of his constituents in that great State of Oklahoma, where he was born in a log cabin. His unique talents brought him widespread acclaim and his climb politically was compared with that of President Lincoln.

All of us, and the people of Oklahoma, will greatly miss this distinguished Senator. I join my colleagues in extending heartfelt condolences to Senator Kerr's devoted wife, Grayce Breene, and his daughter and three sons. Their grief is shared by all of us who had the good fortune and privilege to serve with this outstanding American.

## What Is the Administration Covering Up Regarding Our Foolish Policy in Cuba?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the news and editorials of the past several days are fraught with terror as to what is happening to the once powerful United States in our policy regarding Cuba. The President continues to tell the country what a great victory he has won there, but his brave words are followed by a rewriting of the historical record of what happened at the Bay of Pigs by his brother, the Attorney General, and by Communist boasts of how they took the United States in on the Cuban deal, and the worried questioning of talented newspapermen who are bringing to light that there was not indeed a victory in Cuba, but what may be a tremendous defeat. Mr. Speaker, I think it is imperative that Congress investigate our Cuban policy and demand of the administration a true statement of what has been accomplished and what we intend to do about increasing Soviet military expansion there.

As a part of these remarks, under unanimous consent, I would like to include a powerful column by Henry J. Taylor in the Dallas Morning News, an equally powerful piece by David Lawrence in the Washington Evening Star. I would also like to include the lead of a news article written by William L. Ryan, Associated Press staff writer in Berlin, in which the German Communist leader Walter Ulbricht tells of Communist plans for Cuba and the rest of the Western Hemisphere. Finally, to complete this dismal picture, I include a new article by Earl H. Voss, staff writer for the Washington Evening Star, telling of our abandonment of low-level aerial reconnaissance of Cuba. Mr. Speaker, in heaven's name, what is the administration trying to do?

The articles follow:

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, Jan. 21, 1963]

ABOUT SOVIET TROOPS—PENTAGON WHISPERS CUBA CONFESSION

(By Henry J. Taylor)

The Pentagon has whispered a confession; whispered it to achieve minimum notice and yet amend the rigged record in Washington's manipulated news.

This column repeatedly stated that throughout the White House campaign to call the Russians in Cuba "technicians," Mr. Kennedy knew these were heavily armored, fully equipped Soviet combat troops, more than 10,000 strong. Our Central Intelligence Agency had even identified the troops' shoulder patches. Our Moscow Embassy's military attaché had confirmed these designations as elite elements of the Red army. Moreover, Castro had (and still has) an estimated 144 missile launchers, 24 bases, and at least 500 antiaircraft missiles, including many as "hot" and intricate as anything we possess.

Soviet submarine fishing base construction on the Isle of Pines, Seguanea Bay, continues apace. So does the military adaptation of the great Caverna de Santo Tomas, Caverna del Suisenor, Escaleras de Jaruco and Caguanes Caves, undetectable from the air.

MISSILES BEGAN ARRIVING IN 1961

In addition, the big missiles began arriving as early as November 1961—a fact the White House no longer denies but has never admitted.

Impeccable Cuban underground sources, dead right from the very beginning, still insist Khrushchev placed 86 long-range atomic missiles there, balanced against the 42 that the Pentagon "is sure" Khrushchev took out. But the whole charade was supported by the governmental brigade of tax-paid publicity agents pumping out misinformation like bouncing nymphs or charging Valkyries in yellow braids and 10-league boots.

That is what happened and that is the noisy side of the manipulated news technique. Now the manipulator's problem is to square up the noisy record as quietly as possible and thus ultimately challenge those who claim the public has been misled.

As the French would say, they have a sea to drink up.

Notice the method regarding the Soviet troops still in Cuba: No press release. No public statement. No leaks to "fill in" newsmen or a TV interview to bring the people closed to the Presidency. Why, even the state of the Union message reveals nothing about how Cuba remains a looming bastion fringed with fire or the downhill negotiations that still allow this result 90 miles from our shores.

HOW THE STORY SHIFTED

First was the White House insistence that there were no Soviet soldiers there. Then the President's, oh, well, perhaps there are "two or three thousand." Finally, months later, the Pentagon confirmation that the 10,000 was true. And now the Pentagon has been instructed to state, but only in reply to inquiries, that yes, Mr. Kennedy's estimate of Cuba-based Soviet combat forces is "somewhat higher than had been thought."

How much higher, you ask? Oh, quite a bit. The Pentagon's official admission as of the day of the President's State of the Union message is 17,000. That message stated "while danger continues, a deadly threat has been removed." Has it?

Moreover, Assistant Secretary of Defense Arthur Sylvester finally agreed to reveal that at least 20,000 Soviet soldiers were in Cuba at the hurry, hurry why? moment of lifting the blockade. By the Pentagon's own calculation less than 3,000 have left. Why?

Secretary of State Dean Rusk, in turn, falls right in line with the whole news-manipulation program. Testifying before a Senate Foreign Relations Committee closed session on January 11 he kept up the same old charade—the hair-splitting fiddle-faddle that the President hadn't given a commitment not to invade Cuba. Stalwart Senators FRANK J. LAUSCHE, Democrat, of Ohio, and KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, protested Mr. Rusk's "ambiguities."

CYCLE STARTS WITH RATIONALIZED LIE

The truth seldom bounds out of any political forest like a leaping deer. It must be sought. This is the function of the free press. And under the administration's manipulation policy it is admittedly impossible to accept even our highest officials' statements at face value.

The rationalized lie starts the cycle. Then the denial compounds the felony. Then the adjusted lie adds to the crime. Finally the ultimate confirmation that it was all false from the beginning is forced out only by exceedingly unfashionable persistence.

The Communists are ideologists but they are not idiots. Khrushchev, of course, knows the truth. The only people being fooled are the American people.

---

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star]

UNITED STATES AND THE BAY OF PIGS FIASCO—QUESTION OF MILITARY COMPETENCE OR CIVILIAN INTERFERENCE IS RAISED

(By David Lawrence)

The American people are entitled to know whether the Chiefs of their armed services are incompetent or whether, in strictly military operations, they are being interfered with by civilians in the Government.

A congressional investigation of just what happened before the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba took place in April 1961, is more than ever necessary now, because of what is being disclosed as the "true story" of the fiasco. For unless the responsibility of the U.S. Chiefs of Staff during military operations is clearly fixed, the capacity of the United States to prevent or resist armed attacks in this hemisphere may be open to question.

More than 300,000 men of our armed services were mobilized last October inside the United States for a possible invasion of Cuba in order to get rid of the Soviet missile bases there. But there is no way to judge whether the military Chiefs even then had the full authority to act and just what restrictions were placed upon them which could have affected the success of that expedition.

Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, who, because he is a brother of the President, is regarded as the administration's authoritative spokesman in many matters outside his own department, has just given two interviews on the Cuban fiasco, one to the Knight

newspapers and the other to U.S. News & World Report.

The two interviews dovetail, though they do not cover all of the same points. The Attorney General told David Kraslow, Washington correspondent of the Knight newspapers, that there had been no invasion plan completed during Mr. Eisenhower's term. He said: "There was just a general concept. The logistics and the details were worked out after the President [Kennedy] took office."

Added interest has developed now in this whole subject, because many of the Cuban officers of the invasion force, who were recently ransomed have been telling Americans that the United States had assured them of air cover. Attorney General Kennedy makes quite a point of the fact that "no U.S. air cover" was ever promised. Technically, this is correct. But the United States was fully cognizant of the air support the Cubans were supposed to have. Yet this was inadequate. Attorney General Kennedy said in his interview in U.S. News & World Report:

"The first point is that there was not U.S. air cover and none was withdrawn. In fact, the President didn't withdraw any air cover for the landing forces, United States or otherwise.

"What happened was this: One air attack had been made on Saturday on Cuban airports. There was a flurry at the United Nations and elsewhere and, as a result, U.S. participation in the matter was coming to the surface. This surfacing was contrary to the preinvasion plan. There was supposed to be another attack on the airports on Monday morning.

"The President was called about whether another attack which had been planned should take place. As there was this stir about the matter, he gave instructions that it should not take place at that time unless those having the responsibility felt that it was so important it had to take place, in which case they should call him and discuss it further. And that's what was postponed. It wasn't air cover of the beaches or landings. And, in fact, the attack on the airports took place later that day."

The air cover provided was from a base in Central America. What part the U.S. Government played in organizing it is not disclosed. In the middle of a military operation, however, you can't make a long-distance call to the White House and discuss the next move. The anti-Castro forces were sure air cover was coming from somewhere.

The Attorney General was asked who did the planning. He declared that "the plan that finally went into effect was approved by our military—the Pentagon, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as well as the Central Intelligence Agency." He added that, while the Joint Chiefs "approved" the plan, "the responsibility for the planning lay primarily with the CIA," and that, since the President had to give final approval to the plan, he had accepted the blame.

In both interviews, the Attorney General said that U.S. air power was to have been used only if the ships transporting the Cuban invasion force had been detected by Castro before they reached the target area and were attacked on the high seas on their way back to Central America. This is the explanation given for the presence of U.S. warships, including an aircraft carrier, in the vicinity of the Bay of Pigs on the day of the invasion. Yet it is asserted that before the invasion the President had "made it clear" that U.S. armed forces, including airpower, would not be used.

In the interview in the Knight newspapers, the Attorney General said, "The plan that was used was fully cleared by the CIA and the Joint Chiefs of Staff."

But what does "cleared" mean? Do the Joint Chiefs take responsibility for any such plan as was employed?

Listing the major "mistakes," Mr. Kennedy added: "There was not sufficient air cover at the beach. That was a mistake. There were not enough men and equipment. That was a mistake. Underestimating the T-33's (Castro's airplanes) that was a serious mistake. The planning was inadequate, just inadequate."

But who did all this planning, and why wasn't someone in the U.S. Air Force able to say in advance whether the T-33's had the capacity to carry rockets? These were the U.S. planes originally given to the Batista regime in Cuba.

The important "details" have never been divulged, as there has been a constant coverup. But if Congress now fails to make a searching inquiry, with testimony available to the public, another military fiasco could occur, especially if the same "military planners' are still in command at the Pentagon or elsewhere.

---

REDS WILL FLOURISH IN CUBA AND EXPAND, ULBRICHT SAYS

(By William L. Ryan)

BERLIN, January 15.—East German Communist Leader Walter Ulbricht told world Communist chieftains today that communism will continue to flourish in Cuba and intends to extend itself in the Western Hemisphere.

With Soviet Premier Khrushchev listening from the platform, the spade-bearded East German denounced Red China's attacks on the Russian leader's policies. He credited him with saving the world from nuclear war by compromising the Cuban crisis with President Kennedy.

In his opening address to East Germany's Sixth Communist Party Congress, Mr. Ulbricht also proposed a vague solution for the problem of divided Berlin. He said the United Nations flag should replace the NATO flag in West Berlin, but that any such arrangement must recognize East German sovereignty, especially access routes on the land, water and in the air.

ASNS INDIAN SETTLEMENT

Mr. Ulbricht also called on Peking and India to settle their border dispute at once. He criticized the Chinese Reds for launching their border operation against India in October without consulting other Communist states.

Mr. Khrushchev's handling of the Cuban crisis, Mr. Ulbricht said, prevented the world from experiencing the horrors of nuclear war. Mr. Khrushchev nodded agreement.

Mr. Ulbricht maintained Mr. Khrushchev kept communism alive in Cuba and gave it an opportunity to spread in the Western Hemisphere.

"There was a compromise," he told the party congress. "President Kennedy had to abandon his idea of aggression. * * *

"Cuba was freed of the threat of aggression and is now able to build up its country on the basis of socialism."

---

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star]

LOW-LEVEL CUBA FLIGHTS DISCONTINUED BY UNITED STATES

(By Earl H. Voss)

The United States has ended low-level aerial reconnaissance of Cuba and now relies exclusively on high-flying U-2's to keep an eye on Soviet and Cuban military moves in the Caribbean, according to American officials.

It was new evidence gathered by U-2's that caused American analysts to raise their estimate of Soviet forces in Cuba from upwards of 10,000 to 16,000 to 17,000.

Soviet-manned antiaircraft missile batteries in Cuba, which proved they can reach the unusual altitudes at which U-2's fly by knocking one out of the sky, are not now firing at the planes on their regular reconnaissance flights over the island.

The administration has not felt so sure, however, that the low-level Cuban antiaircraft weapons, supplied by the Soviet Union but believed to be under Prime Minister Castro's control, would hold their fire indefinitely if low-level reconnaissance were continued on a daily basis.

For this reason, the low-altitude flights have been suspended. They could, of course, be resumed if U-2 or other intelligence tips should acquire it.

Soviet Premier Khrushchev apparently is hoping to set an example, by withholding fire on the U-2's, in avoiding a direct clash between Soviet and American military forces.

President Kennedy ignored this principle which the Kremlin apparently hopes to establish, when he discovered Soviet nuclear missiles in Cuba. He interposed a U.S. naval blockade in the path of Soviet ships bound for Cuba.

The possibility of a clash between Soviet and American military forces again would be posed if there were an anti-Castro uprising in Cuba. The United States hardly could avoid a fight with Soviet forces if they tried to prop up Castro by crushing Cuban freedom fighters.

The range of other contingencies in which the United States might be forced to move against Soviet troops is being canvassed now.

President Kennedy's unwillingness to risk incidents between a low-level American plane and Castro-controlled antiaircraft batteries indicates, however, that the administration wants to choose carefully the circumstances under which it again directly challenges Soviet military power, if this ever is found to be necessary.

---

## Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, an article in the October 1962 issue of Fortune magazine entitled "The Priority of Politics Over Economics," casts considerable light on the fallacies of the economic theories of the New Frontier. In its emphasis on Government planning and direction of the economy as well as on heavy Federal spending, the New Frontier economic theorists misunderstand the dynamic nature of the free-market economy and the intricate functioning of the price, wage, and profit system. It is this free system that creates wealth and economic progress, as well as serving as an indispensable buttress to individual liberty. Government must maintain institutions and a climate favorable to growth, but healthy economic growth cannot be imposed from the top down. It must grow from the bottom up.

The Kennedy administration appears to believe that Government spending and control can bring faster economic growth and solve our still serious unemployment problem. Since the last fiscal year of the Eisenhower administration, Federal expenditures have increased from $76.5 billion to an estimated $93.7 billion in fiscal 1963. Yet the economy is still afflicted with an unsatisfactory rate of economic growth and a very high level of 5.8 percent of the civilian labor force unemployed.

As this article by John Davenport points out, Government spending may be regarded as the flywheel of the economy, but it cannot supply the motive power. That motive power resides in the creative energies of the people, and the most Government can do is help to release it. Under unanimous consent, I include the article, as follows:

THE PRIORITY OF POLITICS OVER ECONOMICS

(By John Davenport)

This month the anxiety that overhung the Nation's economy all through the summer will give way, at least momentarily, to the turbulence and excitement of a political campaign. Even as an off-year election, it will be an enormous expression of the national will: all the House seats (435) are at stake, 39 Senate seats, and 35 governorships. Parochial arguments in States and cities and the racket of personal political feuds will fill the air. But the man to whom the outcome will be most important, is the man who isn't running, President John F. Kennedy.

For while local issues will be mainly in the forefront, below the surface will always be the big, rocklike questions: the questions of jobs, of prices, of profits, of Government spending, of taxes. No one is more aware of this than the President, who is taking his case directly to hundreds of thousands of people, attempting to resell his various programs of medicare, urban renewal, and electric power expansion. It could be said that he began his campaign in August in his televised report on the economy. Then he found the economy good enough so that no immediate tax cut was needed. But he promised that in 1963 he will present a bill to Congress that will include an "across-the-board top-to-bottom cut in both corporate and personal income taxes," and will also include "long-needed tax reform that logic and equity demand." This promise of tax reduction obviously has enormous political appeal. It will also be one of the most bitterly debated issues in the new Congress that will be elected this fall.

For quite apart from their obvious and necessary function in government, taxes have become in the last quarter of a century an instrument of social welfare, a weapon of intervention in the economy, a pervasive factor in business decisions, and a demonstration of the intent and power of Washington, and it is impossible, of course, to separate tax reform from the issue of Federal spending. When Harry Hopkins said, "We shall spend and spend and tax and tax and elect and elect," he expressed a cynicism that must pervert and defeat any effort to remedy the tax structure. One test of John F. Kennedy's sincerity will be whether he has left this kind of cynicism behind.

But the greater test of the President's promise of tax reform and of his domestic policies turns on the question of whether he understands the nature of the American enterprise system and the unique system of government that has allowed enterprise to flourish. During the fifties, President Eisenhower clung to the salty philosophy that it was the function of Government to build the framework and to create the atmosphere in which business could prosper and so provide jobs and rising living standards. Ike was not too articulate in this belief; sometimes his metaphors about frames and atmosphere got pretty mixed. And in the end Federal expenditures got out of hand. Nevertheless, Eisenhower's attempt to delimit the functions of Government and relate them to the profit system was welcome and constructive after the Truman years. Now under John F. Kennedy there has been a "shift" in a different direction. How far has this shift gone? And, more important, on what kind of philosophy is it based?

JAMES MADISON PUT THE QUESTION

One paradox that must strike the inquirer at the beginning is that while Kennedy is the most politically minded of men when it comes to gathering votes, he has laid little emphasis on political theory as such. While doubtless an admirer of the Federalist papers, he has not in public, at least chewed over the great questions therein raised as to how a government, endowed with coercive power, can be prevented from misusing it and, in James Madison's phrase, can be obliged "to control itself." Nor does the President seem to have noted that to the architects of the republic, politics in the philosophic sense of the word had clear priority over what we today call economics. Because they took a certain view of man and his liberties, they favored strong but limited government, and in favoring such government, they more or less took for granted the virtues of a free economy. In a curious way the pragmatists and activists of our day have reversed this order of thinking. President Kennedy's politics seems to flow from his economics and his economics in turn forces the Government into a positive and expansive role.

Such expansion breathes through most of the multiple messages that the President has fired at Congress. It is also implicit in his constant talk of "moving America ahead." Under the elms of New Haven last June the President stated that the central problem of our time was "the practical management of the modern economy." And he then asked almost plaintively, "How, in sum, can we make our free economy work at full capacity—that is, provide adequate profits for enterprise, and adequate wages for labor, and adequate utilization of plant, and opportunity for all?" But who is the "we" of this strange, tortured question? And just how is a free economy to be made to do something? And is it really a prime function of such an economy to provide profits for enterprise? Surely matters are the other way around: in the right environment businessmen will as a matter of course seek a profit as the reward of risk taking and the producing of goods that the people demand, and this in turn will expand the economy.

NEW EXPERTS FOR OLD PLANS

Direct interference of the government in the economy is associated with another tendency—namely, reliance on "experts" and expertise. While calling for a dialog, the President said that the central domestic problems of our times "relate, not to basic clashes of philosophy or ideology, but to ways and means of reaching common goals—to research for sophisticated solutions to complex and obstinate issues." The idea implicit in this kind of statement is that economic problems should be left to technicians to solve without the emotional debate that has stirred the country in the past. The President himself doesn't always follow the rule: witness his impassioned plea for medicare. But, beyond this, it must be asked whether research and experts can really resolve basic issues without some kind of guidance. If experts are told to help solve the farm problem within the limits of freedom for the farmer, they will come up with one kind of solution. If they are given no directions they are all too apt to smuggle in their own values, and suggest some elaborate schemata of their own. It so happens that reliance on expertise has usually gone hand in hand with government planning of one kind or another. An expert who tells the government just to let things alone and let the free market take its course will not be earning his salary very long. The Russian Government is full of experts, precisely because it seeks to control every aspect of the economy.

There is nothing new, of course, about Government planning and interference with the market. Its famous practitioners can be traced through history. The Emperor Diocletian, for instance, tried price controls in Rome. King Richard started England on its long experiment with the Corn Laws. One of the great planners was Colbert, minister to King Louis XIV. It was against Colbert and his school that Adam Smith revolted in his "Wealth of Nations" published in the same year as the Declaration of Independence. In the United States, also, planning has a history. It was not so long ago, in the thirties, that the Technocrats under Howard Scott were preaching that modern economic problems are too complicated for the politicians or the population, and should be left to engineers. At about the same time the historian Charles A. Beard was calling for a "single national authority" that would, among other things, fix a "standard of life budget" for the American people and implement it with the aid of production experts. And the idea of planning dominated the NRA, with its codes for controlling prices, wages, and output, which the well-remembered Gen. Hugh (Iron Pants) Johnson strove mightily to uphold. Fortunately the codes were finally declared unconstitutional.

One person who saw through this whole cult of planning very early and tried to change things to a more hopeful direction was President Kennedy's good friend, Walter Lippmann. In his wonderful book, "The Good Society," published in 1937, he made a devastating attack on the planners of his day, arguing that they had missed the central economic development of the modern world. That development was the division of labor, which requires that the specialized work of one man be coordinated with that of another, and that the production of both be somehow linked to the freely choosing consumer. Such coordination, Lippmann held, cannot possibly be achieved by government directives, and those who believe it can are in a literal sense reactionary. Rather, the division of labor necessitates the very market economy that planners scorn, and requires a government that rules by law rather than by arbitrary decree. Wrote Lippmann: "It is no accident that the division of labor, common laws, the ideal of equal justice, the restraint of prerogative and privilege * * * should all have evolved together in the same regions of the earth. They are merely different aspects of the momentous change in which men have been passing out of their primitive self-sufficiency into the intricate interdependence of the great society."

THE VITAL CONNECTION

These philosophic reflections are of immense importance in judging various tendencies and programs put forward in the name of the New Frontier. For if the philosophy of the good society is right, the trouble with the New Frontiersman is not that he is too radical, but that he has missed the bus—or shall we say the jet?—of modern history. In our day government must wield great power in the national defense, in the maintenance of internal law and order, in the provision of a sound and dependable currency system; the functions of government are not fixed and immutable. But the dynamic force of progress is the free collaboration of individuals made possible by the widening of the competitive market and the intricate functioning of the price, wage, and profit system. It is this system, not the directives of government, that creates wealth and work in the modern world. And it is this system, with its wide dispersion of power and decision, that serves as an indispensable buttress to human liberty.

The President has never given sufficient stress to this vital interconnection of political and economic liberty. While his administration has blown cold and hot toward businessmen as a group, it has not consistently upheld free-market principles. The admin-

istration favors freer trade abroad, and in his message on domestic transportation the President recommended less, not more, government interference. But in general the New Frontier's domestic policy points in a different direction. The newly elected President placed great emphasis on setting up national goals for the United States, which always somehow implied more government power and decision. A theme song of the campaign was that the United States had been growing to slowly and that the Democrats would take measures to speed things up.

Growth and economic progress have always been characteristic of the American economy, but there are two ways of approaching these desiderata. One is to assume that healthy economic growth basically comes from the bottom up rather than being imposed from the top down. On this view it is the function of government to maintain institutions favorable to growth—for instance, property rights, contracts, and sound money—letting the growth itself occur as the result of the activity of the citizens of the country. The other approach is to make government itself responsible for economic growth and to set up definite "targets" for this performance, which, if not achieved by private action, must be achieved by more massive doses of government intervention.

The New Frontiersmen favor the target approach, and there has been endless argument about output gaps, defined as the difference between what the economy has done and might have done going full blast. In the process the true meaning of growth has been obscured. It is the assumption of many calculations in this area that growth is simply the piling up of goods and services as measured by the gross national product. But if this is all there is to progress, then a society that simply built pyramids by the use of slave labor might be said to be growing just as fast as a society that put its resources to more constructive use. Again, many economies have grown rapidly in wartime if one counts the output of munitions as economic goods. The fact is that the whole concept of growth is meaningless unless one allows purposes and values into the equation. True growth involves, not just the piling up of goods, but the widening of human options. It means producing goods that people want and freely choose, and the virtue of the market lies precisely in giving the consumer this vote.

A CARTEL FOR AGRICULTURE

The planned economy by definition denies that such choice is important. Russia grows—by producing the goods its government thinks will be best for the population. The Kennedy administration came closest to advocating this kind of specific planning in the case of agriculture. Ever since the depression thirties the Government, of course, has been propping various farm prices above market levels and creating surpluses by so doing. Under the Eisenhower administration there was recognition at least of the fact that the proper solution to the so-called farm problem was to lower support prices and to reduce the number and extent of specific controls. This policy, strongly endorsed by the Farm Bureau, was never given a fair trial or enough fighting support by Eisenhower and Secretary Benson, but at least the direction of the thinking was correct.

The Kennedy administration in its first 2 years simply abandoned any idea of returning agriculture to the marketplace. Its program was to hold price supports high and to extend them to more and more commodities. Then, in an effort to prevent overproduction and surplus, it asked for more and more controls on the number of acres to be planted and the amount of each crop that could be marketed. Such a program, if ever finally enacted, would collectivize or cartelize agriculture completely. Moreover, its benefits, if they can be called such, would tend to go, not to the farmer who might need help, but to the richest producers. The whole history of price-support operations is that they put money in the pockets of the well-to-do commercial farmers. They do little for the marginal family that consumes most of what it produces on the land. (And as the Billie Sol Estes case dramatizes, even the present system of Government controls is a haven for sharpers and speculators and just plain crooks.)

Congress refused to go along with the New Frontier's more stringent controls, and the farm mess remains as bad as ever. The point is that the Kennedy-Freeman plan aims in the wrong direction. Running through the President's initial message to Congress on agriculture was the old, tired idea that there is a fair income for the American farmer and a fair price for what he produces, and that Government can somehow guarantee both. These concepts quite literally come out of the Middle Ages. They imply a completely static view of society in which classes are fixed and each class deserves a certain cut or share out of total income. But America is not like that. The farmer of yesterday is the mechanic of today and maybe the lawyer or entrepreneur of tomorrow. As the result of this constant change farm families now constitute only 7.7 percent of all families as against 30.7 percent in 1910, and meanwhile farm output per man-hour has quadrupled through mechanical invention and advances in chemistry. The Government should not interfere in this process by tampering with prices. For in doing so it jams the mechanism through which progress is made; and its controls strike directly at individual freedom. In agriculture the Kennedy administration was trying to turn the clock back all the way.

Elsewhere in the economy the New Frontier was less committed to specific planning but some of the fallacies inherent in its farm program reappeared. As in the case of agriculture, the administration seemed to conceive of both industry and labor as constituting separate and almost hermetically sealed groups in our society, forgetting again that individuals from one group are constantly passing into the other, and likewise forgetting that the rational purpose of the economic process is to serve the consumer, who is literally everyman. This group approach is reminiscent of the kind of thinking that pervaded both the New Deal and the Fair Deal. Society is thought of not as a coherent whole, in which individuals and their basic rights are important, but as a series of powerful producer pressure blocs. Besides the farmer there is big business and big labor, and, of course, big Government, which somehow must reconcile conflicting group claims.

But whereas the administration has been trying to shove agricultural prices up, it attempted in industry to hold "strategic" prices stable, while putting only a nominal pressure on wages and costs. The most dramatic expression of this, of course, occurred in steel where the President intervened to bring about a wage settlement, and apparently took it for granted that there would be no price increase. When Big Steel attempted to raise prices, he launched the attack which shook all of industry, and was a cause—though probably not the main cause—of the stock market break in May.

Administration spokesmen professed to be astonished at this reaction from the country, thereby showing themselves to be somewhat naive. For businessmen saw the intervention as an attack on the whole price-and-profit system, and as a blatant misuse of executive power. As Charles Reich of the Yale Law School wrote in the New Republic: "The evidence is overwhelming that the actions taken by the President were primarily for the purpose of intimidating and coercing the steel industry. * * * Such use of power, whether its objectives are good or bad, is dangerous. * * * It means that people offend the President at their peril."

THE WOBBLY GUIDEPOSTS

While reacting violently to the attempted increase in steel prices, the administration was far more tolerant as regards wages. In this matter its Council of Economic Advisers last January staked out its famous guideposts for noninflationary wage and price behavior. The central guide was that wages in all industries could rise with overall, or national, productivity without producing inflation. As noted last month, this guide was surrounded by many modifications and was promised on the idea that the economy was actually nearing a state of full employment. Few labor leaders or, for that matter, businessmen troubled to read this fine print. They simply assumed that the Council said wages could rise with normal productivity, and they assumed that this productivity was 3 percent. It is no coincidence that wage settlements so far this year have averaged about 3 percent, with fringe benefits piled on top. Meanwhile, productivity, which spurted sharply in mid-1961, has tended to level out.

These are scarcely the conditions that favor a rapid rise in employment and a diminution of unemployment, which is one of the chief goals of administration policy. For employment depends on profits and profit expectations on the part of employers, and profits in turn are the margin between costs and prices. It was the argument of Lord Keynes, whose thinking has strongly affected New Frontiersmen, that the best way to produce more employment is to have prices rise faster than wages, and this was the whole point of his "reflationary" spending theories. Again, if wages and prices are both stable over a period when productivity is advancing, then the latter may improve profits and so improve job opportunities. But where prices are stable and wages rise with or faster than productivity, as they have been doing, it is very difficult to put more men to work.

THE SPENDING CURE-ALL

The uncomfortabel truth, which few people like to acknowledge, is that maladjustment in wage rates is a positive cause of unemployment, perhaps its most important cause. Labor is not a commodity, but man's work certainly is a commodity, and in this sense a wage is a price. It is perfectly evident that if a businessman sets his price too high he loses his market. It should be equally evident that if wages are pushed too high by union monopoly action, unemployment will follow, unless the government takes countervailing action, by trying to "float off" the unemployment through easy money and doses of government spending.

The administration from the beginning placed great emphasis on these monetary cures for unemployment but with indifferent success. For unemployment is still well above the 4-percent level, which the administration considers as its logical target, despite a big rise in spending. In the last budget year of the Eisenhower administration, fiscal 1960, Federal expenditures ran to $76.5 billion and the budget showed a surplus of $1.2 billion. In the first full budget year of the Kennedy administration, fiscal 1962, Federal expenditures ran to $89 billion and the deficit to $6.3 billion. Nor do these figures tell the whole story. In addition to expenditures reflected in the formal budget are the cash outlays of the social security funds. And in addition to all this Federal activity there is the spending of the States

and local communities. In the calendar year of 1961 the total of all this spending ran to a colossal $150 billion or to 28 percent of the gross national product. This compared with total Government spending of $61 billion in 1950, when expenditures ran to only 21 percent of product.

Surely if Government activity was the whole cure for unemployment and the harbinger of prosperity, the United States would be in prime condition. In fact, while the size of Government has been increasing, the pace of growth has been slowing down. Says Raymond Saulnier, head of the Council of Economic Advisers under Eisenhower: "What recent history tells us about the effect of increases in Federal spending is not very favorable to the view that an economy such as ours can spend itself into prosperity via the Federal budget. * * * What this experience tells us is that if the environment is not favorable to an increase in private spending, an increase in Federal spending, even a large increase, is a well-nigh futile exercise."

A WORLD AT RISK

It can also be a dangerous exercise in view of the condition of the U.S. balance of payments abroad. If the United States were a closed economy, isolated from the rest of the world, then government spending, however wasteful, and government deficits, however potentially inflationary, might not matter so much. But this is, of course, not the position. The dollar is still the world's key currency, and foreigners hold some $19.5 billion worth of short-term claims, which theoretically could be presented for payment in gold. These claims have steadily increased because the United States has been unable to earn enough abroad to cover its outpayments. Last year the U.S. deficit ran to nearly $2.5 billion and the loss of gold to $857 million, and the drain continues.

The administration has taken a number of specific measures to correct the foreign balance and to staunch the gold flow—some good, some bad, and some indifferent. It has rightly tried, for instance, to persuade foreign governments to step up their own defense spending, thus allowing the United States to shave its enormous expenditures for oversea troops and installations. At the same time, however, it has continued to pour out foreign economic aid in profusion, much of which is wasted, while suggesting changes in the tax laws that would tend to restrict U.S. private foreign investment. Meanwhile Washington has tried to throw up an elaborate series of defenses for the dollar, including currency swaps and endless talks with foreign bankers. And the U.S. Treasury has begun maintaining positions in the forward exchange markets of the world to counter speculation against what was once supposed to be the world's strongest currency.

Whatever the merits of these latter stratagems, they fail to come to grips with the question: why should foreigners distrust the dollar and want to reduce their holdings? One reason undoubtedly is that in an effort to stimulate economic activity at home the United States has tended to maintain lower interest rates than prevail abroad. The second and broader reason for distrust of the dollar and indeed for the balance-of-payments gap itself has been a continuous inflationary bias within the United States due in part to its farm program, in part to labor demands, and in part to a succession of unbalanced budgets. In the long run a nation's foreign accounts simply mirror its internal policies. This is what the United States has preached for many years to other nations, and it is time it swallowed some of its own advice. As David Rockefeller wrote to the President last spring: "I would urge upon you a more effective control of expenditures and a determined and vigorous effort to balance the budget. Such measures would act to place our economy in a much stronger position for real economic growth in the period ahead; they should increase our ability to expand exports, and they will strengthen confidence everywhere in the future of the dollar."

A NEW DIRECTION

What all this comes down to is that, given the realities of the modern world, the U.S. economy needs very different policies from those that have been recently in evidence along the New Frontier. While Government spending can perhaps be regarded as the flywheel of the economy, it cannot supply the motive power. The motive power resides in the creative energies of the people, and Government can at best help release it. In his report to the Nation last summer on the state of the economy President Kennedy told the story of a displaced Pennsylvania miner, George DeMart, who had found a new job with a trailer company through the good offices of two Government agencies. Asked for comment by the press, Mr. DeMart blurted out: "Why did they pick on me?" And his question unintentionally packed a lot of significance. For while Government may assuage distress, it is all too easy to overemphasize this role, and to lose sight of what keeps America at work and moving. It is the private economy that today yields employment to some 60,700,000 men and women and will provide expansion in the future.

The vital juice here is no doubt profits, which encourage firms to maintain present levels of output and to invest in new plant. Significantly, the slowdown in the growth of the U.S. economy over recent years has been accompanied by profits taking a declining share of the national income, and by a squeezing of profit margins both on sales and on investment capital. Emphasis on this point should not be taken to mean that there is some predetermined level of profits to which businessmen are entitled and which Government must help them achieve; for this all too easily becomes one more invitation to statist intervention. But profits do play an indispensable role in the free society since they are the reward for risk taking, and for bringing together at the right time and place the elements of production—labor, materials, and capital. Someone must undertake this organizational function. And the alternative to a profit-and-loss economy is either socialist planning or plain chaos.

Once the social significance of profits is understood, the Government's role in an enterprise economy comes clear. This role is assuredly not to butter up the businessman as one more pressure group, but rather to lay down firm and dependable rules under which he, like any other citizen, can operate. One contribution the Kennedy administration could make right now is to make it clear that such interference with the pricing system as occurred in steel won't happen again. Businessmen must be allowed to make their own decisions and their own mistakes if need be—if a mistake is made, competition and the market will soon enough correct it. The Government's job is to see that competition is enforced and here it is amply armed (perhaps too amply) by the antitrust laws.

But sauce for the goose should be sauce for the gander. The obvious threat to the market economy today is not the big corporation but the big union, which wields enormous power as the result of privileges granted to it by the Government. This power needs trimming down. One place to begin is the rigorous enforcement of State and local laws against violence. It is one thing for men to strike; it is quite another for them to prevent men who want to work from working. Secondly, unions should become purely voluntary organizations, which would preclude the union shop, the closed shop, and all variants of the same. And in addition union exemption from the Sherman Act should be reconsidered. Whatever the reforms, the objective should be to bring unions within the framework of law as it applies to other voluntary associations. Such reform would protect the freedom of workers and have a beneficent effect on the whole economy. We would begin to break the vicious cycle wherein wage maladjustments cause unemployment, the Government spends to alleviate unemployment, and this in turn touches off a new round of wage and price pressures leading to direct Government intervention.

THE LOGIC OF TAX REFORM

Finally, Washington will contribute to growth and economic expansion as it combines fundamental tax reform with putting its own sprawling house in order. A general cut in Federal taxes—a kind of handout to the people—will accomplish little or nothing. What is needed is to cut the corporation-tax rate from its present 52 percent to, say, 45 percent and to start, at least, to reduce the ruinous rate of progression in the personal income tax (setting an upper limit of, say 60 percent as against the present confiscatory rate of 91 percent). Such reform, encouraging both saving and investment, might in the long run yield a revenue dividend to the Treasury, but this should not be counted on. Tax reform can easily turn into demagogy unless accompanied by Federal retrenchment.

Given the necessities of defense the budget will inevitably be big, but precisely for that reason cuts should be sought elsewhere. The place to begin is agriculture, where the policies advocated by the Kennedy administration should be reversed. There should be a gradual unwinding of the whole price-support mechanism, which, besides costing over $2 billion a year, is doing incalculable harm. Price supports would have to be lowered in stages, say, over a 10-year period, until prices for the great commodities reflected true market values. This is less of a job than it is sometimes made out to be. Over 50 percent of all farm income is still received from products having no direct price supports. The prices of most vegetables, to take a small example, do not sink to zero because they are unsupported by Government. What happens is that supply and demand make their own adjustment to the great benefit of the consuming public as well as the taxpayer.

Beyond this the Federal Establishment could be cut down to size by recognition of two broad principles. The first is that of federalism, under which the States and local communities can be responsible for many government services at their own levels. The prime example is education. When all is said an done, responsibility for education is a local one. Money taxed away by Washington for aid to education leaves that much less in State and local treasuries. The second path to Government limitation is to recognize that many public ends are best served by private initiative and enterprise. Talk about the need for enlarging the public sector largely overlooks this fact. This is not an appeal for private initiative to build State roads or to run the city garbage-disposal units. But the fact is that the toll road, privately financed and paid for by those who use it, is based on a sound principle. In the matter of health it is already an enormous achievement that 74 percent of U.S. citizens have adopted some form of private insurance. The whole argument that government functions must be enlarged as an economy grows larger and richer is really a reversal of the truth: the richer an economy becomes the more citizens may be able to do for themselves.

THE LIBERAL AGENDA

This kind of agenda, including both tax reform and retrenchment, is liberal in the sense that it looks to the enlargement of

human liberty. It also takes account of two great developments that have helped shape the modern world. One is the rise of government by law rather than by decree. The second is the evolution of the market process, which makes government by decree unnecessary. In his moving inaugural address, President Kennedy spoke of "the belief that the rights of man come not from the generosity of the State but from the hand of God." This is in the great American tradition. The trouble has been that the President seems to have no political or economic philosophy to support this moral insight.

Yet the elements for both are surely at hand and follow logically from the premise. It is because the rights of man are inalienable that limited, as against unlimited, government is a necessity. And if government is to be limited, then in its turn the free competitive market is the only possible solution for man's economic problems. Fortunately, it is also the solution that accords with hard common sense and realism. The United States is too big and varied to be managed or manipulated or pushed around. And its basic institutions are premised on precisely that blend of the practical and ideal which the President admires.

---

## Remarks by the Honorable Robert T. Murphy, Vice Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, at the Panel Session, Second Annual Transportation Workshop, District of Columbia Chapter, American Society of Traffic and Transportation, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D.C., November 15, 1962

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the 88th Congress there will probably be need to give renewed attention to the President's transportation program which was outlined succinctly in the President's transportation message of last year.

In this connection, I would invite attention to the remarks of Hon. Robert T. Murphy, Vice Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, made at the Second Annual Transportation Workshop of the American Society of Traffic and Transportation, held in Washington, D.C., on November 15, 1962. Significantly, Mr. Murphy notes that the President's message was the first effort by any President to deal directly with the complex and confusing transportation problems from the viewpoint of a coordinated national system, and that it suggests a policy of equity and justice which protects the interests of both the industry and consumers. The translation of the philosophy of the President's message into necessary amendments to existing law will, undoubtedly, require careful examination and full discussion in this session of the Congress, but I share the hope expressed by my fellow Rhode Islander, Vice Chairman Murphy, that its implementation will not be frustrated by the petty dissents which may arise in various diverse quarters in the transportation industry. The President is to be congratulated upon focusing our attention upon some areas for improvement in our patchwork transportation laws. I believe the remarks of Mr. Murphy may be timely and helpful in this connection.

President Kennedy's message to the 87th Congress relative to the transportation system of our Nation is a significant milestone in transportation history for more than several reasons.

It is the first effort by any President to deal directly with widely divergent transportation problems from the perspective of a coordinated national system.

It realistically recognizes that many of the ancient ills afflicting one or another mode of transport cannot be simply solved by Federal regulatory elixirs—yet it poses a well-reasoned program of fundamental reforms in transportation policy in clear and concise terms.

Federal regulatory laws were passed for each mode of transportation individually, primarily to solve a major problem for that mode at a particular point in its own history. The reasons for each, and the motives behind them, were quite different. It is therefore no wonder that the regulatory and promotional functions of the Federal Government, individually justified at the time each was passed, may have the appearance of a patchwork as far as concerns a uniform Government philosophy for a transportation system. However, a foundation upon which to build a national transportation philosophy already exists and the President is asking us to get on with the construction.

I sincerely believe in and support the philosophy of the President's message since it suggests a policy of equity and justice which protects the interests of both industry and the consumers and, hence, advances our common welfare.

From my point of view, foremost in our thinking should be the President's stated conviction that less Federal regulation and subsidization is desirable in the interest of a healthier intercity transportation network. This decreasing Federal regulation and subsidization is to take effect with a correlated increase in the role of normal American competition and normal economic motives. In fact, a primary objective of regulation appears to be to have the regulated industry play the part it would if it were subject only to normal free competitive influences. However, because the industry, at a critical point in its development, failed to produce the desired results of our free competitive enterprise system, and failed by such a wide margin in a field of prime public interest, it was made subject to Federal regulation. Still, we hope that it will produce, approximately, the good effects for the public and for its stockholders that it would if unregulated.

Implementation of the President's message obviously will require examination and debate in all quarters in the months ahead; however, implementation must not be frustrated by petty dissents on the minutiae of legislative proposals. The transportation industry, including the airlines, have reason to support the substance of the message.

I have too often seen extremely important programs fail to be adopted because of relatively minor points. Sometimes its opponents kill it by diverting emphasis from its extremely valuable central thrust to little flyspecks around its edges. Sometimes, unfortunately, its supporters become so absorbed in achieving ultraperfection that they wrangle the main objective into futility.

I say, this program is so important to the public, to the entire national economy, and to the Federal Treasury—don't "nickel and dime" it to death.

The policy of limited control of minimum rates and the tolerance of experimental rates, particularly in the freight and cargo field, has a particular application to air transportation and is in line with curernt Board policy. The Civil Aeronautics Board and the industry are presently trying to work out an approach to cargo costs which we hope will become generally recognized and defined for practical use. These costs would then give us a common ground upon which to build our ratemaking principles and policies. If industry and Government follow reasonable costing and pricing principles, the need for minimum rate regulation would be lessened, and the likelihood of ill-advised experimental rates would also be considerably reduced.

Reduction of aviation subsidies is a principle which has underscored many of the Board's actions in recent years and the new impetus given by the President's pronounced policy requesting a specific step-by-step program is both welcomed and desirable and in accord with the policy of Congress. The questions of how far and how fast subsidy should be reduced are matters of judgment. Agreement on the overall objectives of the Executive and the Congress seems clear. However, possible detailed disagreements on the precise level of subsidy to be paid, and during exactly which years, should not interfere with attaining the primary result.

The public benefits flowing from increased emphasis on through routes and joint rates have particular significance in the field of air transportation; the recommendations of the President have already stimulated additional efforts in this field. The expanded highway building program facilitates improved surface-air services, particularly of freight, which must be fostered by the agencies and which are under careful study at this time.

Transportation is more and more considered in terms of door-to-door service. We in the Board realize to an increasing extent, as is probably true of other transport media, that both passengers and shippers want service from ultimate origination to ultimate destination. The total quality of service, and the total elapsed time, are from the door of your home to the door of your destination, or from the door of your factory to the door of the customer. Complete and satisfactory air service is not simply from one airport to another, where the customer is left to his own devices to beat his way through traffic jams to the real end of his journey. Many problems in this area must be solved.

Added emphasis on coordinated research is likewise significant and the Board is ready to cooperate in making its extensive research activities available to all Government agencies through a central clearinghouse. Basic information and research should be interchanged, so that we in the Government and industry can be mutually self-educated on the more commonly agreed facts and theories.

Already, the Board has availed itself of information relating to highway development as it relates to air service and, through its regional airport programs, will continue to seek to properly relate the Federal investment in highways to reducing Federal investment in air transportation wherever justified.

In conclusion, I should note that the transportation message coincides in purpose with the President's equally important message stating the national policy of protecting the interests of consumers. Viewed as a whole, the President's transportation message states a solid beginning point for coordinated Government effort in moving toward a more rational and practical policy for all of the carriers of the Nation's freight and passengers.

## Percy B. Ruhe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, since adjournment of the 87th Congress, this Nation lost one of its top newspapermen, a man admired for his unceasing devotion to his community.

I refer to my good friend, Percy B. Ruhe, editor emeritus of the Allentown (Pa.) Morning Call, who died November 28 at the age of 81.

His death was noted on all the news service wires of the country for Percy Ruhe was one of this country's most respected editors as he strove constructively to aid all walks of life.

Quiet spoken, thorough, industriously devoted to duty, he was nevertheless in quick and easy touch with life's lighter moments. His approach was earnest and responsible but—enriched with a tasteful, intellectual sense of humor—by no means dour.

Percy Ruhe exuded a fierce determination in calling for good government at all levels, better schools, more health services, improved parks and recreational outlets, wider cultural facilities, industrial development and cohesive community facilities. He was known as "The Father of Allentown's Playground System," one of the finest in Eastern United States.

May the great heritage that he has given to his lovely wife and children give them strength in this their greatest trial and sadness. May the Almightly reward him with the blessings of faithful life in the service of his fellow man and his adherence to the tenets of a religious life.

Also, I wish to have included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the editorial that appeared in the Morning Call the morning after this brilliant editor died:

THE MEASURE OF THIS MAN

Regardless of where they lived or the positions they held, few men had the impact on any community for so many years that Percy B. Ruhe had on Allentown and the Lehigh Valley, their people and institutions and progress.

For 50 years this was his page of a growing newspaper. For a half century he used it to challenge and inspire and inform, to encourage and admonish, to laud notable achievements and at times to criticize what he considered the frailties of men or their shortcomings.

Here, in daily thought-provoking columns of comment that could be read and reread, he applied the measures of history and philosophy and religion and ethics in evaluating the significance of the eventful news that poured across his desk. Here he sought to give this community sound and valid judgments and the vision to strive toward its full potential.

The assignment he held for so many years as editor of a newspaper that in his time became a daily visitor in some 85,000 homes is one of the most responsible in any community with such a vehicle of communication. Self-seekers and those with special causes to plead covet its power and prestige. Some would use the position to attain their own objectives, regardless of the broader consequences. Many would influence it, not always with selfless motives.

Percy Ruhe detached himself completely from these prejudices and pressures. He brought to the editor's desk an uncommon sense of fairness and values, a thorough knowledge of the community that was his lifelong home, a broad familiarity with national and international goals and issues, and an understanding of people and their nature gained from his countless and continued contacts all hours of the day and night with men in all stations and situations. He was close to those who made the news and those affected by it, yet able to detach himself from any personal association for a penetrating and perceptive view on the editorial page.

Although books were among his important tools, he needed few for reference, particularly on local affairs. He knew the admonitions of Scripture, the wisdom of philosophers, and the lessons of history. His mind was a storehouse for the facts and situations of the age in which he lived and worked, both those recorded and the more intimate ones that never reached paper. Throughout his life he trained himself to remember what was worthwhile or important, to quickly forget what was shoddy or petty.

The monuments he helped build for this community are many and will keep his memory alive. Better schools with their junior high division and vocational shops and art courses, activities to stimulate and recognize youth, playgrounds and other recreational facilities in an expanded park system, the Baum Art School and the creative talents many hundreds discovered and nurtured through it, a strong and active Humane Society, better government at all levels than many communities have, are just a few. The broadening concept of a more closely integrated Lehigh Valley community is another. He argued convincingly for these and other worthwhile objectives and in many instances joined in taking the progressive steps that made them realities.

Through his lifetime of service to his fellows as the editor of this newspaper and in so many other capacities, Percy Ruhe asked little for himself but the privilige of working as he did to advance noble and worthwhile causes. His own needs were simple and not given to ostentation. They centered primarily about his occupation and his family. In their own right, his children are another monument to his achievement.

Like the late David A. Miller, with whom he worked so closely and devotedly to build this newspaper and make it a constructive force in the broad community it serves, his name will live not for what he had but for what he did for others. This, after all, is the lasting measure of a man.

## Spraying With Poison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am including a letter to me from a well-informed friend of mine, L. L. Henderson, of Corning, Iowa, in which he points out the destructive effect of poisonous spraying:

CORNING, IOWA,
*January 16, 1963.*

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
*Member of Congress,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. JENSEN: First, I want to compliment you on your speech, January 10, "American at the Crossroads." As usual, it was to the point, factual and timely.

I have read the book "Silent Spring" which so forcefully and factually presents the case against wholesale, indiscriminate spraying of crops, meadows, forests, shade trees, fruit trees, rivers, lakes, wildlife and people. I was glad to see that the Congress is making preparations to look into the matter. It deserves most serious study. One should by all means read the book carefully and then decide whether its critics speak with authority or prejudice, or from purely selfish reasons. The review appearing in Time and also copies by Reader's Digest is far from satisfactory; it is biased in favor of the powerful chemical corporations.

A news item by George Mills appeared in the Sunday Des Moines Register January 13 which told of a recent experience with DDT which was mixed in a spray but not indicated on the label, or if it was, it was listed under a high-falutin name which Lavern Osterson of Paton, Iowa did not understand. Result: he sprayed his laying flock of 5,700 birds; the Department of Agriculture quarantined his flock; he had to destroy the entire flock and 100 cases of eggs in addition. The fat tissue in the hen's bodies was found to have up to 40 parts of DDT per million. Seven PPM is the maximum permitted in meat by the USDA. Loss, $18,000.

The book "Silent Spring" explains clearly how the poisons in sprays (many of them being in fact synthetic with no known andidote) builds up in the tissues of people, birds, worms, and animals to the lethal point, even though the original spray was only one to two PPM. Hence, a fish which died from absorbing the poison in its fatty tissues would, when eaten by a bird or animal, be more deadly than arsenic. Birds that eat worms (as most do) which live in the ground that has been sprayed with a 1 PPM mixture will eventually store up enough poison to kill them—and also the birds that eat their bodies.

Sorry this is so long. You probably don't have time to read books. But I think it is high time something be done to control this wholesale spraying. Surely there are more good insects than bad ones; and more good weeds than bad weeds. Surely the Good Lord saw to that.

Yours truly,

L. L. HENDERSON.

## Mississippi Sets National Pace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including an editorial which appeared in the January 20 issue of the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger, which I am pleased to call to the attention of the House:

STATE SETS NATIONAL PACE

Folks, make way for Mississippi. Our great State is fast speeding toward bigger and better things. This State's rate of economic

gain and financial improvement is among the highest in the United States.

The Economic Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture in a study of population and occupational changes in rural areas reports that on the basis of the 1950 and 1960 censuses Mississippi led all of the States of the Union during the past decade in the percentage of increase in median income of all families.

The gain in the 10-year span for Mississippi was 96.7 percent. This compared with 50.5 percent for the United States. Second highest gain was made by Georgia with 81.1 percent. Alabama was third with 77.3 percent. The South raced ahead of the North, the East, and the West.

Why has Mississippi led the Nation in increasing family income? From 1950 to 1960, nearly one-half of all male workers on Mississippi farms shifted to employment in industry or other off-farm work where they made more money. The percent of all male workers on farms declined from 48.1 percent in 1950 to 26.3 percent in 1960.

But despite this shift of workers from farms to off-farm work, Mississippi farm income continued to climb as farms increased in size and farmers used more machinery and other means to handle more acres per worker and to increase production and income per acre.

In interpreting the revolutionary changes in farm employment, John H. Southern, farm economist of USDA, says "It is probable that we have not yet faced up to the real extent of adjustments of the labor resource out of agriculture. Of all employed males in the United States in 1960, only 8.3 percent were in farming, or 1 out of 12 workers. This was a decline from 15.2 percent in 1950."

But Mr. Southern then referred to the sharper change in Mississippi and predicted that "in Mississippi, the decline in farmworkers is so rapid that probably by 1965 it will be more nearly in line with other Southern States, that is, 15 percent or less of the employed males will be doing farmwork."

Only four other states have so large a proportion of its male workers engaged in farming. These States are North and South Dakota, Nebraska, and Iowa.

It is clear that one of Mississippi's most important resources is its people. Our State still has a large farm population with a surplus of fine men, women, and young people available for employment in industry, while at the same time retaining enough workers on the farm to maintain and even increase our farm production and income.

If Mississippi can accelerate its industrial growth fast enough to provide employment for all of our rural people who are seeking off-farm work and at the same time begin to provide technical training for these workers, our State will increase its speed toward a higher and higher ranking among all of the States in total family income and better living.

No State has a brighter future than Mississippi. We have the climate, the resources, the people. We predict that you can look for more and more investment in Mississippi.

## Small Business Problems in the Poultry Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to a statement of the Grower Committee of Delmarva Poultry Industry, Inc., concerning the recent report of Small Business Problems in the Poultry Industry issued by the Select Committee on Small Business.

The statement appears, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE GROWER COMMITTEE, DELMARVA POULTRY INDUSTRY, INC., CONCERNING THE REPORT OF THE SMALL BUSINESS PROBLEMS IN THE POULTRY INDUSTRY

During a recently held meeting of the grower committee of the Delmarva Poultry Industry organization, this group took strong issue with the committee report of the U.S. House of Representatives on "small business problems in the poultry industry," according to Paul Phillips, a broiler grower of Mardela Springs, Md., and chairman of the DPI Grower Committee.

"Our group," said Mr. Phillips, "believes that for most of our growers the advantages of contract growing offset the disadvantages of this method of raising broilers."." Continuing, the DPI chairman said, "Our people realize that growing broilers under a contractual agreement, with a minimum guarantee to the grower by the feed manufacturer-contractor who assumes the financial risk, is for all practical purposes an insurance plan. While we do have some people here in our area who continue as completely independent growers, most of us prefer to have our feed companies assume the risk of financial loss on our flocks; they can better afford to spread this risk among many growers and many flocks than we can spread any loss encountered among four flocks that most of us grow during any year."

It is further realized that competition is sufficiently keen between feed manufacturers and grow-out contractors that an individual broiler raiser has plenty of opportunity to shop around and grow for the company of his choice. Best of all, he can grow independently or on a contractual basis with any feed manufacturer within this area.

This attitude of Delmarva's broiler people toward contractual growing is similar to that found in a study conducted by the Maine Agricultural Experiment Station. According to this study, reported in Bulletin No. 571 and released in May of 1958, most of the growers indicated they would not like to raise broilers on an independent basis, even if they could obtain the necessary financing. Practically all of their reasons for this preference relate to the element of risk involved in producing broilers independently.

A more recent report, prepared by Washington College for the Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C., reveals that vertical integration (which often is associated with contractural growing) is a natural move for a well-financed and agressive firm and has in many cases helped to improve efficiency. This Washington College study further pointed out that "growers also gain, not only from the integrator's aids to efficiency, but also from his assumption of an important portion of the risks of disease loss and of a poor market."

DPI grower committee members, as a result of their evaluation meeting of the congressional report on "Small Business Problems in the poultry industry," took issue with other conclusions and recommendations. Referring to the statement found in the congressional report that, "Existing data indicates that an unhealthy trend has developed and may be continuing, DPI's committee members, on this point, had this to say: "We fail to agree that there is an unhealthy trend or a bad situation of the broiler industry within this area." The DPI group points out that more houses, and better ones than ever before in the history of our broiler industry, are currently being built on our farms; processing plants are being enlarged; new feed mills erected; and soybean processing is being increased. Such developments indicate strength and confidence rather than weakness and discontent.

The fifth recommendation contained in the congressional report stated: "The broiler industry, universities, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture should devote serious efforts to increasing the demand of broilers." The DPI committee heartily concurs with this statement and the five specific practices suggested:

(a) Expand sales abroad where the consumption is far below that of the United States;

(b) In connection with the above, make every effort to protect agricultural interests when negotiations are conducted with the Common Market nations and the governments of other nations;

(c) Where possible, increase purchases by the Federal Government for the military and school lunch programs;

(d) Increase research in broiler freezing methods so as to enhance the industry's bargaining power;

(e) Increase research into new ways of marketing broilers and new methods of serving broilers."

At the same time, DPI's group wants to remind the congressional committee that the USDA, universities, many industry associations, retailers, and other members of the poultry trade have for years been doing a tremendous job in promoting the use of poultry meat. These poultry promotional programs have been done through poultry industry initiative, on strictly a voluntary basis, in contrast to regulated, or compulsory, checkoff plans.

A most creditable example of a self-help promotional program has developed right in the shadows of our Nation's Capital. Poultrymen and civic leaders of the Delmarva Peninsula, birthplace of today's commercial broiler business, from a modest beginning, back in 1948 with an annual budget of approximately $7,000, has continued to expand its activities into what is now a year around program in the interest of both production and utilization. This program is conducted by an association, the Delmarva Poultry Industry, Inc., and is commonly spoken of as DPI. For the past few years, their annual budget has exceeded $100,000. Funds are obtained through a self-help approach in the form of the now famous Delmarva's poultry booster day banquet ($100 a plate dinner). Last year's campaign for funds resulted in exceeding their quota of $135,000, obtained entirely by voluntary workers interested in the future of the Eastern Shore's poultry industry.

One of the principal promotional projects conducted by this industry association is the staging of the national chicken cooking contest, held as a highlight of the annual Delmarva chicken festival. The 1963 festival will be held in Salisbury, Md., June 13, 14, and 15.

The national chicken cooking contest is cosponsored by the Delmarva Poultry Industry organization and the Poultry and Egg National Board. Since its inception 15 years ago, over 6,000 chicken recipes have been submitted, with approximately 2,500 men, women, boys, and girls taking part in the final cookoffs. The contribution of the national chicken cooking contest, resulting in tremendous volumes of follow-up publicity focusing attention on many different ways of preparing and serving chicken, has been of inestimable value to the entire poultry industry. At the same time, consumers everywhere have benefited greatly as they use chicken more often in trying out the many winning recipes printed and distributed coast to coast following each year's contest.

The best evidence that a phenomenal product-promotional job has been done through cooperative efforts of industry people, agency personnel and members of the retail trade is found in the rate at which broiler consumption has increased. During the 20-year period, 1940 to 1960, the per capita consumption of broilers increased from approximately 2 pounds to 23.4 pounds.

DPI's grower committee does not mean to infer that promotional efforts alone are responsible for such progress in the eating habits of our Nation's population. Technological developments of the poultry industry have made the progress of commercial raising of broilers and fryers the envy of all branches of our country's agriculture. Back in 1927, it took 16 weeks and 12 pounds of feed to produce a 2¼-pound chicken. Three decades later, it took only 9 weeks and 8 pounds of feed to raise a 3¼-pound broiler. Currently, Delmarva growers are disappointed if their chickens do not weigh 4 pounds in 9 weeks of age.

In completing their evaluation of the congressional report, DPI's grower committee went on record favoring this regional poultry association's oftrepeated stand as being opposed to Government controls, including marketing orders.

"Delmarva poultrymen are not satisfied with their plight or content to settle for the present situation," said Chairman Phillips. "New heights in efficiency of production must be reached, hard work is needed as we encourage people to eat more chicken, and, of course, we'd like to see chickens sell at a higher price; however, marketing orders and other forms of restrictions would retard continued growth and efficiencies in the production and marketing of poultry meat and would adversely affect millions of consumers through increased consumer prices. We sincerely believe that judging from the rate of growth of our industry, the low cost of production, and through the wide acceptance by consumers everywhere of our young, tender chickens, broiler production will continue to be one of our Nation's most important agricultural enterprises," concluded Mr. Phillips.

The Delmarva Poultry Industry leaders have frequently commended Federal and State agencies for their efforts in assisting the poultry industry in the fields of research, education and market development. However, they continue to believe that the growth and vitality of the poultry industry in the years ahead will depend on the free enterprise system of production and marketing. Admittedly, there are risks involved, but with responsible and intelligent action, sound management practices, and exerting rights as free leaders, it is believed that an efficient poultry industry will continue to benefit both producers and consumers.

Delmarva's position is not an opinion at which they have quickly arrived. Instead, it is truly a reemphasis of their position over the years. Opposition to governmental controls has been repeatedly stated to Members of the Congress and to officials of various agencies.

"Such a philosophy is one of the big reasons why DPI's organization is currently busy, through its fund drive committee chairmaned by William R. Murray, one of the pioneers of our industry, selecting dozens of its members on a voluntary basis to meet its 1963 fund drive goal of $140,000," said A. E. Bailey, president of the Delmarva Poultry Industry Association.

A. E. Bailey,
*President, Delmarva Poultry Industry, Inc.*
Paul Phillips,
*Chairman, DPI Grower Committee.*

## Walter L. Meyer Spreads Friendship With Song

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record I include an article which appeared in the January 3, 1963, issue of the Home Journal, daily newspaper published in St. Thomas, Virgin Islands. The article concerns the recent appearances in the islands of Milwaukeean Walter L. Meyer, the world-known professional song leader:

World-Known Song Leader Delights Groups

Milwaukee's world-known song leader, Walter L. Meyer, on Monday night gave a demonstration of his "Songobatics" (community singing fun), before a delighted audience of Girl Scouts and Boy Scouts at the Catholic school auditorium.

Being his first appearance in the Virgin Islands, Monday night's program marked the 58th country or territory in which the Milwaukeean has entertained. "Music is an international language," remarked Mr. Meyer, "And when you combine it with laughter, you have a wonderful medium with which to spread friendship and good fellowship around the world."

He appeared in two school assembly programs Wednesday, one at the Charlotte Amalie High School, and the other at the Sugar Estate Elementary School.

Possibly no one other person has conducted as many people of all ages in group singing, in as many nations of the world, as has Mr. Meyer. He is active in scouting in Milwaukee, and because of his participation in world jamborees, trekorees, camporals, and meeting events of all kinds—has become known as an "international scouter."

In addition to scout songs and yells, Mr. Meyer included several folksongs from Denmark and Austria and the United States rounds and fun songs. For extra audience participation merriment there was the "Hukilau" from Hawaii in which several scout leaders were brought to the stage to perform the hula.

A professional song leader at home, Mr. Meyer's services are available on his goodwill tours to a variety of charitable, educational and religious groups or institutions without charge. He is unsponsored and pays his own travel expenses. He has been doing this since 1948 when as a graduate student at Columbia University's Teachers College he made his first trip abroad to England, Scotland and France. His present good will song tour which started last week in Puerto Rico, and, and now the Virgin Islands, is his 13th.

As a world entertainer he has succeeded in bringing song and laughter to many orphanages, old folks homes, hospitals, refugee camps, and other welfare institutions where entertainment is seldom received from the outside.

His biggest contribution, through song, comes, Mr. Meyer feels, from the carryover benefits to groups whose leaders learn new techniques for group participation. "This is the best thing that could have happened for our seamen," an officer aboard the World War II famed British aircraft carrier *Ark Royal* stated following an evening singsong attended by 500 of the sailors in the ship's dining room. "We're going on maneuvers in the Arctic waters where they will receive no leave for several weeks. Tonight's experience has shown them the way, namely, how they can create their own group entertainment."

The globetrotting songster has conducted many special workshops in song leading and group fun, and it is because of this teaching and guidance at the grassroots level that he has been described in several sources as a musical one-man peace corps. One of Mr. Meyer's boosters in Washington is Congressman Reuss who is generally credited as being a founder of the Peace Corps idea.

SONG LEADER

From St. Thomas, Meyer returns to Puerto Rico where today, January 3, he is scheduled to spend the day at the YMCA camp. The Dominican Republic is another country in which the songleader has not yet appeared, and he hopes to include it in his present itinerary before returning to Milwaukee.

Len Stine of WSTA interviewed Mr. Meyer for broadcast Monday night at 4:45.

## Under Secretary of Agriculture Murphy Addresses Meeting of the Virginia Association of Soil Conservation Districts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. W. PAT JENNINGS
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, Under Secretary of Agriculture Charles S. Murphy addressed the annual meeting of the Virginia Association of Soil Conservation Districts, which was held here in the Washington area a few days ago. His remarks, which I herewith extend in the Appendix of the Record, are very pertinent to our Nation's relationship to the Common Market countries. We in Virginia, as do many other States, have a vital stake in our export market. We want to keep it.

Under unanimous consent, I commend Under Secretary Murphy's comments to my House colleagues for insertion in the Appendix of the Record.

It is indeed a pleasure to be here this morning. First, it gives me an opportunity to thank personally those of you who actively supported the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962.

Second, I would like to discuss a matter that is of growing concern to the U.S. Department of Agriculture. I refer to the European Common Market and its possible impact on our farm economy.

Finally, I would like to look ahead at conservation's opportunities under the rural development program.

I believe we have here this morning a number of the Virginia supervisors who called on their Congressmen, urging endorsement of the 1962 Food and Agriculture Act. The Secretary and I, in fact, everyone in the Department, deeply appreciate this support.

It exemplifies the positive leadership and readiness to act that have made soil conservation districts such a vital force in rural America.

Too often organizations who would support certain legislation hang back and do nothing. This cannot be said of the Virginia Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts.

I hope you will continue to take an active role in agricultural affairs. The Department earnestly seeks your guidance, understanding, and support in its operations.

This support and guidance is especially needed in 1963.

As you know, one-fifth of our agricultural output goes to oversea markets. During the past year, we exported more than $5 billion worth of farm products. Some of this was provided at low cost to underdeveloped nations through our food-for-peace program. But nearly $3½-billion worth was sold abroad through regular commercial channels, one-third of it to the six Common Market countries of Western Europe. These countries—France, Italy, West Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg—are our bigegst and best oversea customers, for industrial items as well as farm products.

Under the 1957 Treaty of Rome, these six nations agreed to merge their economies into a single customs union, or common market.

Our Government has applauded the move. No doubt history will show that formation of the Common Market, or the European Economic Community, as it is more properly known, was one of the greatest things that could happen to Europe. It is a catalyst that can, in fact, already has, injected new vigor into the Old World. Tariff walls have been drastically lowered between member nations, and they are to be removed completely before 1970. Capital and labor flow freely over what used to be closely guarded boundaries. Train passengers, for example, can now ride between Belgium and Germany without stopping for inspection of passport and luggage. National feelings and prejudices are giving way to common overall interests.

The United States has supported the EEC concept in the belief that closer economic cooperation may ultimately lead to political union, a United States of Europe. This, in turn, could be an essential part of the foundation on which East-West peace is built.

But in recent months, we have become increasingly disturbed by evidence that the Common Market countries are leaning toward a highly protectionist policy for agriculture that could seriously impair the prospects for the success of this whole enterprise.

They have drastically increased the import levies on some of our major commodities, to an extent that threatens to choke off a large share of our agricultural exports to these countries. The duty on our poultry going into West Germany, for example, has been increased from less than 5 cents a pound to more than 12 cents.

Virginia's $28 million-a-year broiler industry already is feeling the pinch of these higher import duties. Our exports of frozen poultry to West Germany have dropped to less than half their prior volume. And if it were not for the lingering effect of a devastating attack of blue mold on the French, Italian, and Greek tobacco crops, your State's $83½-million-a-year tobacco industry might be losing customers because of the new common tariff imposed last winter.

It goes without saying that our agricultural exports are of the utmost importance, not only to you as farmers, but to our Nation as well. Loss of our European agricultural markets would jeopardize our security and foreign aid commitments around the world.

Two decisions are expected this year which will have great impact on the future of the Common Market and international trade itself.

One is the question of Common Market membership for the United Kingdom. The other is the setting of grain prices for the Common Market countries under their common agricultural policy.

For 14 months, the United Kingdom has been negotiating for Common Market membership. Pressure is mounting for a decision this year.

I need not dwell on what it would mean to us, or to the Common Market, to have Great Britain become a member of the European Economic Community. She is the world's largest importer of agricultural products, and one of the leading producers of consumer goods.

A Common Market which included Great Britain and other European nations now seeking membership would be an economic colossus with a population of 250 million. This exceeds the United States population by nearly 70 million.

Moreover, it is what is popularly called a seller's market. Individual buying power in the Common Market is on the increase, and there is a great, unsatisfied demand for automobiles, television sets, and other consumer goods.

The United States could ill afford to be walled from a bloc of nations with such vast buying potential. And by 1970, economists estimate the gross annual output of an expanded Common Market will increase $170 billion.

The second decision I mentioned, the grain price issue, will have a profound effect on the course of history.

The Common Market may fix its internal price for wheat early this year. This is a critical decision. If the price is moderate, it will temper the movement toward an isolationist policy for agriculture, and perhaps signal the start of an expanded level of free world trade. If the price is excessive, and high protectionist walls are erected to limit competing imports, the expansion of uneconomic production inside the Common Market would be accelerated sharply. This could lead to indiscriminate "dumping," or even an international trade war.

The six common market countries are, of course, trying to protect the income of their farmers. We can understand that. We do the same thing ourselves. Virtually every industrial nation has experienced a growing disparity between farm and nonfarm income, and has had to undertake corrective measures.

However, in trying to protect and improve farm income, responsible nations must take into consideration the effects that their actions will have outside their own boundaries. The United States has used export payments to keep certain commodities moving on the open market. But we have used these payments only to maintain our fair share of the world trade. We have not tried to undercut other nations, or take away their markets.

As Secretary Freeman has said, "If we expect others to act responsibly when it comes to setting agricultural policies, we must continue to do so ourselves." And he added: "We are in complete sympathy with measures to protect the income and economic well-being of the farm segment of the European economy. We don't believe it necessary, however, to sacrifice international trade in the process."

The United States recently revamped its international trade policy to meet the jet-age needs of the sixties. This was done through passage of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. This act gave the President the power to reduce our tariffs on imports from the Common Market in exchange for greater access to their markets.

In the debate which preceded enactment of the law, the Congress made it clear that we were to negotiate trade agreements which benefit our agricultural as well as our industrial products.

One section of the act directs the President to take all necessary and feasible steps to eliminate unreasonable trade restrictions that any country, or group of countries, imposes on our farm products. These steps include withholding of concessions and most favored nation treatment, and if necessary, retaliatory action.

The President has clearly indicated his firm purpose to see that the channels for agricultural exports are kept open, and you may be sure that one of the major purposes of the Department of Agriculture this year will be to support the President's efforts in this field.

Another of the Department's major goals for 1963 is to inject new vitality into rural America through creation of new economic opportunities and elimination of wasteful, outmoded land use patterns.

In formally putting the new Rural Areas Development program into motion last November, Secretary Freeman announced that local initiative and leadership would be "the first criterion" for departmental help.

And he invited soil conservation districts to provide this motive power and leadership. I would like to emphasize the word "invited." You supervisors will determine the role played by the districts in developing and using the new conservation and rural development tools. This role can be as large, or as small, as you choose to make it.

We hope you will select the first course. Rural development is a vast undertaking, one that calls for talents and knowledge often unique to local soil conservation districts.

Think for a moment. How many organizations do you know that have your knowledge of what the local soil can do, what it is capable of? How many organizations know the resources that exist in your area? And by resources, I mean both human and natural resources. What other groups in your community know the area's problems, and have the organization and leadership to cope with them? Consider the difficulties a city engineer would have planning land use changes for a farming community.

As you can see, soil conservation districts possess some unique qualifications. I hope you will put these talents to work and make rural development a success.

One of the first things that I would suggest you do is to modernize your working agreement with the Department of Agriculture as suggested by Secretary Freeman.

Many of these agreements were written more than two decades ago, and do not reflect the advances that have occurred in this field of soil and water conservation.

Today we are faced with new problems and new complexities. To cope with the resource problems of the sixties, we must reevaluate our programs, and bring them up to date. We must use the new tools, as well as the old, if we are to create a better way of life in rural America.

When I say "rural areas," I mean more than farm country. Rural America is people, people in towns and small cities as well as on farms and ranches. It is land, rivers, small streams, and forests. It is north, south, east, and west. It is, in fact, all our land, all our people, and all our wealth outside our urban centers.

Today many areas of rural America are in serious trouble. Their farmers and ranchers are living in a state of chronic depression. They work from dawn to dusk, producing more than ever before on fewer acres, but they are unable to buy the equipment they need to expand, or to make their operation more efficient. The land has been drained of its wealth by erosion and unwise use. The

nearby towns and cities long ago stopped growing, and fell into economic stagnation. With no job openings in the area, the brighter young adults move to faraway cities to find work.

The goal of the RAD program is to help the people in such local communities determine exactly what resources they have, then help them develop a plan that will make full use of these resources. Only in this way can we close the gap that exists between our urban and rural economies.

Farmers and ranchers are the backbone of our rural communities. The economy of the area revolves around them. If the farmer is prosperous then the rural community where he shops is prosperous. If the farmer is in financial straits, then the town is, too.

But we must do more than develop family farms to get rural communities moving again. It takes new enterprises, expanded business opportunities, modern rural electrical systems, watershed development, rural housing, water and sewerage systems, new outdoor recreational facilities and better schools.

One of the best ways to revitalize a community, short of a complete rural renewal job, is through a multipurpose watershed project.

These multipurpose projects can stop destructive floods and provide water for irrigation, municipal, and industrial use. They attract new industries, create water-based recreational areas, increase land values and protect and improve farmland.

You have an outstanding example of what a watershed project can do right here in Virginia in the Mountain Run watershed project.

Mountain Run used to flood the city of Culpeper in the spring and fall, then dry up and leave her without water in the summer. The floods were bad, but the summer droughts were even worse.

Culpeper needed a new hospital, but the city couldn't build it, because it couldn't provide water for it. The chamber of commerce had been trying to get new industry to come to Culpeper. But with flooding in the winter, and droughts in the summer, industry wasn't interested.

Late in 1954, the city filed application for a watershed project. Five years and $545,000 later, the project was completed. One multipurpose structure stores 190 million gallons of water for municipal use, better than half a year's supply at the present rate of consumption.

The hospital has been built. Three new industries employing more than 400 people have moved to Culpeper, and other industries are making inquiries. Culpeper didn't have to go after those plants. They came to the city, once the flooding and water shortage problems were licked.

Now that the water mains have been extended, new homes are going up. The former unoccupied floodplain has become a shopping center, adding to the city's tax base. Conservation measures have put Culpeper's farmers on a sounder financial footing.

A 4-acre park was developed bordering one of the watershed structures, giving Culpeper citizens and visitors a place to fish, boat, and picnic.

The success of the Culpeper project is known far and wide.

There are already more than 70 small cities and towns like Culpeper benefiting from watershed projects. Another 453 communities have started similar projects, and 1,294 others have filed application for the same treatment. Our land is, and will be, so much the better.

Recreation is emerging as a use of the land that shows great economic promise. At the regional land and people conferences, and in surveys conducted by the Soil Conservation Service and Forest Service, thousands of farmers described how they switched from conventional farming to outdoor recreation, and made it pay.

It is not surprising. The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission reports that our parks, camping grounds, lakes beaches, and highways are jammed with people searching for outdoor fun. Furthermore, the Commission says this demand will continue to grow, outstripping even our population boom. Where can they turn, but to our privately owned farm and ranch lands?

The Department can now help farmers and ranchers develop recreational enterprises on their land. We also can cost-share on recreational developments in watershed projects.

Just 1 month ago, the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service announced plans for a pilot program to convert unneeded or unsuited cropland to other uses. These activities will be based on the basic farm conservation plan, and they will be carried out under long-term cost-sharing agreements negotiated with the Department of Agriculture.

These are just a few of the new conservation and rural development tools provided by the past Congress. Loan authorities were expanded to include recreation and cropland conversion projects. ASCS was authorized to expand its list of cost-sharing practices in certain areas. The watershed program was enlarged to add as a purpose both recreation and water storage for future municipal or industrial uses.

I urge you to study these and the other new authorities and see how they can be fitted into your existing district program. They represent an orderly step forward in our efforts to keep soil and water conservation dynamic and attuned to the needs of a modern society.

This is the 25th anniversary year of the district movement in your State, the Tidewater district being the first in Virginia to sign a memorandum of understanding with the Department on December 16, 1938.

You have done much to make your rural communities a better place to live. Today you have an even greater opportunity for service. I urge you to seize this opportunity to help yourselves, and your community. Let us push forward together until we have built a firm foundation for permanent prosperity in rural America.

---

## Text of a Speech by U.S. Senator Barry Goldwater, Republican, of Arizona, Before the Air War College, Maxwell Air Force Base Montgomery, Ala., January 17, 1963

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, every Member of the legislative branch of Government has a responsibility to maintain the prerogatives and the obligations of the Congress. To fail in this duty is to upset the balance of power in our constitutional system. The distinuished gentleman from Arizona, a Member of the other body, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, has spoken forcefully on this subject in words that merit the attention of the Congress and the country:

Once, when the architect, Frank Lloyd Wright, was asked to give an address to a distinguished audience, he rose, said his address was Paradise Valley, Phoenix, Ariz., and sat down. I could, just as accurately, say that my view of national security policy today is that it tends to be wrong, and sit down. This, however, would give you an overabundance of leisure and would undoubtedly result in a traffic jam at the library as you rushed to fill the time constructively.

It would also leave us where, unfortunately, many supposedly important national debates leave us—understanding fully who says yea and who says nay but still totally unaware of the process by which the disagreement was reached. It is the process about which I should like to speak today. I will not be able to avoid, because of a personality quirk perhaps, some discussion of specific disagreements, but I will begin, at least, with the broader topic.

My address to you today is supposed to increase an understanding on your part of the role performed by the American party system in developing, supporting, approving, and evaluating national policies. I wish that I could do this, but unfortunately, the American party system no longer plays a major role in these activities affecting national policies.

During the past 30 years of this century, both parties have seemed to recede from positions of principle and have taken attitudes closer to each other to the point that in the last elections, we saw an almost wholesale disregard for the party label and a voting for the man. The party historically in this country is a vehicle by which the citizen has been able to participate in the formation of national policy.

To a great extent, the policies of both parties as enunciated in their platforms have grown so close to each other, that it is difficult for the citizen to distinguish between them.

I suggest then, the proper question for Americans today is not so much what can America's policies do for the citizen, but what in the world can the citizen do for the policies. There was a time when the answer, very simply, would be: he can participate in the formulation of those policies.

As a matter of fact, we fought a Revolution to provide access for him to do just that. We brought representative government to its fullest flower for that purpose.

But, we did it in such a way that government always would be representative—of all the people—and not just of simple majorities. Only thus does representative government remain representative and not become repressive.

Basic in the equation is the balance of power between the three major branches of the Federal Government: The legislative to make laws; the executive to administer them; the judiciary to test them against the great legal framework of the Nation.

Now patience and principle are tested by new demands on this old balance. Congresses are criticized when they resist executive programs, not so much on the basis of why they resist but simply because they resist. The judiciary is caught in a boiling debate about whether it should judge the constitutionality of laws or whether it should also interpret them for maximum social benefit. States are criticized for their differences in approach or standards or wealth whereas they once were felt to be inviolate basically to preserve the opportunity for regional and cultural differences. Big cities, emerging as city states rather than as state units, look past the State capitol to the National Capitol for solution of their problems.

Federal regulation of trade practices has moved from the protective—which prohibits malpractices—toward the coercive—which

demands conformance with practices decided upon administratively.

We are larger and more populous, it is said, than when the Federal system was developed. Old ways are not adequate. Old balances are not meaningful. Does this mean that there is a population limit on liberty? That when 100 million persons live together they can maintain free markets and free and balanced institutions but that when 200 million persons live together they must delegate their local institutions to central authority? There is, at the root of it, no other explanation advanced for the movement today away from the Federal system of balanced powers toward an executive system of concentrated powers.

Now, is it proper for you, as members of the executive branch of government to consider these matters? As a member of the legislative branch, I think so. I think so, among other reasons, because of the essence of our civil-military relationship in this country, the essence of civilian control, directly through the civilian Commander-in-Chief but, as importantly, through the legislative branch which funds the military, makes laws broadly governing it, and to which the military must account when called upon to do so.

It follows that, to the degree that the legislative branch of government loses its weight as part of the balance it also stands to lose its power in relation to the military services. We do not want that to happen. Nor, despite the annoyances sometimes occasioned, do most military men.

Let me elaborate just a bit, lest anyone get the notion that I am urging some sort of political activity on the part of the military. I am doing quite the opposite. I am discussing a system which should make it possible for the military to devote itself fully to its professional mission. And I am discussing developments which threaten to introduce political disruptions into that professional role.

But first let me round out the basis of my argument—that a serious shift is, in fact, taking place in the way in which policy is made and in the way that the Federal system is brought to bear upon the policymaking process.

Some years ago, in his book, "Why England Slept," the then student, now President Kennedy, wrote at some length about the difficulties of preserving free institutions in times of stress and strain. He concluded, however, that despite the obvious advantages of efficiency enjoyed by a totalitarian government, the free institutions work best in the long run and must be preserved even though they might have to be sharpened or refocused in time of crisis.

Last month, speaking to a nationwide television audience, however, the President shifted his position basically. Commenting on the efforts to change the makeup of the House Rules Committee, he said that a failure to do this would "emasculate" the administration's program. This, by clear inference, was the reason that he was giving to change this particular legislative procedure.

There are certain technical reservations I would take to his statement—the House Rules Committee cannot, as so often said by those unfamiliar with the situation or trying to make a special case, the Committee cannot absolutely block legislation by preventing it from getting to the floor. There are no less than four established ways of bypassing the Committee. All are practical, all are available.

My major difference is with the President's reason. And, again, it is a difference based upon my membership in and regard for the legislative branch of government and my deep belief that it is this branch which most constantly, most closely makes a reality of representative government and provides proper access to the formulation of policy.

**It is a blow at the very concept of representative government to say that a procedure of the Congress should be revised in order to permit untroubled development of the program of any administration.**

In the first place, the elected chief executive of the United States supposedly is representative of the entire Nation, not just the citizens who cast ballots for him. To say otherwise is to suggest, in this particular time, a disenfranchisement of almost exactly half of the population of the United States.

If the programs and policies of any administration are opposed by the legislative branch it is just a sharp reminder of that fact—of the fact that this is a representative government and that the direct representatives of the entire electorate are expected to do their work regardless of which party or person is in power.

Interestingly enough, spokesmen for a particular administration program had gone just as far in another direction a few months earlier. After the Senate defeated the administration's social security medicare program, a medicare proponent figured out, and the President echoed in a press conference, that the Senators who voted against the bill did not represent a majority of the citizens of the United States; that is, the States they represented did not contain a majority of the electorate.

Again we have a colorful new view of representative government. The Senate was never designed to represent equal numbers of people. Two Senators are elected from every State despite population. They represent the State. They represent, also, a basic part of the Federal system's great balance of powers. To discuss the Senate on a numerical basis cannot be the result of simple ignorance of the Constitution. It must be on the basis of a simple disagreement with or misunderstanding of the Federal system itself.

On the other hand there are evidences that some supporters of the administration do not hold at all with majority representation—when a majority might interfere with a policy. The now famous memorandum on anti-Communist educational efforts issued by Senator FULBRIGHT, contained the frank statement that there could be too much public involvement with policy. It cited foreign aid, saying that if the program were submitted to direct ballot by all the people, it would probably fail. But this sensitivity to a representative government that makes it possible to balance policies between majority and minority measures—and still accomplish wonders—does not seem to be generally applied.

We have another indicative situation, which bears directly on policy formulation, in the Senate and in the House of Representatives today. It is the matter of staffs for the committees of Congress. Let me first describe why they are important.

Just as generals must, so must Senators and Representatives depend upon staffs to do the real digging and much of the work of putting together the background on which a policy decision can be made. What witnesses will a committee hear, what precedents should be reviewed, what is the status of similar legislation, what are the needs for proposed legislation, and so on and on—all this is the work of the committee staff.

Today, of course, the majority party, which is the Democratic Party, expects a substantial share of the staff to be working for them and to be appointed by them. Republicans would feel the same way.

On committee after committee, however, the minority party has not been able to appoint any staff member at all. On most there is at least a disparity of staff appointments that is far beyond the disparity in party representation. And this disparity, to raise this beyong a mere quibble between the in-party and the out-party is several times more pronounced than under the previous situation of a Republican majority.

Again, the point is simply that less attention than ever before is being paid to the essential role of the legislative as a forum for the views of all the people and as the great molder of policy on their behalf.

Insufficient minority staffing makes the legislative more dependent than even upon the statistics, the witnesses, the proposals of the administration as transmitted through the majority. I would make this point as emphatically, I assure you, if the situation were to deny proper committee staffing to the Democrats.

The need is for proper policies, properly arrived at, properly researched and understood above and beyond the desires of the particular administration running the executive branch.

But what of defense policies in particular? Part of my assignment today was to discuss the role of the two parties in forming these policies. I want to disobey the assignment simply because that role is nowhere near as significant today as is the role of the executive branch operating with virtual autonomy, particularly through the Department of Defense.

It should come as no surprise to you gentlemen to be asked to consider, for instance, the policy implications of the existence of counterpart civilian research or consultative groups for virtually every operational function of the Armed Forces. This shadow Department of Defense is a fact of your everyday military life. It is a reflection, I think, of the new direction in policymaking, the direction away from the proceses of representative government and toward government by expert, specialist, technician, or even computer.

Policies evolved by these outside research groups can have the most profound and direct impact upon our national defense policies. Often, their policies are our national policies. And this is not to debate the point of whether the policies are right or wrong. It is to state, however, that from my position as a member of the legislative branch, responsible to an electorate, the process of forming those policies is wrong, dead wrong.

Policy formation should never be far removed from policy responsibility. By creating this shadow Department of Defense, however, authority and responsibility are widely separated. You might call it a responsibility gap in our policy structure.

Most serious, however, is the possible politicalization of the military services themselves. Let me cite an example. One of the branches of the shadow DOD, a research and analysis group, has been going quite deeply into the question of disarmament. This suggests a possible effort to stress, in our defense policies, actions that will enhance the purely political efforts toward disarmament. This, I hold, is improper. It is not the function of the Armed Forces to beat their swords into plowshares—no matter how devoutly they may cherish the notion. Nor is it the function of defense policies to become an adjunct of particular partisan political policies—such as a particular administration's proposal for disarmament. The implications are obvious and shocking.

Political decisions, of course, must guide the use of the Armed Forces. They should not guide the purely internal and professional decisions and composition of the Armed Forces. For instance, the decision to scrap any particular weapons system should be made on the basis of technology and strategy. It should not be made on the basis of partisan political plans.

Yet, today, the scrapping of Skybolt and the offer to place Polaris missiles at NATO's disposal is essentially the politicalization of what should have been a professional military decision.

As far as I have been able to ascertain in the short time that I have been in Washington since the opening of this Congress, not one member of the Senate Armed Services Committee was apprised of the decision to scrap Skybolt and to offer the Polaris missiles to NATO. Yet, the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, which handles military appropriations, have an interest in these decisions and how they are arrived at, because of their overriding interest in what is good for the Republic. From the exercise of this interest comes the decisions of the committees, and secondly of the Congress, that enable the Department of Defense to build their weapons systems. I might inject at this point that the present disarmament proposal offered at Geneva by the United States, which contains in my opinion the mechanics of unilateral disarmament, was not discussed with the Foreign Policy Committee of either House or with leaders of the Senate who would have a natural interest in any such proposal.

Again we see the emphasis on centralization that characterizes our own domestic situation.

News emanating from the Department of Defense is another familiar example of the way in which policy support is attempted by executive management rather than by representative persuasion.

Suppression of news, I would admit, is a conceivable necessity of a national emergency. But when a spokesman for the Department of Defense argues, publicly, that it is the inherent right of government also to lie in its own defense, then I say that we have moved another giant step away from representative and toward repressive government.

How ironic it is that many of our citizens today are worried by such hyperthyroid considerations of a military coup d'etat as that contained in the book, "Seven Days in May."

How much more to the point would it be to worry about the tiny coups d'etat which take place everyday so that the federal system is being reshaped into a lopsided monster that is virtually all executive in the way it walks, thinks, talks, and cannibalizes the other two branches.

Americans of all political hues were particularly sensitive to a single manifestation of this when another administration attempted to pack the Supreme Court with justices favorable to a point of view rather than dedicated to points of law.

The situation today is far more striking and far more obvious. Our 7 days in May, in truth, are ticking off not in the duty rooms of military stations but in the paneled cloisters of executive offices.

I believe it to be common knowledge across this country that the membership of the 87th Congress almost unanimously supported additional appropriations for the B-70 program and that the Department of Defense has consistently refused to recognize the will of the people as expressed through the votes of the Congress. It is true that a rather piddling sum has been applied to this project, but it is also true that the uninformed civilian researchers in the Pentagon resist this program and are determined to see it fail. This, I suggest, is a very obvious example of the growing determination of the executive to ignore the wishes of the legislative. I stress this balance and point to a lack of it as a principal reason why I could not direct my remarks as suggested by the school toward the methods of solutions of problems by the two-party system.

Policy formulation, in a representative form of government, is like a man. It works less well if its limbs are lopped off. It needs a mind and it also needs heart. It needs eyes and it needs ears. It needs muscles and bone structure linked, balanced, and functioning. Starve the sinews and it collapses. Close the eyes and ears and it risks collision.

And we do starve the sinews and close the eyes and ears when we deny representation and rely overly on administration.

Actually, the situation I have been describing is a direct comment also on the question of how political parties form, support, and press policy positions. They do it less and less as parties and more and more as reflections of particular administrations. The administrations, in turn, do it less and less as representative bodies and more and more as the reflections of their particular sets of policy specialists.

And why? Basically because the keystone of the great arch of representative government, the legislative, is subordinated in policy considerations and more and more asked only to approve what the executive technicians have developed. In the case even of the opposition there is less and less opportunity to speak out for a new formulation of policy. Opportunity usually is left only to oppose.

A domestic example would lie in the medicare proposal to which I referred previously. The Congress already has passed legislation establishing certain means of obtaining medical attention for elderly persons, the Kerr-Mills bill. In short, it has said that there is another way to reach the goal of medical care. But, because this representative expression does not please this executive branch, its operating agency in the field, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, is deliberately using its powers to stutlify the Kerr-Mills procedures and thus pave the way for a new attempt to obtain congressional surrender to an executive proposal. It is not enough for representative government to agree on the goal and then work out a consensus on how to reach it. Executive emphasis in government, says, instead, that the legislative must also agree to, accede to, the exact wording, the punctuation, and the procedures of the Executive plan.

In international policies it is even more pronounced. Time and again, the legislative branch has sought to hammer out a broad base of policy that could guide us as a Nation. Time and again, the executive branch in this and in previous administrations has moved ahead unilaterally to positions that may solve a momentary problem but beg the whole broad issues of national objective.

There is no doubt, for instance, that the consensus of the Congress is opposed not just to missiles in Cuba but to the toleration of a Communist base there at all. Executive policy, operating behind a nearly total blackout of information regarding even the invasion prisoner negotiations, takes a different tack, offering no-invasion pledges, pinning policy to offensive weapons and not to offensive doctrine, and so forth.

Skybolt and the RS–70, the whole elimination of the manned bomber program is one of executive engineering and too little congressional debate—and information.

The pause theory, the no-cities theory of nuclear attack are executive decisions. They have not passed any of the tests that should be applied to major decisions in representative government. They have passed the review only of the executive's technicians. And these technicians, supposedly representative of the Nation as a whole, are in obvious fact representative only of a faction of a fraction.

There may be, in all of this, instances of bipartisanship. But it is a bipartisanship only of convenience and of detail.

Half of this Nation has been, in effect, disenfranchised. The half that seems to believe, by its voting record, in policies of lessened centralization of government at home and in a strategy of initiative rather than reinforcement of the status quo abroad, are disenfranchised by an executive branch that is out of sympathy with their position and all too sensitive to and resentful of efforts to redress the balance in the legislature which is the only ameliorating body available.

True bipartisanship would, at least, find the executive appreciative of and not laying siege to legislative prerogative.

Properly this is the only way to focus the policies of the two parties upon the debates from which the single policy of national statement should emerge.

Your interest in the actions of the two parties must be counted partially academic. Until the balance between executive and legislative and judicial is fully restored, policy will remain essentially a possession—not of a party or people, but of an Executive. Only when the balance is restored can it again become a process and a participation.

What has been taking place in America is a revolution directed at the piecemeal changing of our concept of government. One might say that the revolution was based upon the concept expressed in our Declaration of Independence, "all men are created equal," for the proponents of the revolution intend to see that man is not only born equal, which is the true meaning of the words in the Declaration, but that he remains equal in material things all through his life. This material equality would be maintained by taking from the ambitious their property to be distributed among the lazy. To do this—to either take property without the due process of the law—or to change the laws through Executive edict to ignore that prohibition of the fifth amendment—would require a thoroughly controlled centralized government. The revolution, of course, has been a bloodless one. We have had no fighting in the streets, no bombings, no assassinations, but no one can successfully argue today that the revolutionists have not been successful. Actually, when we discuss conservatives and liberals today we are discussing the opponents in this revolution. The liberals believe that the power of a central government can best regulate the lives of men regardless of what it does to their freedom. The conservative believes that the closer government remains to the people, the more the people have to say about policies of their government, the more can be gotten for all of the people, including that most important point, the preservation of freedom.

Had I felt it possible to discuss this broad problem within the confines of a two-party system, it would have been an easy assignment and I could have accomplished it in length of this paper. It is not an easy assignment, however, because as I said at the outset, we in effect have drifted away from the two-party concept, and while we still do not have a one-party mechanism which might be called the alternative, we do find a terrific growth of power in one branch of our government, which, if allowed to continue, will successfully stamp out both parties. And I am afraid also that the legislative and then the judicial branch of government will fade further leaving only the executive. This process of deterioration, I might remind you gentlemen, has been experienced by nearly every government in the history of the world and the experience has caused their ultimate undoing.

I look forward, therefore, to the question period so that we might develop in a more specific way questions that I might have placed in your minds.

## How an Iowa Democrat Looks at the Tax and Spend Policies of This Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, of special interest to me was a recent letter to the editor of the Des Moines (Iowa) Register from Mr. Frank Engel, 1727 Division Street, Davenport, Iowa.

Mr. Engel is a leading Democrat in our State but he certainly has no stomach for the pellmell race which the President and his spendthrift advisers are conducting with sophisticated economics to run this Nation into insolvency.

Because I feel that Mr. Engel's remarks will strike responsive chords in the Congress, and because I feel that they carry a special message to the taxpayers of this great country, I wish to insert this letter to the editor in the Appendix of the RECORD. The letter follows:

EDITOR,
*Des Moines Register,*
*Des Moines, Iowa.*

DEAR SIR: The big tax loot the country has been shelling out is beginning to make itself felt, and if something drastic isn't done, it's going to hurt more. It's going to take more than some scrawny cut by Congress in deference to President Kennedy's plea, to preserve the incentives favorable to the success of the capitalistic system in the United States.

A lot of people say a cut in taxation should be accompanied by a cut in government spending. They should know better and be more realistic about offering such high-sounding economic platitudes, for the logical conclusion of such reasoning will never appeal to the government spenders and it will never be ardently advocated by those who live off the public trough. So long as you keep filling the trough for them, they will be your unwelcome guests. No genuine desire for efficient and economical government will ever come from the taxeaters and the tax-spending donkeys we are feeding as the free-loaders on the bin of American production.

Take into account the gigantic dollar total of all governmental taxing bodies, beginning with local, school, city, county and State taxes in addition to the huge Federal budget, and it already eats up more than half the national wealth produced in the United States annually. We are literally being eaten out of house and home. The size of that tax dish is a stupendous portion of our production.

The tax-eating hordes will strive, however, to make the tax trough bigger to hold more. They don't want employment in productive industry. They don't want to help bake a bigger pie. They just want a bigger slice, which, of course, leaves a smaller share for those who make it, or keep on trying to make it. To them, the idea of cutting taxation is bizarre and "unorthodox."

Perpetuated long enough, our taxation system will ultimately destroy the fabric of unity which binds our people together. We have now become already, a nation divided by those who produce the national gross product for the maintenance of the standard of living requirements from those who produce nothing, except persuasive arguments for more spending and taxation, and socialism.

Taxation is like a drug. It easily becomes an immoral habit. A little may be useful and necessary, but the appetite grows with what it feeds on. The orgy of tax-spending is now swallowing our economic production and destroying the legitimate incentives which has made capitalism successful. Like drug addicts, if the tax-spenders can't get enough money by taxation, they go on with deficit spending and push the country into the red with debts. We go into deficit spending very naively for the benefit of foreign nations, therefore why not go with the same deficit practice by giving something to the American taxpayers in the way of a substantial tax cut. The billions we give foreigners they now use to buy our gold supply and we even let them shell that out without protest.

While the tax-spenders wreck the economy, they yet consider themselves our overlords and the masters of the public welfare state. The U.S. State Department even runs advertisements on television suggesting people to seek careers in government. In the first 2 years of the Kennedy administration an additional 180,000 people have been added to the public payroll. They can't all be relatives. The demand for the social welfare state is hatched and built up by propaganda conceived and launched by the political tax-spenders and never was originated by the majority of the people. In short, the public doesn't know what it wants. It never has, and short of some intellectual utopia, never will. Its collective mind is a vacuum into which will rush the dreariest social-demanding divertisements conceived by such cynical suppliers seeking political status. In truth the public opinion is a shapeless glob, waiting to be given form by men richer in political cleverness than conscience. And that's how we got into the mess we've been shoved. We take it without protest and keep shelling out the loot to the tax-eaters and the tax-spenders. Let's start driving those donkeys and make them pull their share of the load with productive employment as the President suggests.

FRANK L. ENGEL.

## Joseph William Briggs: Our First Postman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans would appreciate what Joseph W. Briggs has done for them but they may never have heard of him. Forgotten, except for a handful of relatives is the Clevelander who conceived the free postal delivery service for cities, served as the first mailman and designed the first free delivery letterbox.

Mr. Briggs, who died in 1872 and is buried in Woodland Cemetery in Cleveland, had nine children. His closest living descendants are two grandchildren: Mrs. Victor P. Minier, 12479 Cedar Road, Cleveland Heights and Mrs. Irene B. Allen, Thompson, Ohio. Their grandfather had reached his early fifties in the Civil War period. Cleveland got its regular mail route in 1803 and its first post office in 1805, located on Public Square on the site of the present Federal Building. During the Civil War, Mr. Briggs was stationed there as a clerk and assistant to the postmaster. At that time everyone had to go to the post office for his mail, which was either placed in special boxes or delivered at the windows.

During the winter of 1862–63 Mr. Briggs noticed that the women who stood in line in the cold suffered unnecessary hardships. They were so anxious to get letters from their husbands and sweethearts who were away at the fighting fronts that some of them used to stand exposed to the cold for hours before they could reach the delivery window. So Mr. Briggs suggested the idea of sorting the mail and taking it to the various grocery stores in different parts of the city where it could be distributed to the people who lived in the immediate vicinity thus saving them a long trip downtown and waiting in line. The idea was adopted and it worked out so successfully that Briggs went a step further. He suggested that uniformed post office employees should deliver the mail at the homes of the people to whom it was addressed. At first the idea met with every kind of opposition, but it was finally put into effect and Mr. Briggs designed the first uniform worn by the post office employees who became our first letter carriers.

On March 3, 1863, Congress passed the bill authorizing city free delivery. The Postmaster General in Lincoln's Cabinet, Montgomery Blair, then made Mr. Briggs a special agent of the Post Office Department for the supervision of the free delivery system. In that capacity, he organized the system of free delivery of mail matter in 52 cities from Bangor, Maine, to San Francisco, Calif.

I do not suppose any man ever contributed as much good to as many people as Joseph W. Briggs, who died in 1872, unhonored and unsung. Today, some of our most beloved public servants are the postmen who bring our mail to our homes daily. However, if it had not been for the foresight of Joseph W. Briggs, we might still be going to the central post office and standing in line to get our mail.

## Independence Day of Chad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 11, the Republic of Chad celebrated her second anniversary of their independence, and we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President of the Republic, Francois Tombalbaye; and His Excellency, the Chad Ambassador to the United States, Adam Malick Sow, on this memorable occasion.

This month the people of the Republic of Chad are celebrating the second anni-

versary of their independence. Although proclaimed free and sovereign on August 11, 1960, and admitted to the United Nations the following month, formal independence celebrations were deferred until January 11, 1961.

Chad is a republic, one and indivisible, secular, democratic, and social. It has seen a period of gradual and peaceful transition from colonial rule to independent status. This Republic became a separate colony in 1917, distinctive from the other colonies in France's African empire. Chad attained the status of an oversea territory of the French Union in 1946, becoming in 1958 an autonomous republic of the French community. The final step was full independence in 1960. This peaceful and gradual transition has instilled in the people a feeling of responsibility to adhere strictly to democratic processes. In the preamble to the Constitution of Chad, the defense of the rights of man, the separation of powers, and civil liberties are laid down as the fundamental principles of the nation.

Chad is a land of many terrains and a great diversity of people. There are settled farmers in the south, raising cotton on lush riverlands. There are ranchers in the center of the nation raising cattle and sheep on the expansive savannas. And finally, there are nomads in the north, living off the desert, guiding their caravans into the interior. The country's landlocked position and relative inaccessibility are the major deterrents to development. Since the economy is dependent on cotton and cattle, it is necessary to have sufficient transportation facilities to enable these products to reach foreign markets, and in turn, to be able to receive much-needed produce from the outside. That is why immediate development plans for the future call for railroads, paved roads, and expanded air service. In the near future, development projects also outline plans for greater diversity in industy and the exploitation of minerals and other raw materials.

When the President of the United States recognized the independence of Chad, he stated that the United States looked forward to close and friendly relations with Chad's government and people. On this second anniversary, I extend the wishes of the people of the United States for continued progress and success.

---

## Our American Heritage: Will We Keep Freedom Alive?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Our American Heritage: Will We Keep Freedom Alive?" by a prominent American, Mr. Walter Knott.

**Mr. Knott is a conservative patriot who has unselfishly dedicated much of his own time and resources to maintaining and furthering the American system. He is founder of the California Free Enterprise Association, a sound organization that publishes important economic facts of our times and encourages schools to teach free enterprise the American way.**

The article follows:

OUR AMERICAN HERITAGE: WILL WE KEEP FREEDOM ALIVE?

NOTE.—Walter Knott is the founder of Knott's Berry Farm and the builder of Ghost Town, an authentic replica of early California gold mining towns, at Buena Park, Calif. This article by Knott appeared in Tax Digest, third quarter, 1962, a magazine for taxpayers published by the California Taxpayers Association. Richard Winter is editor. Knott was born in San Bernardino, Calif., in 1889. In 1920, he and Mrs. Knott moved to their present location in Orange County, and built their farming enterprises from 10 acres of rented land to their present extensive acres. Their four children are partners in the business and now manage it. In addition to the world famous Berry Farm and Ghost Town, their ventures include the restoration of Calico Ghost Town, halfway between Los Angeles and Las Vegas.)

(By Walter Knott)

For a few minutes let us examine our great American heritage—our individual freedom—from whence it came; what it has done for us; and what we are doing to pass this heritage on to our posterity.

Throughout all history comparatively few men have ever been free. Some historians say not more than 5 percent and most of these have lived in America. Until our American Revolution the common man everywhere had only the freedoms that his government chose to bestow on him.

Our founding fathers when gathered together to form our Constitution came up with a whole new concept of government. These men (divinely guided, I believe) said that freedom was God-given and rested in the individual. The rights were his and he could give as little or as much as he chose to his government. These pioneers chose to form a very limited government keeping their individual freedom and bearing their individual responsibilities. Here for the first time in history the chains were taken off the individual and placed on his government.

At the time of the American Revolution there were less than 5 million colonists. Yet this small number, together with freedom loving people from other parts of the world, filled the Atlantic coast and started moving west, subduing a wilderness as they went. In an incredibly short time these pioneers who had so little to work with, had subdued the West and built a nation.

How was it that they were able to build our towns, our cities, our roads, schools, churches, colleges and their homes and all without government aid? And how is it that now, even with all our accumulated wealth, we have to run to Washington when we have to build a wing on a hospital or a dormitory at a college. I think there may have been several reasons. First, hardships overcome, make strong, self-reliant people and certainly they were used to hardships. Second, they did not have to support a large and expensive government. And third, they had a degree of personal freedom that we don't have today; and fourth, they had an understanding that with freedom, there must be responsibility.

In the year 1910 the cost of running our Federal Government was $1 billion and by chance that year the national debt was just about $1 billion. Our population then was 90 million people.

Since 1910 our population has doubled but the cost of running our Federal Government has jumped from $1 to $90 billion this year and the budget for next year is $93 billion. In these same years our national debt has climbed from $1 to $298 billion and we are adding to this debt at the rate of $650,000 per hour (24 hours per day) for every hour since January 20, 1961.

Today it costs us 90 times as much to govern twice as many people as it did 50 years ago. Why? How and when did we let this take place?

It started in the year 1913 when we passed the 16th amendment to our Constitution When that amendment was ratified without any limit beyond which the Government could tax its citizens, the Government began to grow.

With this new easy money coming in, the Government bureaus began to grow, slowly at first but it was soon found that Government could buy favor with blocs of voters so as the Government grew, it again needed more money and the rates were raised. Then the Government had more money to curry favor with more voters and rates could again be raised. We soon learned that Government bureaus never die, they only multiply.

In less than 50 years (less than my adult lifetime) I have seen that innocent appearing tax of 3 percent on a few rich people, grow until today those same rich people are paying 91-percent tax and the poor people who were to have been the beneficiaries of the tax, are paying 20 percent.

With every increase in this tax there has been a corresponding increase in the size of our Government, an increase in the controls on our lives, and a corresponding loss in our freedoms.

Perhaps you feel that the rich man who finds himself in the 91-percent bracket is not personally hurt and to a degree this is true. Today we are in an industrial age where it costs from $7,000 to $30,000 of invested capital to provide each new job. If the Government continues to penalize the industrious citizens by assessing a higher and higher penalty on thrift and industry, where will this large amount of capital come from to provide the new jobs for today's generation of young people? Obviously we will have to go to the Government for capital, and when the Government owns the tools of production, that is socialism.

Today America and the rest of the free world are fighting a cold war against communism. More than 100 years ago Karl Marx told his followers that the way to capture any capitalistic society was to get a high and progressive income tax levied. Ours is now up to 91 percent. Frank Choderof puts it this way, "Without the income tax, socialism is impossible, with the income tax, socialism is inevitable."

During that same 50 years our national debt has grown from $1 billion to $298 billion.

We have only balanced our budget six times in the last 31 years and 25 of these years we have plunged deeper into debt.

During the first 140 years of our life as a nation, we paid our national debt down after our wars, even after the great Civil War and World War I. But during the last 30 years instead of paying, we have added to our debt at a fantastic rate, and have made absolutely no effort to pay. I will bet you have not heard a politician in years even suggest that we should be paying on this ruinous debt.

No doubt some of you are thinking how can things be so bad when we are so prosperous. Yes, we are properous, we have gone $25 billion deeper in debt during the last 15 years since the end of World War II while we should have been paying on our debt.

We are prosperous because we have been mortgaging 150 years of thrift and hard

work, saving and capital accumulation. A 150 years during which we saved, worked and became the most productive people in the world. We have mortgaged this until now the interest on our national debt is more than it cost to run our whole Government 22 years ago.

And, our generation is making no effort to pay. We are greedily enjoying a fool's prosperity by mortgaging everything our forefathers accumulated and leaving the responsibility to pay to our children. Do you think we are rearing children who will be more responsible, more self-denying, willing to bear their debts and ours too?

Why did this breakdown of morality, this lack of responsibility, this dishonesty happen in our generation after America had lived through five generations without building a big, extravagant Government to control the lives of its citizens? Was it the 16th amendment to the Constitution that made it possible?

Note the change in our people's thinking during the short 49 years since that fateful day in 1913. When this amendment was being discussed in Congress, one farsighted lawmaker stood up and said if we pass this iniquitous law, without setting a limit beyond which some future Congress can go, some of you will live to see the day that Government will not take 3 percent from the rich people as planned now, but will take 10 percent and they hooted him down because 49 years ago no one in America could conceive of taking 10 percent from anyone.

Well, the years passed and the Government grew and taxes were increased slowly at first, then faster and faster. From 1913 to 1933 the growth was in such little doses we hardly noticed it, even though during this time we fought World War I and we were paying on the debt this war had created during the 1920's.

Since 1933 Government debt, taxes, and Government controls have grown at a fantastic rate. We are governed today by an incredible bureaucracy.

In 1910 you could go from one year to the next and never see a Government agent, while now one person out of seven who is gainfully employed in America, is working for Government.

One-third of our national production goes to pay taxes. The average American works 4 months out of each year just to pay taxes. We are one-third socialized.

During a very brief span of years America has tried the only real experiment in freedom the world has ever seen. It has succeeded far beyond anything the world ever accomplished in all history. Under this freedom and our free-enterprise system (Capitalism) one-seventh of the world's population has been able to produce one-half of the world's goods and wealth. And we have been able to divide this production and wealth more equitably among our people than any other people during all history.

Either we will again assume the responsibilities of freedom or the light of freedom will go out in America, and if it goes out in America, hope of freedom will go out all over the world.

Today we have both a great opportunity and a great responsibility. We may be writing the last chapter in this wonderful experiment in freedom started by our Founding Fathers. This experiment that has given us so much. That has made us the envy and hope of people everywhere.

If the wealth, the luxury, the leisure that our system has brought us makes us smug and complacent, willing to load our responsibilities on our Government, we will lose and deserve to lose our freedom and with it will go all of these fruits of freedom.

We have no right to lose this freedom that was given to us to use—to enjoy and to pass on to our children. Our children deserve the same opportunity.

Let us write our chapter so that our children and their children will have the opportunity to add theirs to this, the world's greatest experiment in freedom.

## Proposed Merger of New York Central Railroad and Pennsylvania Railroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM E. MILLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Niagara Falls Area Chamber of Commerce, January 14, 1963, with respect to the proposed merger of the Pennsylvania Railroad and the New York Central Railroad.

The resolution is self explanatory and I felt it would be of interest to several of my colleagues whose constitutents also have an interest in this proposal.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF NIAGARA FALLS AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, JANUARY 14, 1963

With respect for the proposed merger of the Pennsylvania Railroad and the New York Central Railroad, which is before the Interstate Commerce Commission for consideration in finance docket Nos. 21989–21990, and in which the citizens and businesses of the city of Niagara Falls have a significant interest because the New York Central Railroad prominently serves enterprises of this city and community, and in consequence of a public hearing of this matter held in the city of Buffalo on December 19, 1962, at which testimony of individuals was heard, it is the desire of the Niagara Falls Area Chamber of Commerce to present a restatement of its resolution adopted on October 30, 1962, as follows:

"Whereas there is presently proposed a merger between the Pennsylvania Railroad and the New York Central Railroad and a joint application has been filed by these railroads with the Interstate Commerce Commission (finance docket Nos. 21989–21990); and

"Whereas a statement and testimony under oath in opposition to this merger were submitted at the public hearing on December 19, 1962, purporting to represent the sentiment substantially of this city and community, which differ with the conviction held by this organization; and

"Whereas this organization reached its decision only after extensive effort to secure facts in addition to those facts readily available. It relies on expressions by organizations and declarations by individuals closely allied with the transportation industry who are, in reality, experts in this field who state: An excess transportation capacity exists in the United States; the facilities of the several transportation modes overlap; the major modes of transportation suffer from overregulation applied as an awkward device for dividing the available traffic; that the railroad industry, in particular, in spite of extensive investment in and widespread use of the most modern operating techniques, has been unsuccessful in its efforts to derive net revenue sufficient for healthy operation; and the further fact that insolvency may be imminent; and

"Whereas improved conditions of operation, with consequent improvement in net revenue, reductions in expenses, increased efficiency, the elimination of duplicate physical facilities, and the effective pooling of managerial skills, are persuasively promised by a merger of the Pennsylvania Railroad and the New York Central Railroad, all to the end that markedly improved freight transportation service may be expected in the Niagara Falls area with a corresponding effect on its economic growth; and

"Whereas testimony which springs from hearsay, or relies on misleading information or misunderstood data, all of which is presented in summary as truly representative of this community, clearly disputes the considered judgment of the directors and officers as they represent the membership of the Niagara Falls Area Chamber of Commerce; and

"Whereas this organization desires emphatically to reiterate its earlier adopted position for the betterment of Niagara Falls industries who must rely on adequate railroad service: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Niagara Falls Area Chamber of Commerce, in its continued emphatic support of the Pennsylvania Railroad and the New York Central Railroad proposed merger for the reasons stated, does so in the firm belief that its position truly represents the sentiment of the area, and furthermore, intends this resolution shall have the effect of correcting in the Interstate Commerce Commission record any reference to a contrary attitude which it believes to be detrimental to the interests of the people of the Niagara Falls area.

## Voss Manufacturing Co. of Atlantic, Iowa, Wins at National Show

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, we Americans are always duly proud when our friends receive recognition for outstanding accomplishments.

Mr. George Voss, president of the Voss Manufacturing Co., has again proven his company's slogan: "If it is made of wood we can make it."

Under leave to extend these remarks, I include the following editorial from the Atlantic News Telegraph, Altantic, Iowa:

[From the Atlantic (Iowa) News Telegraph, Jan. 8, 1963]

VOSS MANUFACTURING WINS AT NATIONAL SHOW

A kitchen built by the Voss Manufacturing Co. of Atlantic and designed by Georgia Tonnelli the former Georgia Voss, has been chosen the outstanding exhibit in the kitchen department of the National Home Builders show in Chicago. The kitchen, designed for Better Homes and Gardens, was pictured in a four-page spread in the November issue of the magazine, has been exhibited at a number of national home shows and has won widespread attention. The Home Furnishings Daily of December 19 featured pictures of the outstanding units of the kitchen and this national publicity has brought to the Voss Manufacturing Co., inquiries from as far away as both coasts.

Before the job of building the kitchen was given to the local concern, Better Homes and Gardens had submitted the plans to a large group of furniture builders. Without exception they had said that they could not build the kitchen. The project was all but abandoned, when Georgia mentioned to the firm that her father could build it. He was handed the job with the result that now an entirely new field for the services of the local firm appeared to be opening up.

The kitchen, French provincial in design, features a wall-hung table adapted from a maple chopping block, with wood and wrought iron supports attached to a corner post extending from floor to ceiling. It is built in pie-shaped wedges and seats six. Another unique feature is a spindle-supported plate rack, while the spindle features is carried over into cabinet bases.

The Home Furnishings Daily describes the kitchen under the headline "Fine Furniture Look in the Kitchen," and from all the exhibits at the National Home Builders used three of the Voss-built kitchen features out of a total of seven selected for detailed descriptions.

## Work of the Trustees of the New Haven Railroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ABNER W. SIBAL
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, the Bridgeport Post of Wednesday, January 17, carried an excellent editorial tribute to the work of the trustees of the New Haven Railroad. It should be encouraging to all Members to know that this railroad, which is being operated under the Bankruptcy Act, has such highly competent men at the controls. When the New Haven, through the joint action of Federal, State, and local governments, is at length restored to financial health, we all will owe a great deal to the imagination and dedication of the trustees, who are laboring against great odds to preserve and improve this vital asset. The editorial from the Bridgeport Post recognizes this and I am happy to offer it for the RECORD:

THE TRUSTEES ARE TRYING

The trustees of the New Haven Railroad, with initiative and energy, continue their valiant effort to revive the line against heavy odds.

A new train-to-airport transfer service is a good example of the trustees' modern thinking, the search to overlook no possibilities. Through an arrangement with a motor coach service, the railroad provides rides from Grand Central Terminal to the major airports.

There may not be an enormous amount of profit in this new program but every little bit helps. And it bespeaks an up-to-the-minute outlook which has the feature of turning competition to advantage so that it isn't, as they say, a total loss.

In the vital matter of freight revenues, the New Haven is acquiring substantial new "weapons" in its fight to increase business in southern New England. The first 3 of 50 additional modern piggyback flatcars were placed in service the other day on the Boston-New York Shore Line.

Here again, there is the factor of turning competition to advantage. The 85-foot flatcars, each capable of carrying two 40-foot highway trailers, are 3 feet high. This permits them to carry tall, 12-foot 6-inch trailers in the restricted clearance area between New York and New Haven.

Acquisition of the flatcars involves modernization. They will be paid for from the proceeds of old locomotives and other outdated rolling stock.

The trustees, explaining the reason for acquiring the new cars, cite the savings in operation and labor costs, the faster service of benefit to the shipper and railroad.

The trustees are to be commended for refusing to act as though the situation is hopeless.

## Did the Appeasers Sabotage the Invasion?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, with apostles of appeasement surrounding the President, the American people are not getting the truth.

David Lawrence, in an article in the January 22 issue of the Washington Evening Star, raises a very serious point when he questions whether our Military Establishment is competent and if it has been unduly interfered with by civilians.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the article, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 22, 1963]

UNITED STATES AND THE BAY OF PIGS FIASCO—QUESTION OF MILITARY COMPETENCE OR CIVILIAN INTERFERENCE IS RAISED

(By David Lawrence)

The American people are entitled to know whether the chiefs of their armed services are incompetent or whether, in strictly military operations, they are being interfered with by civilians in the Government.

A congressional investigation of just what happened before the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba took place in April 1961, is more than ever necessary now, because of what is being disclosed as the true story of the fiasco. For unless the responsibility of the U.S. Chiefs of Staff during military operations is clearly fixed, the capacity of the United States to prevent or resist armed attacks in this hemisphere may be open to question.

More than 300,000 men of our armed services were mobilized last October inside the United States for a possible invasion of Cuba in order to get rid of the Soviet missile bases there. But there is no way to judge whether the military chiefs even then had the full authority to act and just what restrictions were placed upon them which could have affected the success of that expedition.

Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, who, because he is a brother of the President, is regarded as the administration's authoritative spokesman in many matters outside his own department, has just given two interviews on the Cuban fiasco, one to the Knight newspapers and the other to U.S. News & World Report.

The two interviews dovetail, though they do not cover all of the same points. The Attorney General told David Kraslow, Washington correspondent of the Knight newspapers, that there had been no invasion plan completed during Mr. Eisenhower's term. He said: "There was just a general concept. The logistics and the details were worked out after the President (Kennedy) took office."

Added interest has developed now in this whole subject, because many of the Cuban officers of the invasion force, who were recently ransomed have been telling Americans that the United States had assured them of air cover. Attorney General Kennedy makes quite a point of the fact that no U.S. air cover was ever promised. Technically, this is correct. But the United States was fully cognizant of the air support the Cubans were supposed to have. Yet this was inadequate. Attorney General Kennedy said in his interview in U.S. News & World Report:

"The first point is that there was not U.S. air cover and none was withdrawn. In fact, the President didn't withdraw any air cover for the landing forces—United States or otherwise.

"What happened was this: One air attack had been made on Saturday on Cuban airports. There was a flurry at the United Nations and elsewhere and, as a result, U.S. participation in the matter was coming to the surface. This surfacing was contrary to the preinvasion plan. There was supposed to be another attack on the airports on Monday morning.

The President was called about whether another attack which had been planned should take place. As there was this stir about the matter, he gave instructions that it should not take place at that time unless those having the responsibility felt that it was so important it had to take place, in which case they should call him and discuss it further. And that's what was postponed. It wasn't air cover of the beaches or landings. And, in fact, the attack on the airports took place later that day.

The air cover provided was from a base in central America. What part the U.S. Government played in organizing it is not disclosed. In the middle of a military operation, however, you can't make a long-distance call to the White House and discuss the next move. The anti-Castro forces were sure air cover was coming from somewhere.

The Attorney General was asked who did the planning. He declared that "the plan that finally went into effect was approved by our military, the Pentagon, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as well as the Central Intelligence Agency." He added that, while the Joint Chiefs "approved" the plan, "the responsibility for the planning lay primarily with the CIA," and that, since the President had to give final approval to the plan, he had accepted the blame.

In both interviews, the Attorney General said that U.S. airpower was to have been used only if the ships transporting the Cuban invasion force had been detected by Castro before they reached the target area and were attacked on the high seas on their way back to Central America. This is the explanation given for the presence of U.S. warships, including an aircraft carrier, in the vicinity of the Bay of Pigs on the day of the invasion. Yet it is asserted that before the invasion the President had "made it clear" that U.S. Armed Forces, including airpower, would not be used.

In the interview in the Knight newspapers, the Attorney General said, "The plan that was used was fully cleared by the CIA and the Joint Chiefs of Staff."

But what does "cleared" mean? Do the Joint Chiefs take responsibility for any such plan as was employed?

Listing the major "mistakes," Mr. Kennedy added: "There was not sufficient air cover at the beach. That was a mistake. There were

not enough men and equipment. That was a mistake. Underestimating the T-33's (Castro's airplanes), that was a serious mistake. The planning was inadequate, just inadequate."

But who did all this planning, and why wasn't someone in the U.S. Air Force able to say in advance whether the T-33's had the capacity to carry rockets? These were the U.S. planes originally given to the Batista regime in Cuba.

The important "details" have never been divulged, as there has been a constant cover-up. But if Congress now fails to make a searching inquiry, with testimony available to the public, another military fiasco could occur, especially if the same "military planners" are still in command at the Pentagon

In an AP dispatch of January 22, a member of the Cuban Revolutionary Council disputes Bobby Kennedy's version of the Cuban invasion.

The President of the United States, instead of having his hatchetmen speak for him, should be forthright with the American people and clear the air like a man.

The article follows:

CUBAN EXILE INSISTS U.S. PLEDGED AIR AID

MIAMI, FLA., January 22.—A leader in the exile organization that mounted the 1961 Cuban invasion insists that the anti-Castro brigade was promised full air cover.

Manuel Antonio de Varona, of the Cuban Revolutionary Council, said he was obliged to break silence because of Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy's statement yesterday that no U.S. air cover was planned.

The Attorney General said President Kennedy couldn't have issued last-minute orders canceling air cover, as many administration critics have maintained, because there never were any plans for the United States to provide air support.

Senator GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, also disputed the Attorney General. In Washington Senator GOLDWATER said he talked with the President just after the invasion and "I certainly got the impression then that an air cover had been part of the original invasion plans."

Mr. Varona, a former Cuban Prime Minister who headed the leading Cuban democratic revolutionary front at the time of the invasion, said in a statement:

"The colonel designated by the Government of the United States as head of the camp where the Cubans trained assured me in February 1961, when I expressed concern over the reduced number of troops, that the Cuban patriots would have 'full air control' during the invasion.

"The brave expeditionaries never had the promised air coverage.

"Neither was I informed of the date nor of the plans for invasion, which in any case would not have had my approval in view of the conditions under which it took place."

## The Essence of Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague from California, the Honorable CHET HOLIFIELD, recently addressed the annual convention of the National Appliance and Radio-TV Dealers Association in Chicago.

As usual, our colleague delved deeply, with an analytic address entitled "The Essence of Competition."

Mr. HOLIFIELD linked his subject with the quality stabilization bill, saying Congress, by enacting that bill, will affirm the true essence of competition; namely, the profit incentive, the right to earn a profit.

His meaty words have brought much comment. Typical is this column by Earl Lifshey, the well-known writer of Home Furnishings Daily.

IF YOU ASK ME

(By Earl Lifshey)

"Everywhere we find evidence that the competitive price is being singled out as the dominant element in today's free competitive enterprise system. In fact, in an increasing majority of business circles, to be competitive has come to mean only that one sells at the lowest price in the particular trading area. But unless quality is tied to price then price becomes deceptive.

"And is it any wonder when our own Federal Trade Commission in a recent case involving the Snap-On Tools Corp. said: 'Playing off one dealer against another in the hope of obtaining a better price is the essence of competition.' I don't know whether the manufacturers in your industry have left the above quotation unchallenged, but I am delighted to use the platform of the National Appliance and Radio-TV Dealers Association to challenge it."

The challenger in question is Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat, of California, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the ranking Democratic member of the Government Operations Committee, who tossed that gauntlet at the FTC the other evening in a speech at the NARDA convention dinner. Long a retailer himself—he has a men's clothing store in Norwalk, Calif.—he spoke with the authority of a merchant as well as a legislator. And, he continued:

"If we have reached the point where 'playing off' one dealer against another in the hope of obtaining a lower price is in fact the essence of competition, then we have pushed into the background all of the wonderful constructive marketing practices that have played such an important part in the growth of the most prosperous country on the face of the earth.

"In my opinion, the FTC has not selected, as the essence of competition, the necessary element that must prevail in order to preserve our free Democratic form of government. The essence of competition is unequivocally the incentive. I'm speaking of the incentive that causes us to do all the constructive things that we do to bring to market the splendid products of industry. I'm speaking of the fair reward for those constructive efforts. In this way the essence of competition is tied to the right to earn a profit, with emphasis on the word 'earn.'"

Citing the various factors that contribute toward earning a profit in merchandising, the Congressman declared that in doing those things "you have exercised your prerogatives * * * your right to earn a profit. But did you make a profit? If you did was it commensurate with the effort expended?" To help insure the continuation of the right to earn a profit and to help protect against the cannibalism of price debasement, however, he urged the exercise of another prerogative, the wholehearted support of the pending quality stabilization bill in Congress.

"That legislation will restore the competitive price to its proper perspective and will take a big step toward helping you do all those things that you are anxious to do to earn a profit," Representative HOLIFIELD continued, reminding the dealers that "It's not the FTC, nor the courts, nor the predators in the marketplace that make our laws; it is the Congress expressing the will of the people that has the power to make the laws in this area."

Whether the housewares industry, which is currently staging its great semiannual exhibition in McCormick Place here, or the home electronics and appliance industry would take top honors in any profitless, price-cutting contest no one particularly cares about. But that the quality stabilization bill constitutes a highly desirable measure to help correct that situation is something on which I have often declared myself here most emphatically. And I join Representative HOLIFIELD in strongly urging you to promptly write or wire your Senators and Congressmen to support it when it comes up for a vote.

But there is, apparently, still a lingering misunderstanding in the minds of some people in the marketplace, if not in Washington, about this legislation. It does not guarantee a profit to anyone. All it does—and this is a point I have emphasized again and again—is help insure the right to try to earn a profit—but under the basic, traditional terms of individual, free enterprise—not under terms dictated by those who want such rights for themselves but deny them to others.

Many things have changed in this distribution revolution, but free, individual enterprise is still a two-way street.

## Pilgrims and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there is natural discussion these days of the virtues or lack of virtues of communism. It is equally natural occasionally to compare the communism of today with its original theories and comparable practices.

I was especially intrigued by an editorial which appeared in the January 10 issue of the Lansing Journal, which discusses the economic principles of the Pilgrims in a most interesting fashion. Under leave granted, I include the editorial "Pilgrims and Communism" in the Appendix of the RECORD.

PILGRIMS AND COMMUNISM

We were intrigued the other day by an investment banker's speech that called our Pilgrim Fathers a bunch of Communists and then went on to prove it.

He was, of course, showing why our great free enterprise system is the only way to achieve the standards of living we have today, but he chose to do it by telling how the Pilgrim Fathers gave the communistic principles quite a whirl in 1620, even down to a 7-year plan, but pitched it out when they found it wouldn't work.

The speaker was Amyas Ames, president of the Investment Bankers Association, who addressed their convention in Hollywood, Fla.

He noted that the Pilgrims signed a 7-year agreement, agreeing to put all of their profits

and benefits gotten by trade, teaching, working, or fishing into a common stock. Also all of them drew their meat and drink from this common stock.

"Three years later," Mr. Ames said, "they were wise enough to forsake communism by allowing the incentive of profit to energize their people."

The lesson is clear. We have built a prosperous nation on the energy of profit. The postwar world has been remade on the energy of industrial profit—in Japan, in West Germany, France, England, and Italy.

We can't put it any clearer than by using Ames' words: "Profits pay our taxes, support our Government, and our schools, and most important of all they work for people and energize our communities."

## Scranton's Program Warmly Received by Both Parties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article and editorial from the Pittsburgh Press:

[From the Pittsburgh Press, Jan. 23, 1963]

SCRANTON'S PROGRAM WARMLY RECEIVED BY BOTH PARTIES

(By Sherley Uhl)

HARRISBURG, January 23.—Both parties have responded warmly to Gov. William W. Scranton's "program for progress" but Democratic reaction contained a grain of tongue-in-cheek skepticism.

Democrats generally endorsed the Governor's 11-point legislative program and noted that it contained several planks frequently scorned by the GOP Old Guard.

Their attitude was that the Governor would encounter more roadblocks within the conservative wing of his own party than would be erected in the legislature by his Democratic opposition.

Many privately expressed the conviction—if not hope—that Democrats could now sit back and watch the Republicans fight among themselves.

Republican leaders, however, exhibited no qualms. They too accepted the Governor's recommendations favorably and predicted few hitches.

There were a few reservations, however. House GOP Leader Albert W. Johnson said he couldn't anticipate reaction to the Governor's desire to extend civil service protection to an additional 17,000 employees.

The same proposal was greeted cynically by Democrats who observed that it was hitched to a qualifier permitting the Governor to review records of current payrollers for 1 year to determine which are ineligible.

This qualification inspired a wave of Democratic titters and smirks in the course of the Governor's address yesterday before a joint session of the Senate and House. It provoked the only adverse restiveness noticeable during his entire speech.

Aside from this, the Democratic leadership offered to provide votes for the Governor's program if it should be stalled by the Old Guard.

Conservative Republicans, for instance, have customarily rejected proposals to rewrite the State Constitution via the convention method—as advocated by Mr. SCRANTON.

Upstate Republicans also may dissent from his proposal to establish a separate department headed by a Cabinet-rank officer to assist cities and metropolitan areas with their special problems.

Genevieve Blatt, Secretary of Internal Affairs, called the Governor's attention to the existence of the Bureau of Municipal Affairs in her own department.

She said she is prepared to spare the State the expense necessary to create an entirely new department by volunteering to deal with municipal problems. Miss Blatt is a Democrat.

After the Governor's address, Senator William J. Lane, of West Brownsville, Senate Democratic whip, commented:

"This guy sounds like a Democratic Governor."

Senate Minority Leader Charles R. Weiner, of Philadelphia, said the Governor's message sounded like a variation of the Democratic platform. He said his party would support some administration bills if they ever let them out of committee—an oblique reference to possible opposition by GOP committee chairmen.

Senator M. Harvey Taylor, Harrisburg, senate president pro tem and GOP old guard leader, described the Scranton program as sensible and constructive.

But Representative K. Leroy Irvis, Pittsburgh Democratic caucus chairman, observed:

"I noted the grimness with which Senator Taylor greeted the speech."

Republican Senator George N. Wade, Camp Hill, labeled the Governor's recommendations as "appropriate but revolutionary."

Other Scranton proposals would—

Declare a 1-year moratorium on the school district reorganization act.

Place strip-mine controls under the department of forests and waters (conservation) and remove them from the department of mines, where industry's influence is sometimes paramount.

Create a separate department of mental health with no political activity.

Separate policymaking from administration in the education field by establishing a State board of education to draft principles to be followed by the department of public instruction.

Place all professional licensing under a commission of professional affairs.

Reform election laws to free election officials of political fetters, and supply the polls with adequate inspectors.

Enact Project 70—a Democratic plan to encircle metropolitan areas with forests and parks, and locate year-round recreation facilities within reach of all Pennsylvanians.

Liberalize Pennsylvania's participation in the Kerr-Mills (medical care for the aged) program by erasing the assumption that it exists for paupers only.

Return the harness racing commission to the department of agriculture, and bar politicians from investing in parimutual tracks.

The Governor also urged the general assembly to appropriate an additional $4 million for the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority to keep it solvent through this fiscal year.

---

[From the Pittsburgh Press, Jan. 23, 1963]

EDITORIAL

GOVERNOR SCRANTON'S HOPEFUL START

If there is anything Pennsylvania needs, it's a batch of new ideas to help us cope with our community problems, our need for industrial development and the whole range of health, educational, welfare and governmental issues which remain to be tackled.

In outlining his program to the Legislature yesterday, Gov. William W. Scranton tackled these issues head on. He presented a set of suggestions which can be the basis for both legislative and administrative reforms, for the better conduct of State government and better service to the people.

Each of these proposals probably will need further discussion before the citizens, or their legislators, can properly assess their worth and decide whether or not they favor them. But the issues raised by the new Governor are the kind we should be studying.

Mr. Scranton's proposal for a new department for community development will interest many people and many communities in western Pennsylvania. Most of us have some interest in such matters as public transportation, urban renewal, housing and community facelifting. If there is anything the State government can do in this regard, Mr. Scranton will find a broad base of public support for his proposal.

It may be pointed out that, in the absence of substantial amounts of State money for loans and grants, the State may be able to do little. But it is equally true that the State is in position to make studies and firm up plans that will be of value both to local governments and to the legislature. And, as Mr. Scranton points out, if Harrisburg does nothing to help, the Federal Government surely will.

The new Governor's proposal for a State board of education deserves study by educators and legislators. He envisions separate councils of such a board for higher education and the elementary-secondary field. Meanwhile, he asks a 1-year moratorium in the effective date of the school merger law. Many will deplore this delay as unnecessary and harmful to the ultimate objective of larger and more efficient districts, but it cannot be denied that it was a hot political issue in many districts during last year's election campaign.

A separate department for mental health is a long-time objective of many informed persons in that field. A council of human services to include heads of welfare, health, and other State services to people could help to coordinate programs. A commission to handle professional licensing could replace the present slipshod and scandalous method of handling this function.

Mr. Scranton has reiterated his views on strip mine legislation and while the precise terms remain to be defined, he has appointed an able committee to draft legislation. There is a good prospect that a strong bill will emerge from this group and, with administration support, have an excellent chance of avoiding the legislative pitfalls which undoubtedly await it.

Great value can be attached to Mr. Scranton's proposal to expand and consolidate the State civil service system, adding 17,000 employes to the group included. Pennsylvania is notorious as one of the last great strongholds of the spoils system, which benefits only the politicians at the expense of the taxpayers. There are whole departments, and Mr. Scranton named them, which should be completely out of the field of patronage politics.

The new Governor's endorsement of Project 70—the huge parks and recreation plan—is wholesome. So is his support for measures to prevent the more obvious abuses which can come out of legalized horse-race gambling, to which the State is committed by prior action.

Most of us will want to hear a great deal more about Mr. Scranton's proposal for constitutional revision before declaring ourselves on that long step, but he showed courage in kicking that ball out in the open for such action as the Legislature may take.

In all, it was a hopeful message which could result in many governmental reforms if legislators of both parties approach it in the same way the Governor has presented it. Mr. Scranton has made a good start.

## Eric Waldman Discusses German Bundeswehr

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Eric Waldman, director of the Institute of German Affairs at Marquette University in Milwaukee, has recently returned from a study trip to Germany. He is the author of the recent book, "The Soldier Within the State," on the German Army. His article on the status of West German armed forces appeared in the January 20 issue of the Milwaukee Journal. It is a penetrating and illuminating analysis of the Bundeswehr and its new director, and I commend this excellent article to the attention of the Members of this body.

As the West German armed forces—the Bundeswehr—celebrate their seventh birthday today, they are the strongest single national contribution to the conventional forces of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The 11th West German army division was integrated into NATO last month and a 12th is soon to be added, fulfilling Germany's promised quota to NATO.

Within these 7 years, the Federal Republic of Germany thus has contributed to the Western defensive alliance more than 400,000 men, designated as trained and combat ready, in the 11 army divisions and numerous air force and navy units.

At the 7-year mark, the Bundeswehr also has a new civilian chief, Defense Minister Kai-Uwe von Hassel, who this month replaced the competent though controversial Franz Josef Strauss. It was under Strauss' direction that West German forces were built into such an important component of the NATO shield which stands guard against Soviet aggression in Europe.

But Strauss was plagued—as his successor is likely to be—by critics from both extremes: Those who say the bundeswehr is too weak, and should be greatly strengthened, and those who fear its strength as a rebirth of German militarism, with all its unhappy historical associations.

What actually is the nature of West Germany's military, as the new minister takes over, with the declared intention of continuing Strauss' major policies?

The number of men under arms alone does not provide a reliable yardstick to measure the quality of the military contribution. Ever since the highly publicized article in the German weekly magazine Der Spiegel the question of the overall reliability of the bundeswehr has been of considerable concern to many people within as well as outside of Germany. This article of October 10, 1962, which brought about a government crisis in Germany and the removal of Strauss, said that the German units received a very low efficiency rating as result of their performance in the NATO maneuvers last fall.

Der Spiegel has advocated for many years a neutralist position for Germany in the East-West struggle. It therefore opposed from the very beginning German rearmament and Germany's participation in a European defense system.

The perennial hostility to Strauss, exponent of a strong German military contribution to NATO, is seen by Bonn observers as part of Der Spiegel's effort to discredit the German military and Germany's alinement with the West.

Strauss' successor, Hassel, the former minister president of Schleswig-Holstein, is a longtime, faithful follower of Chancellor Adenauer. It remains to be seen to what degree Der Spiegel and the elements in Germany which either endorse its neutralist conceptions or appeal to antimilitary tendencies among the German people will shift their attack to the new defense minister.

Hassel might prove a more difficult opponent to bring down than his predecessor because of his calmer personality and his avoidance of petty arguments.

Hassel, 49, an energetic and strong-willed man, has repeatedly demonstrated great administrative and political ability since he joined Adenauer's Christian Democratic Union (CDU) in 1946.

He was born in German East Africa, the son of a German planter in what is now Tanganyika. During World War I his family was expelled. In 1935 Hassel returned to Africa and worked himself up to director of several plantations. In the spring of 1940 he was deported again to Germany and became a lieutenant in the German Army. He was captured by the British in Italy in 1945.

After the war he became mayor of a small resort town on the Baltic Sea and a member of the state legislature of Schleswig-Holstein. In 1953 he was elected to the bundestag, or lower house of Parliament, in Bonn. To accept his appointment as minister president of Schleswig-Holstein in 1954, he had to give up his seat in the bundestag. From 1956 until 1957 he was the president of the bundesrat, the upper house of the German Parliament.

Hassel's strong position within the CDU makes him one of several men mentioned as possible future chancellors. In 1955 he was appointed as one of two deputy leaders to Chancellor Adenauer of the national CDU.

NO INDEPENDENT ROLE

Hassel's general political outlook is conservative. He is reluctant to accept at face value the announced change in domestic and foreign policies of the Social Democrats (SPD). It remains to be seen if his distrust of the socialists may prove to be a handicap for the new defense minister in obtaining SPD support in military matters and in making his ministry less a partisan office than it was under his politically ambitious predecessor Strauss.

If in 1963 the present coalition government of Christian Democrats and Free Democrats should break up once more, a so-called great coalition of the CDU with the SPD is most likely. This development might terminate Hassel's position as defense minister. He might be replaced by the military expert of the Social Democrats, Fritz Erler, who has been serving as vice chairman of the defense committee of the German Parliament since its inception.

The combat efficiency and reliability of the forces for which Hassel will be responsible is a question of great concern to NATO, because of its impact upon the effectiveness of the entire conventional defense structure in Europe.

There are two aspects to evaluation of the new West German military forces: One is the question of political reliability and the other military preparedness.

In regard to political reliability, great attention was paid from the first to the proper integration of the military into the young German democratic state and society. The German armed forces were to be under the executive branch of the civilian government and were not to play an independent role in the political life of the nation.

Between 1950 and 1955, representatives of the three major political parties, educators and former officers who were known for their anti-Nazi position carefully studied civilian-military relations in the Western democracies and incorporated in their planning of the bundeswehr those features which could be applied to the German situation.

The aim was to develop a politically conscious soldier who would be aware of the values he might be asked to defend. The planners believed that only this type of soldier would be able to stand up to the psychological pressures of a future hot war and to the propaganda warfare of the present cold war.

CITIZEN SOLDIER ARMY

On the basis of a thorough investigation, this writer believes that the German armed forces have achieved the goal of the planners and created an army of citizen soldiers. It is not a democratic army since no military establishment can successfully eliminate the hierarchical principle, but it is an army made up of citizens who, during their military service, retain their basic rights. The West Germans understand well the significance of the ideological cold war and they orient their political education to the challenge which reaches across the Iron Curtain and attempts to undermine Western resistance. (This judgment is based on a careful analysis of the educational material used within the bundeswehr and on 4,660 questionnaires completed by officers and soldiers throughout the German military forces.)

The combat efficiency of the young German military forces probably can be much improved even though high ranking NATO officers have repeatedly praised the excellent German performance in maneuvers. The relative short term of draftees is one handicap. Up to 1962 the military service for draftees was limited, because of strong political pressure, to 12 months. The present 18 months of service has brought some improvement but obviously could not overcome the entire problem.

The fact that Germany had no military forces for 11 years is the reason that there is a shortage of young field grade officers to command battalion size units and to occupy staff positions.

When judging the new German armed forces, the complete integration of the German combat units into the NATO structure must be considered. Criticizing the lack of support units, a necessity for an independent military striking force, is not valid for an integrated army.

NOT A NATIONAL FORCE

Indeed, the absence of an independent German military capability should put those people at ease who lack confidence in the changes which took place in postwar Germany. A bundeswehr which must rely for heavy weapons and supply support primarily upon its American ally is hardly capable of repeating Hitler's attempts at subjugating Germany's neighbors.

Moscow is aware of the integrated nature of the West German military. Nevertheless Soviet propaganda to undermine NATO unity accuses the West Germans of plotting to continue Hitler's aggressive policies agasinst Eastern Europe.

In contrast, most foreign observers are suprised at the radical change of the German political scene and at the strong impact made by concepts of western unity and European integration.

## Italy Honors Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week the people of Chicago had the great privilege and honor of welcoming the Prime Minister of Italy, Amintore Fan-

fani. The Chicago Sun-Times has expressed the spirit of the people of Chicago most eloquently in the following editorial welcoming the Prime Minister:

ITALY HONORS CHICAGO

Today the Prime Minister of Italy, Amintore Fanfani, visits Chicago at the personal invitation of Mayor Richard J. Daley. During his short stay he will be honored with a military reception at the city hall, he will lunch with business and civic leaders, tour the University of Chicago and the Museum of Science and Industry, hold a reception at the Italian consulate and he will receive the plaudits of Chicago at an official city dinner.

Chicago is accustomed to receiving distinguished visitors but the Prime Minister is quite an exceptional one. A strong fighter against fascism, a keen economics expert and an able statesman he typifies the new Italy—a country ready and eager to take her place in the world community of free nations.

In Chicago, Prime Minister Fanfani will find that the Italian community is a large and valued part of this great city. Americans of Italian birth and extraction have already made their mark—and are still making it—in religion, business, politics and the arts. This city has always cherished the strong ethnic groups that make for a great democracy and the Italian segment of Chicago's population is especially appreciated.

We welcome the Prime Minister and we hope that in the near future he can come again and spend more time in Chicago.

## Hatch Act Eclipse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, on the 17th of January, I had occasion to call the attention of the House to reprehensible activities taking place in the executive branch which violated the basic principle of the civil service. The Washington Post has commented on this same situation in an objective editorial which I append:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 18, 1963]

HATCH ACT ECLIPSE

However one looks at it, the pressure that has been applied to Government employees to buy tickets for the Democratic fundraising affair tonight is a shabby business. The Hatch Act tells Federal employees that they may not participate in partisian activities. The civil service system holds out to them assurance that they will be compensated and promoted on the basis of merit. Yet many of them are being pressured to give $100 to the Democratic cause—in installments if they cannot afford to buy a ticket to the gala outright—by their supervising officials who should be the first to respect the spirit and letter of the law.

The law on the subject is unequivocal. It provides—

"Any executive officer or employee of the United States not appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall request, give to, or receive from, any other officer or employee of the Government any money or property or other thing of value for political purposes shall be at once discharged from the service of the United States."

Probably most officials have avoided outright violation of the law which forbids them to solicit funds for partisan purposes from other Federal employees. But no one can fail to recognize that, when the head of any agency invites all those who are going to the gala to attend a preliminary party at his home or elsewhere, he is applying indirect pressure to buy a gala ticket. The Hatch Act and the Corrupt Practices Act are designed to protect employees from precisely this kind of subtle coercion.

It may be taken for granted that most of the steam behind this venture comes from the Democratic National Committee. Party officials are always eager to bring in new recruits and replenish the party's treasury. The chief fault lies in the failure of many high officials, the Civil Service Commission and the President to offer employees any protection against the demands of the politicians.

A very different atmosphere would have prevailed if the CSC had publicly reminded officials of the provisions of the law and assured employees that refusal to make requested partisan donations would not count against them. Better still, the President could have warned his subordinates that no coercion or pressure would be tolerated. In the absence of any such protective measure, many employees are likely to feel that the Government itself is winking at violations of the law, leaving them no alternative to making a "contribution."

## Dr. D. M. Nelson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, last fall the Nation lost one of its foremost educators, and Mississippi one of its most beloved and distinguished Christian leaders in the death of Dr. D. M. Nelson, president emeritus of Mississippi College. It was my happy privilege to have known Dr. Nelson as a close personal friend for many years. He exerted a tremendous influence for good throughout the State of Mississippi and the South.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including an article written in memory of Dr. Nelson by one of his closest friends and associates, Dr. W. M. Caskey, a member of the faculty at Mississippi College. Dr. Caskey's eulogy to Dr. Nelson is a fitting and deserving tribute to the memory of a great man, and the sentiments expressed therein are shared, I am sure, by everyone who knew Dr. Nelson in his lifetime. The article follows:

IN MEMORIAM

(By Dr. W. M. Caskey)

The great essayist, Ralph Waldo Emerson, said, "There is properly no history; only biography." A great Christian institution, such as Mississippi College, just didn't happen. It is the lengthened shadows of dedicated men. Our college has become a great and honored institution, and much of the credit must be attributed to Dr. D. M. Nelson, a devout, selfless man with a vision and a sense of mission.

Dr. Nelson's tenacity and determination to succeed in life is revealed in his zeal in seeking an education. In spite of the fact that at 18 he had only completed the 8th grade, he not only graduated from high school, but also earned his bachelor of science degree from Mississippi College, his law degree from the University of Chicago, and his master's and doctor of philosophy degrees from the University of Indiana. Still obsessed with that insatiable desire and incentive to acquire learning and knowledge he was a student, and continued his fluent writing until the end of his more than fourscore years.

After graduation from Mississippi College in 1907, Dr. Nelson spent the greater portion of five decades serving in the field of education. Most of these 50 years were spent at his alma mater to which he was totally dedicated. The last 25 years he served as its distinguished president.

Few individuals in Baptist life were ever as closely identified with the development of an institution as Dr. Nelson had been at Mississippi College. During his long tenure, this financial wizard discharged the large indebtedness accumulated during the dark depression years of a half million dollars, and he operated during all these years in the black. Not once during these 25 years did he have a deficit or a financial reverse. In fact, he had a sizable surplus when he retired. This was, of course, turned over to his able successor.

As one Baptist editor has so well said of the phenomenal strides made under his dynamic leadership: "His amazing career in the service of the Great King was one of the seven wonders of the Baptist world. He, like Saul of Tarsus, moved through his busy life with divine compulsion." Undoubtedly, this great Christian educator has earned for himself a unique place in the affections of all the people of all the faiths in Mississippi. He has made Mississippi College one of the most cherished and respected institutions in the country.

Dr. Nelson had an innate love for young people. In chapel talks—and this greatest of orators always participated in these inspirational services—he often affectionately addressed the student body as "my children." This was indeed a Christian college guided by a dedicated man of God, whose personality will live within this college so long as time shall exist. The testimony of his "children" will bear fruit in the lives they lead as they put into practice the principles which were instilled in them as they studied under this great southern Christian gentleman.

The writer, who feels his inadequacy to write this editorial, came to Mississippi College shortly after World War II, and was closely associated with Dr. Nelson until the end. This great scholar grew on this writer, and, as was soon discovered, he was not only a man of deep and worthy convictions, but also a man of courage, which he demonstrated by showing complete loyalty to the causes he endorsed, and by his refusal to sidestep any issue in which principle was involved.

Dr. Nelson was a versatile man, but never a man of expediency. One consuming cause of his life was of course Mississippi College. Another cause in which he was always a devout believer was our southern cause and our traditional southern way of life, which he considered an essential integral part of our American way.

The accomplishments during the presidency of Dr. Nelson would require volumes for individual listings, and must necessarily be omitted. But a brief résumé of some of the most notable achievements made during his tenure must include: the addition of some 30 buildings; a greatly enlarged library; remodeling of all old buildings; greatly increased number of departments; built concrete streets, stadium, and tennis courts; growth of endowment from about

$100,000 to approximately $1½ million; faculty and staff increased to more than 100; acquiring Hillman College property; and becoming coeducational in 1942.

The beautiful old reconditioned chapel, "a historical ante bellum landmark, stands for the traditions and ideals that have made Mississippi College one of the truly liberal arts colleges in the country." Nelson Hall, built in more recent times, "during the enlargement program, and named for Dr. Nelson as a tribute to him and his outstanding administration, symbolizes the progressive and determined outlook of the college, while it continues to remain true to the past that has made it great."

It must never be forgotten that Dr. Nelson was blessed by "The-Other-Self," Mary White Nelson, who enabled this Christian statesman to achieve all his remarkable accomplishments. With her natural talents, and most pleasing personality, this gracious lady could have risen to high attainments in her own right; but she chose the better part of being the queen of a Christian home, and the mother of a worthy son and daughter, and sharer of her husband's burdens, responsibilities, joys and successes. Miss Mary, as she was known to her closer friends, was always near at Mr. Nelson's (as she called him) beck and call. Always standing by his side, she was a model hostess at all college functions, and a personal friend to all the students.

In conclusion, no more appropriate sentiment can be found to express our impression of the life and work of this really great man, who served not only as president of this institution, but who also became an institution among Mississippi Baptists, than these sublime lines from Longfellow's Psalm of Life:

"Lives of great men all remind us
We can make our lives sublime,
And departing leave behind us
Footprints on the sands of time."

## From New Orleans Comes a Program To Increase the Efficiency of the Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I bring to your attention today "Unique Training Experiment—A La Nouvelle Orleans," which has won national recognition from the National Civil Service League.

The program has been outlined by Felix J. Bethancourt, senior personnel specialist for the Veterans' Administration regional office in New Orleans. This regional office, under the management of Frank W. Sheridan, a dedicated career man, has made remarkable strides during his stewardship and well deserves the plaudits of every citizen interested in veterans' affairs. The regional office in New Orleans is most fortunate in having Mr. Sheridan assigned to that post and the improvements in efficiency and morale since he arrived have been most marked and outstanding.

As to Mr. Bethancourt, the author of the article describing the program: I have known Mr. Bethancourt since his birth and have seen him grow into manhood. He, too, is a dedicated public servant who went directly to the Veterans' Administration following his discharge from the U.S. Army in World War II. I know of no individual with higher ideals and determination to discharge his responsibility than Mr. Bethancourt. Here is a man who is wedded to the public service with a fierce determination to contribute his every ounce of energy to proving that those in the public service measure up to the high standards expected of them.

Mr. Bethancourt is one of those individuals who believes that there are those in the civil service who are interested in giving the taxpayer his money's worth and would like to substitute the words "work and service" for the stigma words "coffee break."

There is no doubt that Mr. Bethancourt and those associated with him have gotten a great deal of satisfaction by participating in this training program and I assure you that satisfaction is the only compensation received by them. They believe that they have struck on one medium of improving their image.

These dedicated men decry any attempt to politicalize the civil service and seek to eliminate any taint of political patronage by allowing the system to maintain an honest merit system instead of a spoils demerit system. These men are determined to advance and live by the ideals in which they believe and will not be sidetracked by the nonbelievers and the cynics. All power to them.

This program was not only recognized nationally but the New Orleans States Item editorially recognized their efforts with an editorial which I also am directing to your attention. Perhaps it is better to direct your attention first to the editorial and then to the article by Mr. Bethancourt which is done in simple open style that should be the envy of any professional writer.

Here is the New Orleans States Item editorial followed by the article which appeared in the National Civil Service League official bulletin Good Government:

[From the New Orleans (La.) States-Item, Jan. 18, 1963]

BETTERING GOVERNMENT

Graduation of another class from the Public Employees Training Institute this week centers attention again on this important piece of pioneering in New Orleans.

Purpose of the institute is to give both Federal and State supervisors in this area an opportunity to take a short course relating to their field under a faculty drawn from universities, business, and government.

The new graduating class of 25 includes supervisors from 12 Federal and 5 State agencies. Because of the 12-week training, they are better qualified, meaning enhancement of their public service.

A creation of the Federal Personnel Council of Louisiana and the Louisiana Personnel Council, the training institute only last month was hailed by the National Civil Service League for its worth and originality.

In doing a good turn for taxpayer and public careerist in this area, the idea should catch on nationally, multiplying its benefits.

[From the Good Government bulletin]

A UNIQUE TRAINING EXPERIMENT—A LA NOUVELLE ORLEANS

(By Felix J. Bethancourt)

"Way down yonder in New Orleans, in the land of dreamy dreams * * *"—well-known lyrics to an ever popular song. Those words may have a validity to a tourist who stops off in this Crescent City and weaves his way through our famous Vieux Carre. But to the residents of this old city, it isn't all dreamy. There are those who do have dreams—the kind that helped make this country great. Maybe this analogy is a bit dramatic and exaggerative for what follows. Nevertheless we will let the future contradict it.

This dream emanated from Ronald L. Brignac, an aggressive and sincerely dedicated Louisiana State employee. Ronald is executive assistant for the Housing Authority of New Orleans.

Early in 1961, Brignac addressed the memberhips of the New Orleans Federal Personnel Council and the Louisiana State Personnel Council. His proposition was this: that these two groups sponsor a training organization aimed at presenting courses in good supervisory practices to Federal, State and municipal supervisors. Brignac pointed out "demands for government services are growing with our rapidly expanding population along with steady pressure for economy in operations. We are not likely to economize by eliminating the services; but we can economize by performing the services we are now rendering more efficiently. We can substitute the long-run economy of doing a good job for the high cost of doing a mediocre job." He added: "Increased competence in supervision is a very tangible need and it can best be achieved by united study and effort." He emphasized that in Federal and State services many agencies have developed excellent training programs in the hands of experienced trainers. "By forming a training school," he said, "we can bring all this experience and know-how to bear on our local situations for the good of all agencies, large and small, who are willing to use the pooled resources."

The membership of the two personnel councils readily agreed to explore the possibility of forming an organization as proposed. They authorized their respective chairmen to appoint a committee to study and present a plan. The State personnel council appointed Brignac; Henry R. Rauber, Port of New Orleans; and Miller Lee Martin, Louisiana State Department of Civil Service. The Federal Council appointed Walter J. Laroque, gulf district, U.S. Maritime Administration; C. B. Harrison, Army Transportation Terminal Command, gulf; and the writer.

Appointing a committee to investigate, study and report is a common practice and quite often, as we all know, that is the end of the proposal. It didn't turn out that way with our committee. The enthusiasm generated by Brignac caught on quickly and all members of the committee pitched in to make the dream a reality.

After several get-togethers, and burning of the midnight oil, a constitution and bylaws were drafted under the name of "Public Employees Training Institute." The constitution provided for a board of directors to be appointed by the chairmen of the two personnel councils, with terms of each appointee designated to extend for 1, 2, and 3 years. The appointed committees of each council presented the constitution and bylaws to its membership and received unanimous approval and sponsorship. Members of the original committee were appointed as the first board of directors of the institute. Members of the board elected Brignac as chairman; Laroque, vice chairman; Rauber, secretary; and Harrison, Martin, and Beth-

ancourt, members of the board. The board then appointed an executive director and assistant director. Edward Boettner, Jr., Department of Apprenticeship and Training, U.S. Department of Labor, and his assistant, Norwood Jatho, Jr., were appointed to the No. 1 and 2 spots. Each of these gentlemen has had considerable experience in the field of training. They lost no time in collaborating with the board in setting up administrative controls and scheduling courses.

After study and review of various State and Federal training manuals, we decided to offer our first course in middle management. A combination of the best materials available was consolidated to present 25 conference-type sessions totaling 56 hours. It was decided to assess each agency a fee of $10 per trainee to cover cost of materials. Sessions were scheduled each Tuesday and Thursday from 9 a.m. to 11 a.m. General Services Administration provided a conference room in the new Federal Building.

The subjects presented were: "Leadership on the Job"; "Elements of Human Relations"; "Differences in Job Relationships"; "Building Good Relations"; "Handling Behavior Problems"; "Handling Employee Dissatisfactions"; "Dealing with Breaks in Relationships"; "Memory Training"; "Performance Evaluation"; "Employment Interviewing"; "Orienting the New Employee"; "Finding Training Needs and Instructing Employees"; "Developing Understudies"; "Communications; Listening"; "The Management Concept"; "Techniques of Management"; "Planning Work"; "Making Sound Decisions"; "The Nature of Organization and Organizing for Effective Action"; "Directing Operations"; "Coordinating Operations"; "Controlling Work Activities"; "Community Resources Available for Self-Development."

Brochures were perpared outlining the curriculum and objectives of the institute. These were mailed to heads of local Federal and State agencies. Each agency was requested to nominate a middle-management supervisor. The response was excellent, however. Selections were based on comparable grades and levels of responsibilities in the nominee's respective agencies.

In the meantime, a volunteer faculty was selected by the board and executive director on the basis of teaching ability and experience in the subjects to be presented. It was our good fortune to secure the services of high caliber individuals from several of the State and Federal agencies, private industry, universities, and private schools in the area. Each member of the faculty was furnished conference outlines and requested to modify the material so as to relate it to the cross-section of supervisors in attendance. A different conference leader was assigned to each session.

Members of the board alternated in attending each session and introduced the conference leader assigned for the particular session. Also, the executive director or his assistant was in attendance.

At the beginning of each session, students were given a specially prepared critique sheet and asked to evaluate the contents as presented, as well as the manner of presentation by the conference leader. The board member in attendance also completed a special evaluation sheet.

As the course neared completion, we presented an open-type questionnaire to the students which we asked them to complete prior to the last session. We emphasized their honest and sincere evaluation would enable us to determine the feasibility of continuing future courses.

It was obvious from the evaluations and individual critique sheets that overall the course was a success. All students voiced the opinion that the training as given was worthwhile and encouraged us to continue the institute. They were also helpful in offering constructive criticism where they felt weak spots were evident in either presentations and/or material used. We found that the most common criticism referred to: desire for more participation; elimination of duplication and repetition of material; a desire for more handout material and more use of visual aids.

On the other side of the ledger, the majority commented that they liked the wide variety of subject material; the use of a different conference leader for each session; and the opportunity to observe and associate with a variety of governmental and industrial leaders.

One pertinent comment that should give food for thought to those above the middle-management level was this: "This course would be beneficial to some individuals above me. I am thankful, however, that I was the one who benefited from it. I feel more confident and a little better qualified to carry out my specific duties, but discouraged in knowing that so much could be improved in my organization. Maybe if the opportunity comes my way, I will be able to put into practice the principles I have learned." Perhaps this feeling is not universal, but to repeat, it does give food for thought.

We do feel that our efforts have been rewarded and the dream has become a reality. We are now underway with definite and improved plans for another course. As far as we are concerned, we have passed the pilot stage, and we're in business. Better supervision with the end product of better service to the taxpayer is our goal.

We would be flattered if our movement extends beyond the "land of dreamy dreams."

## Alaska Economy Expanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, Alaska's growth continues to be a matter of widespread interest, especially in view of a recent controversial television show by David Brinkley which left erroneous impressions that Alaska's economy is lagging. The facts, as disclosed by a report of the National Bank of Alaska, of Anchorage, show vigor and growth. Excerpts from said report are published in an article in the Anchorage Daily Times of January 19, 1963, which article I commend for the information of my colleagues. The following is from that article:

The report deals generally with the State and more specifically with the coastal areas served by the bank and was given by Elmer Rasmuson, president of the bank.

The National Bank of Alaska serves Anchorage, Ketchikan, Juneau, Sitka, Kodiak, Wrangell, Soldotna, Homer, and Skagway.

Statewide, Rasmuson said the overall economy is continuing to climb.

Excerpts from the report follow:

Alaska Department of Revenue figures show that the gross volume of business increased to a new high for the State. Gross business volume for fiscal 1961–62 was $948 million as compared with the $842 million total for fiscal 1960–61.

More people called Alaska their home.

Provisional U.S. Census data for July 1, 1962, sets the State's population at 246,000 persons. This is a 4.2 percent increase over the figure for July 1, 1961.

Total employment was up for the first 8 months of 1962.

July and August traditionally are peak months of employment. In July 1962, the total number of persons employed was 78,200. This figure is 2,100 above that for July of 1961.

The August 1962 figure is 77,800 persons employed and is an increase of 2,800 persons over the same month in 1961.

Record catches of halibut and king crab highlighted the 1962 commercial fishing season. The commercial salmon fishing season was one of the best in years in central Alaska and in the southern section of southeastern Alaska.

The 1962 shrimp catch, estimated at 21 million pounds, exceeded the 1961 catch by 5 million pounds.

The total salmon pack was 3,420,000 cases. Total pack was down in Bristol Bay (53 percent) and in the northern section of southeastern Alaska (64 percent) from 1961.

Total pack for western Alaska was 521,300 cases; central Alaska, 1,989,100 cases; southeastern Alaska, 910,000 cases.

Halibut landed in Alaska totaled 32,452,000 pounds as compared to 1961 landings of 26,014,000 pounds.

Approximately 50 million pounds of king crab, valued at about $4 million, was caught.

New highs were reached in petroleum and natural gas production and activity.

More than 10.2 million barrels of crude, an increase of 59 percent over last year, were produced. Its value was in excess of $28 million.

Natural gas production jumped to 1,600 million cubic feet, a 230-percent volume increase over 1961. Value of natural gas production was $340,000.

Twenty-seven exploratory wells and 9 development wells were drilled. There are, at present, 50 producing oil weels and 6 producing gas wells in the State.

Estimated expenditures by the petroleum industry during the year for exploration, production, and the construction of a refinery on the Kenai Peninsula is $60.5 million.

First step in a development to extend the State's sea roads by adding a new element was accomplished in 1962.

Three State-owned ship ferries, to carry freight and passengers, were launched. All are expected to go into service this year. (The first ship ferry will leave Seattle Monday en route to Alaska.)

Each is capable of transporting 500 passengers and 105 automobiles.

They will serve southeastern Alaska from Prince Rupert, British Columbia, to Ketchikan, Wrangell, Petersburg, Sitka, Juneau, Haines and Skagway, and will provide a sea tie to inland road systems at each of their terminal points.

The Canadian National Railroad extended its freight service to Alaska early in 1962 when it initiated barge service from Prince Rupert to Whittier.

Plans are now underway to provide similar barge service between Prince Rupert and southeastern Alaska ports.

The Alaska Railroad showed a slight increase in gross revenues and revenue tons carried. Gross revenues for fiscal 1961 were $14,308,295; in 1962, the railroad's gross revenues were $14,455,225.

Tonnage was 1,331,359 in fiscal 1961 and 1,447,966 in fiscal 1962.

Air passengers making use of Anchorage International Airport totaled 398,629 persons last year. In 1961, the passenger total was 377,695.

Air freight and express carried last year increased to 41,103,844 pounds from the 1961 total of 40,785,032 pounds.

There was a total of 9,490 inbound flights. Approximately one-third of these were jets.

Landings of all aircraft at Anchorage International Airport and on Lake Hood during 1962 total 128,524.

Military expenditures for the calendar year of 1962 were an estimated $37,452,000, according to the U.S. Corps of Engineers.

Civil works expenditures totaled $2,110,000, according to the corps.

Completion of a power and market study for the Rampart Dam, authorization of Bradley Lake (on the Kenai Peninsula) and Snettisham (near Juneau) hydroelectric project for design and construction, installation of additional pumping stations on the Haines to Fairbanks petroleum pipeline, construction of small boat harbors in Dillingham, Douglas, Homer, and Seldovia highlighted the year's program.

More land was under agricultural production last year than previously with a total of 18,648 acres tilled. Statewide, production climbed for hay, grain, silage and most vegetables.

The Matanuska-Anchorage-Susitna area accounted for two-thirds of the total agricultural production in the State.

Power generation and transmission in the Cook Inlet area took great strides during the past year.

Both the City of Anchorage and Chugach Electric Association took steps to fill this vital need.

An 18,000 kilowatt capacity gas turbine generator was built and installed for the city of Anchorage.

Completion of CEA's transmission line from Cooper Lake made additional power available to the Greater Anchorage area. Cooper Lake generates 15,000 kilowatts.

CEA is in the process of constructing a $2 million oil fired generating plant, of 10,000 kilowatt capacity, north of Kenai. The turbine generator is scheduled to go into operation before summer of 1963.

FISH, PULP, OIL, CONSTRUCTION

The city of Anchorage issued 1,110 building permits during the past year. These covered a total construction value of more than $18 million. Twenty public works projects were completed at a cost of $2.2 million.

Cargoes crossing the Port of Anchorage dock more than doubled in tonnage.

School district construction came to an estimated $4,750,000.

School enrollment increased from 14,049 in 1961 to 15,188 in 1962.

Ketchikan's salmon pack was the best in several years; halibut landed there reached a new high.

The Bay West Mining Co. mined and sold 6,000 tons of uranium ore valued at $1.5 million.

Building permits within the city totaled $1,318,977. In the school district, permits totaled $950,000 in valuation.

In Juneau, 250 building permits were issued for a valuation of $1.5 million.

Voters approved two bond issues: $3 million for improvement of streets, sidewalks, sewers and a small boat harbor, $776,000 for a new grade school.

Bids for construction of a new Federal building, to cost about $12 million, will be let early this year.

Improvements were made at the airfield to permit all-weather jet landings.

Kodiak's 1962 salmon catch was the largest in the city's history. Total pack reached 711,900 cases.

The king crab pack set a record. The economy of the community has been increased and stabilized as a result of more concentrated king crab fishing in the area.

More than 34 million board feet of spruce was shipped from the Wrangell Lumber Co. during the year. Eighteen ocean vessels operated out of Wrangell to move this cargo.

Shrimp and crab pack totaled $479,000 in value; the salmon pack totaled $600,000 in value.

The past year marked the second consecutive year of more than $1 million of construction in Soldotna. Population of this community's trade area is now estimated at 4,000 persons.

A good fishing season bolstered Homer's economy. Two new oil wells were started within 14 miles of this community. Work on portions of the Sterling Highway continued preliminary to paving.

Skagway saw a good tourist year with more persons visiting there than in several previous years.

Work is being done on the ferry landing in anticipation of the Alaska State ferry system beginning operations.

Pulp production at Sitka's Alaska Lumber & Pulp Co. reached a new high. Plant expansion, to allow for an increase in output from 370 to 450 tons of pulp per day, were nearing completion. Pulp is destined for Japanese markets; brings in an average of $24 million a year.

Firm's Alaska payroll is approximately $4.75 million. Local loggers receive approximately $7 million annually.

Federal payrolls in Sitka are in excess of $3 million. A $5 million expansion of Bureau of Indian Affairs facilities at Mount Edgecumbe Hospital is planned.

---

## Congress Should Have Authority To Fix Postage Rates for Fourth-Class Mail the Same as Congress Fixes Rates for First-, Second-, and Third-Class Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced, for appropriate reference, a bill to return to the Congress the authority to fix rates of postage in fourth-class mail which includes the parcel post system.

I have discussed the grave problems confronting the parcel post with several Members of Congress, including the distinguished chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee and we are in agreement that immediate action by the Congress is necessary in the interest of protecting the parcel post system.

As Members know, Congress a number of years ago relinquished its authority to fix rates in parcel post and gave concurrent responsibility in this matter to the Postmaster General and to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

This arrangement, although workable at the time that this authority was granted the Postmaster General and the ICC, has proven to be unsatisfactory and, as a matter of fact, now poses grave financial threats to the very existence of an efficient and well-operated parcel post system.

Within the last 2 years a proceeding was instigated by the Postmaster General at the Interstate Commerce Commission regarding fourth-class rates. This proceeding has been drawn out for a year and a half and finally was brought to a halt with no action taken.

The present statutes require that whenever the parcel post system is more than 4 percent out of balance as between costs and revenues, the Postmaster General is required to petition the ICC for its permission to place into effect rates which the Postmaster General determines are needed to place parcel post within 4 percent of cost.

The Interstate Commerce Commission in numerous proceedings under this statute has determined that it has no independent authority to make investigations of figures presented by the Postmaster General, and has no authority to make any change at all in the petition of the Postmaster General.

In addition to this problem, several recent proceedings of this type in fourth class have demonstrated that this arrangement gives rise to many costly and time-consuming adversary proceedings which delay and hamper the arrival at decisions in the public interest involving parcel post rates.

The Congress has complete authority to set postage rates in all other classes of mail, including the fixing of zones and the assignment of priorities of delivery. The Congress met this responsibility last year in proper fashion as all of us know.

It is my sincere belief that the fixing of rates for parcel post can no longer be separated in any administrative proceeding from the fixing of rates in all other classes of mail. We have but one Post Office Departemnt with one overall operating budget. This Department has four classes of mail and the problems of all of these classes are interrelated. If the Post Office Department is to serve the public, it must be considered as a whole, and its services must be considered collectively.

I am informed that the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee intends, at an early date, to begin an exhaustive study of the parcel distribution systems in the United States. I am informed further that on the basis of the information elicited in this study that the chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee desires to take action in this Congress in the matter of establishing rates in fourth class. I believe that this is a correct course of procedure and that we can all benefit from such a study.

In view of the grave threats to the parcel post system and its ability to serve the public, I hope that the appropriate agencies of Government who are presently concerned with parcel post rates will take note of the interest of those of us in the Congress who intend to take action to rectify the situation with which we are confronted. The problems of price, volume and service to the public in our parcel post system are extremely important to all and I feel confident that all agencies will want to cooperate with the Congress in solving these problems. I hope further that we may proceed without delay to hearings on my bill and action in the House.

## Uncle Sam Has Butter Running Out of His Ears

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. DELBERT L. LATTA
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, our huge dairy surpluses stand as mute testimony of the failures of the New Frontier stewardship in this area of our economy. Now they are proposing another costly, grandiose program for our dairy industry. The Congress should examine it carefully in view of the past, complete lack of performance in this area by this administration.

I commend an article on this subject by Robert Dietsch which appeared in the Washington Daily News on January 23, 1963, to my colleagues. It follows:

UNCLE SAM HAS BUTTER RUNNING OUT OF HIS EARS

(By Robert Dietsch)

People on relief in this country use a lot more butter per person than do the people who support them.

This doesn't necessarily mean relief clients prefer the higher priced spread. They're entitled to the butter under Federal- and State-operated welfare programs, and the Federal Government is only too glad to donate it.

Uncle Sam has butter running out his ears.

Under the farm-price support program, the Government is committed to buy excess dairy products—dried milk, Cheddar cheese and butter. Because supplies are up and demand down, surplus stocks are at an all-time high.

INVENTORY

This was the inventory situation at year's end:

Two hundred and ninety-four and three-tenths million pounds of butter in stockpile—almost twice as much as on December 31, 1961; 2 years ago stocks totaled only 15.9 million pounds.

Sixty three and two-tenths million pounds of Cheddar cheese—compared with 5.4 million at the end of 1961 and none at the end of 1960.

Five hundred and thirteen and nine-tenths million pounds of dried milk—against 186.1 million pounds and 177.4 million pounds the 2 previous years.

The growth of dairy surpluses—and the end isn't in sight—is leading the Kennedy administration to renew its plea for legislation to cut production voluntarily. At present, law requires the Government to guarantee certain prices to dairy farmers and buy up stocks farmers say they can't sell above those prices.

The administration would lower the support price and pay a bonus to farmers who agree to reduce the amount of milk they send to market.

NO ENTHUSIASM

Up to now, Congress has shown little enthusiasm for such a program.

The dairy program now costs taxpayers $500 million a year; Agriculture Department spokesmen say a production cutback plan would save $150 million.

"The butter surplus situation is acute; cold storage space is already scarce," said one source.

There's just no way of handling much more butter.

Certainly efforts to step up butter giveaways haven't solved the problem. Last year people on relief received almost 50 million pounds of butter; generally speaking, policy calls for giving a relief recipient 1 pound of butter a month.

Therefore, each person on relief may have received—and used—12 pounds of butter last year—far above the U.S. per capita consumption average of 7.4 pounds.

## Kennedy Administration Backs Labor's Demands Against Rest of Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, what is being hailed as a statesmanlike settlement of the strike of the longshoremen which seriously affected the entire economy, is in reality a disgraceful surrender to the demands of a few. It is always easy to reach a settlement by surrendering, but I wonder how long 185 million Americans will tolerate being blackjacked by powerful labor leaders abetted by the administration to giving in to unreasonable demands? The following editorial emphasizes this point.

SETTLING A STRIKE BY SURRENDER

A Presidential Board appointed to recommend a settlement of the disastrous dock strike has followed the usual practice of such boards—give the union most of what it wants.

The striking longshoremen demanded a wage increase and other benefits amounting to a total of 50 cents an hour over a 2-year period. The shipping companies offered a package totaling 22 cents an hour. The Presidential Board, headed by liberal Senator WAYNE MORSE, compromised at 39 cents.

The union leaders accepted the Board's proposal on Sunday, and Presidential pressure was applied upon the shipping companies to do the same. Mr. Kennedy asked the Mediation Board to express his concern. Senator MORSE predicted the shippers would accept the settlement, even though they are not happy about it.

Yesterday the shippers gave in, announcing that they did so in the national interest and in cooperation with the President.

At the beginning of the strike the most important issue was a demand by the shipping companies that the size of dock crews be reduced to take advantage of improved methods of handling cargo. The union insisted on preserving the old crew size. This issue has been removed from the dispute and will be tourned over to a board to be appointed by Labor Secretary Wirtz.

President Kennedy, in his annual economic message to Congress Monday, declared: "As long as wage rate increases stay within the bounds of productivity increases, as long as the push for higher margins through higher prices is restrained * * * the outlook for stable prices is excellent.

This sound advice has been ignored by the President's own Board in the proposed settlement of the dock strike. The shipping companies have been trying to keep wage increases within the bounds of productivity increases. How can they do so unless they can be assured that the work crew issue will be settled in their favor?

## Fine Accomplishments of the U.S. Air Force Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress, and the American people, the facts and figures on the amazing success of our U.S. Air Force Academy. As Congressman from the 27th District of Pennsylvania, it has been a high privilege and deep responsibility to appoint 12 young men to this fine Academy. Here is the evidence of the Air Force Academy's highly commendable accomplishments.

Six Rhodes scholarships have been awarded to members of the five graduating classes including the current class of June 1963. This places the Air Force Academy among the top four colleges and universities of the United States in the percentage of graduates so honored. In addition to Rhodes scholars, many have gone on to university and college graduate schools throughout the country and have done exceedingly well. For example, among the members of the class of 1959 who went to graduate schools, three won top honors at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, California Institute of Technology, and Princeton, majoring in astronautics, aeronautics, and political science respectively. One of these young lieutenants had the distinction of being chosen an all-America football player during his undergraduate days.

Academic success has been remarkable as attested by the scores achieved by cadets on the graduate record examination in comparison with those of graduating students at 231 representative colleges and universities throughout the country. The class of 1962 ranked No. 1 in the social science area among the 231 schools, and the classes of 1959, 1960, and 1961 were second. This certainly broadens the popular conception of the military mind.

Brig. Gen. Robert F. McDermott, dean of faculty, describes the curriculum this way:

Half our courses are in the social sciences. It may appear surprising that a service considered highly technical does not give more emphasis to science and engineering courses.

But we're not producing engineers. The cadet here receives a broad liberal education and a good knowledge of the sciences applicable to his service, which means aeronautics, astronautics, nuclear physics, and electronics.

We think our graduate's cultural attainments will command respect not only for himself, but for the Air Force and the country. Most important of all, his judgment should be tempered by an understanding of humanity—this is the sort of judgment the world demands of one entrusted with the means for its destruction.

In the area of natural sciences, the classes of 1959, 1960, and 1961 ranked

second among the above-mentioned 231 representative colleges and universities. Such achievements contributed to the Air Force Academy receiving academic accreditation as an institution of higher learning by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools even before it graduated its first class in 1959.

The Air Force Academy cadet graduates as a second lieutenant and bachelor of science on completing a 4-year program of academics, military training, and physical training which totals 189¼ semester credit hours. This compares favorably with the 140 to 145 semester hours required in the Nation's engineering schools and 120 to 130 hours at the average liberal arts college.

The Academy curriculum is equally divided between basic and applied sciences on the one hand and the social sciences and humanities on the other. Building on the experience of the other U.S. service academies, foreign academies, such as the English and French air academies, and civilian colleges and universities the Air Force has developed and continues to evolve a curriculum best suited for young men who will spend their lives serving the Nation primarily through the application of aerospace power. In doing so, the Air Force Academy was the first undergraduate school in the Nation to establish a Department of Astronautics—space vehicles and environment.

A program of elective enrichment courses was developed at the Air Force Academy soon after its founding. The cadet can take advanced and graduate level courses in addition to the required curriculum. Cadets entering with previous college work or who volunteer to take courses in addition to the set curriculum may range far beyond the required program. The Air Force Academy encourages its cadets to advance academically as far and as fast as their talents and interests permit. This program is one of the primary reasons for the outstanding scores attained in national graduate placement examinations. The Air Force Academy was the first of the service academies to institute an enrichment program beyond its prescribed curriculum.

Over 50 percent of the cadets have participated in the enrichment program. As a result, 25 percent of the graduates have earned majors in one or more of four areas: basic sciences—including physics, mathematics, and chemistry; engineering science—with options in aeronautical and electrical engineering; military management; and international affairs. Normally, service academy graduates receive only a bachelor of science degree without a major.

The Engineering Council for Professional Development recently authorized the Air Force Academy to award engineering degrees. This accreditation of the Academy is a result of the enrichment program of elective studies. About 80 cadets, or 16 percent, of the next graduating class will fulfill requirements to graduate with the degree of bachelor of science in engineering sciences. The Air Force Academy is the first of the national service academies to receive this accreditation.

The enrichment program also permitted the Air Force Academy to pioneer among the service academies in developing graduate level courses. Cadets who take this advanced work can, after graduation, complete graduate programs in astronautics or international affairs at civilian universities and receive their masters' degrees within 7 months.

The Air Force Academy has accomplished much in a remarkably short time. There are several reasons for this. The Academy selected the best from the older service academies, foreign academies, and civilian colleges and universities and added many progressive new practices. Maj. Gen. James E. Briggs, the second Academy Superintendent, said:

> Being new has its advantages. Nothing binds us to the past. That goes for customs that may have outlived their usefulness and it certainly goes for teaching methods and curriculum.

Equally important has been the support given by Air Force Headquarters and the Chief of Staff, Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, who insists that top priority be given to the assignment of instructor and administrative personnel for the Air Force Academy. This is good judgment and broad vision for the future.

Of the Academy's all-military faculty, 21.6 percent have doctorates and the remainder master's degrees, placing the Air Force Academy faculty first among the service academies in academic qualifications. Instructing at the Academy is a job which is very popular within the Air Force, and over 4,000 applications from qualified officers are on file.

The military program is equally as important as the academic program. It is woven throughout the entire 4 years of the cadet's career. The young man is molded into an officer willing and able to accept responsibility for leading and directing a military team in peace or war. Cadets are given increased privileges and responsibilities as they advance through their 4 years at the Academy. Seniors are given the responsibility for the basic summer training of the new members of the cadet wing. Under a newly instituted system of fourth class—freshmen—training, emphasis is placed upon leadership by example and training without harassment. Upper classmen must train, encourage, and exercise positive leadership rather than prejudge or degrade. All disciplinary and training must have a definite purpose. As a result, the military program is more challenging and objective and has significantly reduced fourth-class losses.

Flight training at the Air Force Academy includes indoctrination in flying and navigation. Those who choose to earn their wings must go through 13 months of flight training after graduation. Approximately 90 percent of the first four classes have gone on to pilot or navigation training. Academy graduates who have gone to flying training have done exceptionally well. Whereas the overall elimination rate for flying trainees is approximately 30 percent, Academy graduates who go through flying training have had but half that attrition rate.

Military training motivation was revealed last summer when 85 of the cadets gave up their leave to enroll in paratroop training at Fort Benning. No cadets were eliminated and 1 cadet was first in the total class of 700.

The third lieutenant program is another important element of military training. Each senior cadet gets a short tour of summer duty with an Air Force unit so as to gain first-hand familiarity with the work and environment and problems he will face following graduation.

The honor code is one of the most dynamic features of life at the Air Force Academy and is the foundation of all programs and activities. It is:

> We will not lie, cheat, or steal, nor tolerate among us those who do.

To this code all cadets pledge themselves without reservation and live religiously by it.

The athletic program, along with the academic and military training programs, play an important part in the development of a well-rounded Air Force officer. On the playing field, the cadet develops self-confidence, aggressiveness, courage, leadership, and the will to win. Each must compete in 14 sports—football, field hockey, soccer, cross country, boxing, handball, squash, wrestling, water polo, lacrosse, rugby, swimming, basketball, and judo. He must participate as a member of an intercollegiate or intramural team. Many of the 2 million visitors to the Academy last year viewed the intercollegiate athletic program in which the cadets won 66 percent of their contests. The Academy fields intercollegiate teams in 15 sports. Last year its new 40,000-seat football stadium was dedicated, a gift from the Air Force Academy Foundation, a private organization of civic, business, and Government leaders who deserve a great deal of credit. Funds for the stadium were voluntarily contributed to the foundation from private sources and by individual members of the Air Force. The Academy is extremely fortunate to have such support.

Extracurricular activities at the Air Force Academy are similar to those of civilian institutions. There are cadet clubs devoted to languages, cameras, debating, mountaineering, and geography. Cultural activities of all kinds are encouraged. Religious and devotional facilities are excellent and the chapels are extremely well attended. During the Academy's first year, cadets took over Sunday school classes for children of base personnel. More than 100 men volunteered, making it, in the words of one chaplain, "the only Sunday school with more teachers than pupils."

We have in the U.S. Air Force Academy an excellent, intelligently planned, and well-run institution of which we can be justly proud. In its short life it has excelled remarkably in the academic, military, and athletic areas. Because of its accomplishments and its dedication to prepare young men for a career of service to our Nation, the Air Force Academy

is deserving of our fullest support, respect, and esteem.

Congratulations to the U.S. Air Force, and to our U.S. taxpayers on the success of the Air Force Academy, and a hearty pat on the back to the present cadet corps, the graduates, and the teaching staff for dedication and topflight results.

To ambitious young men in our high schools and secondary schools in America, if you want a really high-level education with a promising future, look up to the U.S. Air Force Academy.

## Hartwell Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution was adopted by the board of directors, Saluda River Electric Co-op on January 8, 1963. This association represents Laurens, Blue Ridge, Broad River, Little River, and York Electric Co-ops and Greenwood Electric Power Commission which serve the northwest one-third of South Carolina. Blue Ridge, Little River, and the Greenwood Electric Power Commission are in my own congressional district. The Greenwood Electric Power Commission and all of these co-ops in northwest South Carolina are among the best in the United States and are doing an outstanding job.

Mr. Speaker, I am in complete agreement with the sentiments expressed in this resolution, and I urge the Department of the Interior to deal fairly with the preference customers of South Carolina in the distribution of Hartwell power.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS, SALUDA RIVER ELECTRIC CO-OP AT THEIR REGULAR MEETING HELD ON JANUARY 8, 1963

Whereas the Southeastern Power Administrator of the Department of Interior has been engaged in working out a marketing and wheeling arrangement for power generated at Hartwell Dam with regard to the amount going to the South Carolina side of the Savannah, and it appears that a contract for wheeling will be entered with Duke Power Co.; and

Whereas the within named six electric cooperatives of South Carolina and two from nearby North Carolina have conferred and worked with Southeastern Power Administration for many months to plan for delivery of this power to them and other preference agencies, and during all of this time it has been planned that the area of delivery would likely be either 100 miles or 125 miles from the dam depending upon the number of preference agencies served, and this plan appeared to satisfy both the South Carolina and North Carolina cooperatives and cities; and

Whereas it now develops that the Interior Department through the Administrator for Southeastern Power Administration now proposes to allot this power to the uttermost part of the vast Duke system which will produce the result that the majority will be sold in North Carolina, even to the Virginia and Tennessee borders: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Saluda River Electric Cooperative, an association representing Laurens, Blue Ridge, Broad River, Little River and York Electric Cooperatives and Greenwood Electric Power Commission which serves the northwest one-third of South Carolina*, That we strongly oppose this new plan and we contend that the marketing area should be not over 125 miles from Hartwell Dam for the following reasons:

1. Half of Hartwell power is already going into Georgia. Under the new formula of the remaining half of the total, three-fourths will go to North Carolina and only one-fourth of this half will go into South Carolina.

2. In order to attain an appreciable saving it was formerly planned that all customers may receive 30 percent of their power requirements, but under this new plan, consumers will now get only 10 to 14 percent of their requirements, so small that it will be difficult to transmit such savings to the ultimate consumers.

3. Greenwood County Electric Power Commission now purchases power from Duke in a substantial quantity, and therefore, it should be allotted its pro rata amount of Hartwell power in relation to this connected load.

4. At the time that Hartwell Dam was authorized it equally received the full support of every Senator and Congressman from South Carolina and Georgia. Congress never intended that the power from a dam on the Savannah should be allotted 50 percent to Georgia, 37½ percent to North Carolina, and 12½ percent to South Carolina, as would result from this new policy.

5. Duke Power Co. has stated that it can deliver and wheel power to any consumers designated by Southeastern Power Administration, near or far. There is ample precedent for the Interior Department to limit the area of distribution. It could be inferred that the diversion of the lion's share of this power away from South Carolina may be a punitive measure by the Department in payment for the fact that every South Carolina Representative and Senator has not always supported every request of the Interior Department. The result could be that added ammunition is given to those who allege there is ineptness and false economics on the part of those who advocate public power.

6. No public power from within North Carolina or Georgia has ever been wheeled or transmitted into South Carolina although there are interconnecting lines by which this could be done. It would appear then that this new policy would require that we go back and redetermine an exact pro rata allocation to all preference customers in all three States by a pooling of all such public power and by utilizing all available interchanges. If it is the policy that we seek to reach the greatest number of people regardless where they may be situated this is a means to get it done, and be consistent with this new policy.

7. There are undeveloped hydropower resources in North Carolina which can be developed to better serve all the areas over 125 miles from Hartwell, and it is fair that these areas should look to their own resources to serve their own areas.

8. This plan for unlimited service areas becomes arbitrary and capricious by reason of the fact that it is without precedent, it was never discussed with your relators prior to its disclosure, and it was not sought or expected by the more remote areas of North Carolina.

Be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Interior Department, to Senators and Congressmen from South Carolina, and to all other officials and persons who have an interest in this matter.

Adopted unanimously at a regular meeting of the board of directors on January 8, 1963.

———, *Secretary.*

## Our Debt to Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the complex problems facing us in the field of foreign affairs, the lack of consistency has been one of our most prominent failings.

Consistency would require the proper perspective and appreciation of the contribution to free world strength other nations have made. It has been my thought that we have not provided consistent understanding of the problems that our British allies have faced, taking them for granted as often as they have taken us for granted.

Our attitude toward Great Britain is very graphically illustrated in an article which appeared in yesterday's Washington Evening Star by syndicated columnist, William S. White, which I include in the Appendix of the RECORD.

THE MANLY DEBT WE OWE BRITAIN
(By William S. White)

A hard-used cousin of the United States has fallen ill, and wearily so, and now requires our help and understanding, for the sake of ordinary decency but most of all for the sake of ourselves.

This cousin is Great Britain. And this national illness is like that personal illness which comes as a chilling vision upon a middle-aged war veteran long, long after the guns have rusted in the silence of the yesterdays. Suddenly, as though in the middle of the night, he sees clearly that all his old exertions and perils have ended in dust and ashes for him and that his late rivals and even enemies are doing far better than he in the world they lately sought to destroy.

He wears, along with his wound stripes and the invisible medals that bring no profit in the marketplace, the gray badge of economic fear while more fortunate men are living it up on top of that world which only his valor and honor had helped to make for them.

This parallel between an ex-soldier now suffering postcombat fatigue and a nation suffering the same, through no fault whatever of its own, is not inexact. It is plain, given the smallest perception and understanding, that today's Britain has had altogether too much to bear for altogether too long. (And it is petty undertone to the tragedy that the mist brittle of England's young entertainers now wow them on this side of the Atlantic by venomous commentaries on the land of their birth.)

BARRED BY FRANCE

The nation which so long stood alone against Hitlerism—a Hitlerism backed for a time by Stalinist Russia, too—now finds itself barred from its best hope to recover its wasted strength, the European Common Market. And by whom? By the country, France, which went to its knees before Hitler's very first blows and left that island kingdom across the channel, that England which was once forever green, naked to a storm which blew not merely against England but against all freemen everywhere.

The nation whose civilians uncomplainingly underwent not days and weeks but months and years of bombing from the skies and freely spent its substance and its lives awoke at last from the nightmare of war. And to what? To an implacable pressure

(at which the United States of America stood at the very forefront) to strip from her all that she had in colonial wealth; to tear from the living body of the old Commonwealth every oversea resource she might have had to repair her ravaged strength.

But not even all this ends the tale of the hero of war who was to fare so ill in the peace which so indispensably he had helped to win.

The harsh realities forced the United States to pour out treasure, not upon tired and broken old England but upon those other lands—whether ex-enemy, as in Germany, or ineffectual ally, as in France—which it was now necessary to bolster against the sick appeal of communism.

BRITAIN GOT SYMPATHY

We could always depend upon the British, tired and broken or not. So to Britain we gave, perforce, our sympathy; to the others we gave our billions. So at length these others, notwithstanding their past guilt and failures, became, not Britain's fair equals but Britain's subsidized superiors in the economic rat race which was one of the legacies of the war.

The British are stout fellows, and very proud, too. But, to repeat, they have had altogether too much to bear for altogether too long. They would reject pity; but manly help in mutual respect they need from us. Help in the economic rat race—a determination here that no Charles de Gaulle and no dozen Charles de Gaulles shall further push Britain down, economically or otherwise—that storied first home of an American Republic which was, after all, raised up by British men.

What, then, is required of us? Why, simply, all that may be required by them to keep that honored place which by blood and valor and brains and historic decency they have a hundred times over earned. If they are no longer quite a top power in this world, they have irreplaceable values to offer still. And that world without them would be poor beyond belief—for us as well as for them.

## President Again Hails as a Victory the Giving in to Soviet Demands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the record of the Kennedy administration is replete with piecemeal surrenders to Soviet demands which are then hailed as Kennedy victories. This happened in Laos where surrender was called a compromise, in Cuba where a brave show of strength developed into a farcical coverup of continued Soviet military expansion, and now in the talks for banning nuclear testing. The firm statement of the President that no ban would be effective without adequate inspection has now been watered down to accepting with enthusiasm a weak counterproposal by Khrushchev which will put us completely at the mercy of Soviet duplicity which is the rule in most of her agreements. The following editorial should be read with care for it indicates to what lengths President Kennedy is willing to go in ignoring bad faith on the part of the Communists.

THE BIG NUCLEAR TESTING "THAW"

The United States, in negotiations now in their fifth year, originally notified the Soviet Union that America's minimum terms for a permanent ban on nuclear testing called for 180 monitoring stations around the world and 20 on-site inspections a year within the Soviet Union.

The Kennedy administration revised the quota of inspection downward to 12 to 20. Then President Kennedy said there must be "some." Last August he and the British offered the Soviet Union an unpoliced ban on tests in the atmosphere, underwater, and in outer space. They left underground explosions to later negotiation, but held out for some sort of inspection.

Now Premier Khrushchev, of Russia, proposes placing three mechanical detectors at widely spaced spots in the Soviet Union where there are frequent seismic disturbances. He would permit American inspectors to come in and look at tape recordings two or three times a year to satisfy their suspicions, provided the United States and other nuclear powers permitted the Soviet Union similar access to their territories.

Provided, further, that the American inspection team be flown by Soviet airmen in Soviet aircraft with screened windows and no cameras. Provided, also, that these inspectors take it on faith that they are being transported where they are told the automatic detectors have been placed, and provided they don't snoop around anywhere else.

Mr. Kennedy, in a well-buttered note, found all this "helpful" and expressed himself as "encouraged." Why? Having started out demanding foolproof inspection and control, he has progressively retreated until the kind of ban he is now hopeful of achieving has more holes than a sieve. Some remaining element of caution has deterred him from full acceptance of the Khrushchev proposals.

The President, in his statement, omits reference to a few matters which are of an importance overriding any terms committed to paper. The first is that, in all 45 years of the existence of the Soviet Union, that Government has never honored any treaty or agreement any longer than it has been useful to Russia.

The second is that Mr. Kennedy has before him the unexampled record of Soviet bad faith in secretly preparing and resuming nuclear tests in the autumn of 1961, in flat violation of the solemn moratorium on testing which it entered with the United States in the autumn of 1958. Khrushchev himself had sworn that he would never be the first to break the agreement. He then proceeded to do just that.

Mr. Kennedy seemed to have learned that lesson when he made a last chance offer for a permanent ban in a speech March 2, 1962. On that occasion he said, "But this must be a fully effective treaty. We know now enough about broken negotiations, secret preparations, and the advantages gained from a long test series never to offer again an uninspected moratorium."

The third consideration is that Mr. Kennedy has had a more recent demonstration of Soviet bad faith. When he announced to the people last October 22 that Khrushchev had converted Cuba into a missile pincushion, he told how the Soviet Government, the Soviet Premier, and the Soviet Foreign Minister had all brazenly lied when they had given him assurance that no Soviet strategic missiles would ever be emplaced outside the Soviet Union.

Now he seems on the verge of being willing to take these chronic liars at their word. As the old rhyme has it, " 'Step into my parlor,' said the spider to the fly."

## Easy Guide to Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith a recent column, entitled "Easy Guide to Growth," which appeared in the Wall Street Journal within the past week. Prof. B. H. Beckworth of the Graduate School of Business, Columbia University, has skillfully used satire to focus the spotlight of commonsense upon the ridiculous new theories of economics which the New Frontier is attempting to formulate. I commend this article to my colleagues with the comment that not all academic people have accepted the principle that deficit financing is the best road to economic growth. Thankfully I say that there are still some sound economic thinkers. I would hopefully say that I wish more of them were in Washington.

The article follows:

EASY GUIDE TO GROWTH

(By B. H. Beckworth)

"Growth, it is wonderful," exclaimed the Government economist, sipping champagne with evident pleasure. "You see, it is not what the country can do for you, it is what you can do for your country. I did my bit by using the money freed by tax reduction to buy good American champagne. That helps growth."

"Why does that contribute to growth?" inquired a serious-looking listener. The economist gave him a withering look. "Why, as everyone knows, it increases the gross national product," he replied. "That is growth."

At the mention of GNP, there was a respectful silence in the room.

"Would it be proper," asked another individual, "for me to use my tax savings to repay a bank debt?"

"Of course not," the economist replied condescendingly. "That would be a Keynesian leakage. That destroys money. That does not help growth."

"Should the deficit resulting from tax reduction be financed by selling securities to investors?" timidly inquired another listener.

"How ridiculous," responded the economist, "you don't understand the miracle of modern money. Commercial banks need no money. They create money by a stroke of a pen. The Federal Reserve banks, too, create money by a stroke of a pen. The pen is not only mightier than the sword; it takes the place of taxes, it takes the place of savings, it causes interest rates to decline."

"But why should interest rates fall?" inquired a doubting Thomas.

The response came slowly and pedantically: "With a stroke of a pen the Reserve banks create high-powered money, with a stroke of a pen commercial banks multiply this high-powered money, into everyday money. Money is the seed of money, money begets money, no population control here."

"But," persisted the doubting Thomas, "are we never to balance the budget?"

"Simply one of our grandfathers' myths. A balanced budget is a drag on growth." Then the Government economist added: "We have budgets for every occasion: administrative, cash, income and capital. They meet every need, they win every vote."

"But will not," asked another, "a large deficit cause foreigners to lose confidence in the dollar?"

"Not at all. The balance-of-payments deficit gives the foreigner dollars. With these he buys Government obligations. One deficit finances another. I regret that I have only two deficits to give to my country."

The questioner was not wholly satisfied and put still another query.

"I was in France a few years ago and found that the budgetary deficit did not help the franc."

"Oh," declared the economist, looking at him pityingly, "the franc is not a key currency. Deficits help only key currencies. The duty of non-key currencies is to key in with the dollar. We swap dollars for francs, we swap dollars for marks, we swap dollars for guilders, we swap where we can. 'Tis Gresham's law in reverse."

All of the bystanders gazed in amazement at the erudition of the economist. Finally one of them exclaimed: "If a little deficit is a good thing, why not bigger deficits?"

"Now you understand the new economics," exclaimed the Government economist as he drained his champagne glass.

## West Penn and Project Keystone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 21, 1963*

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, recently, publicity was given to a new project of great proportions and great importance to the area of Pennsylvania I represent, as well as a vast area including parts of New York, New Jersey, and West Virginia.

This project is to be constructed entirely by investor owned utilities. The magnitude of the project makes it one of the boldest and largest privately financed endeavors of this day and age. If this can be accomplished without Federal or Public Treasury moneys it will mark a rebirth of the private enterprise system in the field of power producing installations.

Those of us in Government charged with fiscal responsibility will watch with more than passing interest the progress of this project.

The great promise of increased economic activity in western Pennsylvania coal mines, which can add at least 1,200 new mine jobs, will be a welcome lift to this hard-hit region.

Unemployment in this area is chronic and the recession is serious. Many of our people have been unemployed for many months, some stretching into years.

This condition cannot endure much longer. The depreciation of values in both human, as well as economic conditions must be halted.

If this project succeeds in this area it can well set up a pattern for an economic revival in other hard hit, depressed areas of our country.

I sincerely hope the Members can find time to read this encouraging message to all of us whose districts have felt the blight of economic depression for too long:

WEST PENN AND PROJECT KEYSTONE

The same kind of thinking big that inspired Americans to cross the Rocky Mountains in wagon trains or slice through the Isthmus of Panama became evident once more in the electric utility industry on November 19.

That day, West Penn Power joined with 17 other investor-owned utilities[1] in announcing plans for a giant $350-million coordinated extra-high-voltage transmission line and power plant construction program.

Allegheny Power System's part will account for $75 million of this total program, which calls for completion of the first stages by 1967.

Simultaneously at press conferences across the State, the 18 companies revealed the mammoth project which includes construction of a 1,600,000-kilowatt power station in Armstrong County, a 500,000-kilowatt station near Point Marion on the Pennsylvania-West Virginia border, and a 600-plus-mile extra high voltage transmission system that will supply power from the 2 stations at 500,000 volts to a 7-State area with a population of 30 million persons.

This is one of the largest coordinated extra-high-voltage transmission line and powerplant construction programs in the history of the electric utility industry, and will mark one of the first full-scale uses of 500,000-volt transmission in our Nation. Transmission at 500,000-volt is so far limited to experimental lines.

Civic and business leaders throughout the country and especially in the 7-State region have hailed it as an important step in meeting future electric needs efficiently and at low cost. (The project will also boost the economy of western Pennsylvania areas near the power stations, and northern West Virginia.)

Participating companies will benefit from such economic factors as lower costs in transmitting large blocks of power at extra high voltages, more efficient operation of larger generating units, power pooling between companies and systems to meet peak loads and emergencies more efficiently, and coal mined near the new power stations to reduce hauling expenses.

General Public Utilities Corp. (GPU), Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., and Philadelphia Electric Co. will jointly own the $175 million Keystone station set for construction near Elderton just inside the eastern boundary of Armstrong County in Kiski District.

Our neighboring utility, Pennsylvania Electric Co. (Penelec), headquartered at Johnstown, is one of four GPU subsidiaries.

The first of Keystone's two 800,000-kilowatt generating units will go into service in 1967, and the second will follow a year later, making this the largest power station in Pennsylvania. (Its 1,600,000-kilowatt capacity will approach West Penn's total 1963 capability of 1,662,000 kilowatts after Mitchell unit No. 3 goes "on line" early next summer.)

Keystone's high-pressure boilers will consume about 4.7 million tons of coal each year for the first 10 years and during their estimated useful life of 40 years should burn about 160 million tons of coal.

Most of this coal will be mined within 15 miles of the plant—although some will come from a radius of 40 miles, providing 1,200 new mining jobs. The station itself will employ about 175 persons.

The nearness of coal to Keystone will keep down costs of hauling fuel, following the "mine mouth" concept that it is cheaper to generate near the coal supply and transmit the power than it is to haul coal a long distance to a power station.

Lacking a large water supply, Keystone, situated near the confluence of Crooked and Plum Creeks, will require four huge cooling towers which look like prehistoric silos. The only other similar cooling tower in the country is at Kentucky Power Co.'s Big Sandy plant.

Allegheny Power System will build and operate the power station on the Monongahela River at the State line near Point Marion, a $57.5 million plant.

When this APS unit goes into operation in 1967 it will consume as much as 1,350,000 tons of coal annually in its early years of operation, and over a 40-year period use 40 million tons. This will become the largest generating unit and plant in the Allegheny Power System, and could possibly be doubled in size if future economic conditions should warrant it. Consolidation Coal Co. will supply fuel for this station.

More than 600 miles of extra high voltage transmission lines stretching from a point near Wheeling, W. Va., across Pennsylvania and on into northern New Jersey and metropolitan New York will tie these two new stations into existing interconnected transmission networks to the west as well as the east and deliver power from these two stations at 500,000 volts alternating current (a.c.) to terminals near Philadelphia, Newark, and New York City.

One 500-kilovolt line will run westward from the new APS station to tie in with the American Electric Power System's Kammer station near Wheeling. Another line will run northeast from the APS station to the new Keystone station. West Penn will build most of these two lines which will total 130 miles and will cost $17.5 million.

From Keystone station, two 500-kilovolt lines will run eastward. One will terminate near Philadephia, a 225-mile distance, and the other will connect with northern New Jersey and New York City 300 miles away.

The decision to build the giant power stations and 500-kilovolt lines came after more than 2 years of careful study of tests and research conducted by utilities and electrical equipment manufacturers during the past 15 years.

Penelec's pioneer 2-year experimental operation of a 13-mile section of 500-kilovolt lines provided valuable information in making the decision. By special arrangement with Penelec, West Penner William C. Guyker took part in this research program to help our company gain firsthand knowledge of extra high voltage operating methods and results.

West Penn and other companies involved in this program have already developed facilities to interchange power.

For years, interconnections between companies have existed as a protection against emergencies. But only beginning November 1 was frequency coordinated between the interconnected systems group of which West Penn is a part and the PJM companies to the east.

Last month, APS and GPU companies placed six interconnections in parallel operation, three of which involved West Penn and Penelec:

Near Clarion, 4.25 of a 115-kilovolt transmission line connects West Penn's Burma

[1] Allegheny Power System and its subsidiaries: Monongahela Power, Potomac Edison, West Penn Power; Pennsylvania-Jersey-Maryland Power Pool Co.—Atlantic City Electric, Baltimore Gas & Electric, Delaware Power & Light, General Public Utilities Corp. and its subsidiaries: Jersey Central Power & Light, Metropolitan Edison, New Jersey Power & Light, Pennsylvania Electric; Luzerne Electric Division of United Gas Improvement, Pennsylvania Power & Light, Philadelphia Electric, Potomac Electric Power, Public Service Electric & Gas, and Consolidated Edison.

substation to Penelec's Piney station; a 138-kilovolt interconnection at our Loyalhanna substation, near Blairsville; and the interconnection at our Shingletown substation.

Potomac Edison System also has three interconnections.

How does the $350 million project fit into the national and international electric industry pictures?

The Federal Government is making a survey of transmission facilities in the United States. The present administration has indicated an interest in building a coast-to-coast transmission network linking Federal and rural electric cooperative generating facilities. Such a move would cost U.S. taxpayers many hundreds of millions of dollars and entrench the Government deeper in the electric business.

In addition to providing economic advantages for its participating companies, the new project ties together the entire mid-Atlantic region into one large-scale transmission network.

American Electric Power, serving nearly 5½ million persons in seven States including Michigan, Indiana, Ohio, Kentucky, West Virginia, Virginia, and Tennessee, has a 345-kilovolt transmission network.

The direct tie-in between these two systems will provide a major investor-owned transmission grid stretching one-third of the way across our Nation.

Other investor-owned transmission networks—existing or proposed—will eventually make a coast-to-coast grid which should offset the need for Federal construction to duplicate facilities.

For example, studies indicate that it may be desirable to connect the new 500-kilovolt transmission system with that of Virginia Electric & Power Co. now under construction.

Internationally, Russia is the United States' closest competitor in electric generation and transmission.

Russia pushed ahead fast in developing extra high voltage because of its need to carry power over vast, undeveloped areas of land.

However, U.S. capability is 199.9 million kilowatts, or three times that of Russia, and the total number of miles of transmission lines in the United States far exceeds Russia's.

Furthermore, the announced extra-high-voltage project in which West Penn is participating will strengthen our Nation's position in extra-high-voltage transmission.

President Streuby L. Drumm has cited extensive engineering and economic studies of the past 2 years as supporting the technical and financial feasibility of the overall $350 million project.

He said, "although this program is one of the biggest single projects ever advanced by the electric industry, it is only a small part of future expansion plans.

"The Nation's investor-owned utilities will invest a total of $42 billion in plant and equipment during the current decade and another $80 billion in the 1970's. This continuing investment is one reason Americans are so far ahead of the rest of the world in availability and use of electric energy."

The following correspondence is worthy of reprint:

SECRETARY OF INTERIOR PRAISES CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Secretary of Interior Stewart L. Udall lauded West Penn and the 17 other investor-owned electric utilities for their bold and imaginative plan to link 3 mid-Atlantic power systems at a cost of $350 million, and called it American private enterprise at its best. Here is his complete letter, and President Streuby L. Drumm's answer to it:

NOVEMBER 21, 1962.

Mr. S. L. DRUMM,
*President, West Penn Power Co.,*
*Cabin Hill, Greensburg, Pa.*

DEAR MR. DRUMM: I read the press accounts yesterday of the bold and imaginative plan of your company, and 17 other private utility companies, to further integrate and coordinate your systems. Having recently seen some of the pioneering work which the Soviets are doing in extra high voltage transmission power, it was heartening to me to note your plan to activate a long-distance line as part of your overall program to keep the cost of electric power at the lowest possible level.

It is my strong feeling that a plan such as the one you have just announced will do much to keep American energy competitive and to help our Nation meet the challenge of efficiency which President Kennedy has stressed so many times as a major national goal.

I should, therefore, like to commend you and your associates in the highest terms for the scope of your plans. To me this is American private enterprise at its best.

Sincerely,

STEWART L. UDALL,
*Secretary of the Interior.*

NOVEMBER 28, 1962.

Hon. STEWART L. UDALL,
*Secretary of the Interior, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. UDALL: It was considerate of you to share with us your reaction to the recently announced $350 million, 18-company generation and transmission project.

We too, of course, are enthusiastic over the contribution this project will make in holding the line on the cost of electrical energy and meeting the ever-growing energy needs of America.

We are particularly pleased at your reference to this as a contribution of private enterprise.

Sincerely,

S. L. DRUMM.

## The Shame of the U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, written by a friend and constituent of mine, Mr. Raymond J. Dulye, points up once more the sentiment among so many of our people.

The average citizen is ashamed and appalled at what has taken place in Katanga. He is ashamed and appalled when he realizes that all this has been paid for largely with his hard-earned tax dollars.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, many of us agree with Mr. Dulye that the United Nations has become our Svengali, and a dangerous and savage one at that.

Under unanimous consent I insert the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD.

[From the Wolden (N.Y.) Citizen Herald, Jan. 17, 1963]

THE SHAME OF THE U.N.

Through the 18 years of our starry-eyed involvement with the global fantasy called the United Nations, both the actual injury and the potential peril of our misguided altruism have become increasingly apparent and painful.

We emerged from World War II, the savior of the free world and we entered the sanctified company of the United Nations as the strongest of all. But what has happened to us since that day passeth all understanding.

Undertaking a "peace action" in Korea we became involved in a war in which our armies, joined by token forces from a few other U.N. members, were under U.N. command; a war we were not allowed to win, a war in which 125,000 Americans died in vain.

In 1956, after years of encouragement by our radio propagandists, Hungarian patriots rose and beat their Red slavemasters with fists and stones and clubs and a few small arms—but we lacked the courage to help and allowed them to be massacred by hordes of Soviet and Red Chinese troops. We averted our eyes while Mao's forces pillaged and enslaved Tibet, while Nehru took the peaceful, industrious Portuguese enclave of Goa, and a Communist stooge seized Portuguese Angola.

But now we have been stirred to action in airlifting U.S. arms to the U.N. "peace force" in its ruthless destruction of the hopes and resistance of pro-Western Katanga and its president, or once-president, Moise Tshombe. Our presence in Katanga is illegal by the law of this land and by the law of the United Nations, yet we're there. As what, international brigands? Strange we could not lift a finger, not point a gun or a plane against the Cuban bandit, Castro, a grave menace on our very doorstep. But against the friendly Katangese, yes!

The U.N., it seems, is our Svengali. We have been hypnotized, rendered incapable of acting in our own interest and traditions. We have even given the U.N. a blueprint for the three-stage takeover of the U.S. Army, Navy and Air Force.

This same U.N. is considering a grant of $2.1 million to Castro, of which we would supply nearly half a million. Our U.N. Ambassador, Adlai Stevenson is opposing it, yet he admits that if the U.N. bosses approve the plan there isn't much that can be done about it.

Isn't there? If we have any spirit or pride left, we can do what we should have done before Korea. We can get out before it's utterly too late.

## Congress Must Guard Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, once again we are witnessing the recurrent phenomenon of Congress being roundly condemned by a plethora of liberal columnists and authors. Their vision is quite myopic when they glance in the direction of the executive branch and its legions of disciplined $100-a-plate bon vivants. But when they take a look at Congress they see visions of oligarchy, autocracy, and a host of other dangerous symptoms of chronic constitutional malaise. Recently the Nation was advised by Mr. Kennedy's friendly biographer, Prof. James MacGregor Burns, that:

The basic thing wrong with our political system is that our Government was set up to be a divided government with internal checks at a time when we did not need a strong National Government. Today it is imperative that we have a strong National Government, but we still have our old constitutional checks. This is the basic problem.

Implicit in these intemperate remarks is the vengeful frustration of the liberals who view the Congress as merely another stumbling block to the onward march of executive power. They knowingly avow that we have simply outgrown the Constitution of an 18th century agrarian society with its checks and balances and silly notions of three independent and coordinate branches of National Government. All important legislation must now come from the Chief Executive in a series of "must" bills. Should the men in the Congress tarry too long in determining the "rolling national consensus" one of those terms of which New Frontiersmen are so everlastingly fond, the remedy becomes clear. They must be labeled as "obstructionists" and drummed out of public life.

How the liberals used to fume about the father image of former President Eisenhower. Today these same liberals are carefully creating the image of the man in the White House as the sole repository of national purpose and the wisdom to achieve our national goals. What a tragedy that they display so little faith in the inherent genius of the Founding Fathers when they provided for a separation of powers.

The last thing they want is a strong Congress; rather they demand a subservient Congress. If they and others of so-called liberal persuasion have their way, "of the people, by the people, and for the people" will all too soon become "of the President, by the President, for the President." Then the management of the news which is now the policy of the present administration will certainly preclude the kind of comment about the Chief Executive which they are now so free to make about the Congress. We do not need a man on horseback; we have got a man in the White House. This, sadly enough, is the bankrupt philosophy of the liberals whose impatience with the legislative process is now plain to behold.

It is against this background and within this context of current opinion that I was pleased to read a recent editorial by Rex Karney, editor of the Rockford Register-Republic entitled, "Congress Must Guard Authority." It points out that we, as Members of Congress, have a responsibility to lay aside petty intramural bickering and join in a common defense against the assault that is being made against the integrity of our National Legislature as a coequal and coordinate branch of the Federal Government. His warning against the inevitable results of further encroachment by the executive and judicial branches of Government should command our attention as we proceed into this first session of the 88th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Karney's excellent editorial follows:

POWER DELEGATED OR NOT USED IS POWER LOST—CONGRESS MUST GUARD AUTHORITY

(By Rex Karney)

Unless U.S. Senators and Representatives stop their squabbling—Republicans against Democrats and liberals versus conservatives—they will find that they have lost another more important battle. Unless our national lawmakers quit fighting among themselves, they will soon discover that while their attention was diverted to relatively minor issues, they have been relegated to a position of subservience to the judicial and executive branches of our National Government.

Under the U.S. Constitution, the Nation is given three separate but distinct branches of Government.

All lawmaking power is given to the Congress, which consists of the Senate and House of Representatives. The Executive power is given to the President. And the power to interpret the Nation's laws as written by Congress rests with the Supreme Court.

But in the past three decades the lines of demarcation between the three branches of Government have become blurred. Presidents have successively reached out to steal authority from the Congress, or to nullify its will as expressed by laws. And the Supreme Court has likewise edged over into the area of legislation, torturing the English language to wring from Federal statutes meanings that never were intended.

This week the White House succeeded in convincing a sufficient number of Representatives that the House Rules Committee should number 15 members, rather than 12. As President Kennedy said in one of his recent television shows, he felt that the committee should number 15 rather than a dozen so that appointment of additional liberals would make it easier for him to get his program through Congress.

That may or may not be the case. Time will tell. But the fact of the matter is that the President succeeded in dictating to Congress the proper size of one of its committees.

Congress in the majority of the years since 1932 has been controlled by members of the Democratic Party. Senators and Representatives alike have drifted into a position where it is accepted procedure for lawmakers to wait for the President to come forth with his legislative program. The success or failure of most congressional sessions now seems to be calculated on the basis of what percentage of the President's program has been written into law.

This is not to say that the President should have no right to ask for or recommend certain legislation. He has that right, indeed. But the congressional tendency has been to await orders, to surrender the initiative to the Chief Executive, to bow to his will. Only occasionally, when White House pressure becomes too extreme, does Congress balk. Mr. Roosevelt ran into trouble when he tried to pack the Supreme Court. Mr. Kennedy ran into resistance last year when his lieutenants got too heavyhanded.

The extent to which the executive department and Government bureaus nullify the clear intent of Congress is too seldom realized, even by Congressmen themselves.

Administrative agencies such as the Labor Board, the Federal Trade Commission, Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Federal Communications Commission all make decisions and issue orders that have the full force and effect of law. Many of these orders and decisions would never have a chance of passage if they had to run the gauntlet of legislative debate. The Justice Department and Internal Revenue Service, for example, apparently cooperated in the decision to make individual and corporate contributions toward ransom payments to Fidel Castro tax deductible. Does anyone think such a proposal would pass if it were put to the test of a rollcall vote in Congress? Right now the Kennedy administration is using Government contracts as a bludgeon to force aerospace companies to deliver all their employees into labor unions. If such a program required congressional sanction, it couldn't be done.

The other day Mr. Kennedy again crossed swords with Congress when he refused to allow unspent foreign aid funds to revert to the Treasury, or to be spent only with the consent of congressional committees. It will be interesting to see whether Congress will take this lying down, or whether it will reassert its control over the public purse.

Congress has authority, but authority not used, or delegated elsewhere, is authority that is lost. Unless Congressmen, regardless of party, soon reassert their authority, they will find they have lost it. Congressmen always will quarrel among themselves, but they should be united in a stand against encroachments by the executive and judicial branches of our Government.

## "And Some Men Yield to Temptation"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the happy sight of the returned Cuban prisoners in recent weeks should not obscure the reasons for their being in Cuban jails—or the methods by which ransom was raised for their release. While the Bay of Pigs fiasco can be referred to as past history from which a lesson must be learned, the half-hidden moves of the Kennedy administration in negotiating the return and raising the ransom, by their very obscurity, are neither history nor encouraging for the future.

It, of course, has been no secret that the President felt a need to do something for these men. We also know that the Justice Department, and the President's brother as Attorney General, participated in the operation to redeem the Cuban invaders. Ostensibly, the manufacturers and other businessmen who contributed supplies or money to the ransom shipments did so voluntarily. No doubt, some did, or would have, had they been approached by private individuals.

A very public individual, however, did the approaching, and the persuading; namely, the President's brother. Whatever the value of the end to be sought, the fact remains that the methods used, and the public office involved, are highly questionable. It is not surprising to me, therefore, that the following editorial appeared in the January 11, 1963, edition of the American Metal Market, and this editorial leaves no doubt that business as well as the American public lose confidence in any administration where even the suspicion occurs of the use of a public office in one sphere to aid the administration in another.

Over 2 years ago, the then Senator Kennedy, in a speech at Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio, on October 17, 1960, outlined an eight-point policy

statement he hoped would govern officials of his administration should he be elected. The second point stated:

Secondly, no officer or employee shall engage in any business transaction with * * * any enterprise or person * * * who is subject to regulation, investigation or litigation under the jurisdiction of that (the employee or officer's) unit. To be above criminality is not enough; I want my appointees, like Caesar's wife, to be above suspicion.

As the editorial states, there is sufficient uncertainty about the application of antitrust laws and other regulatory measures now without more being added. Perhaps we can only return to Mr. Kennedy's campaign speech for an answer:

But experience has shown that such promises are not enough. For ours is a governmen of men, not promises—and some men yield to temptation * * *."

The editorial follows:

MISCARRIAGE AT JUSTICE

However one may extol Americans for their humanitarianism in gaining the release of the Bay of Pigs invaders from Castro prisons, the details of the exchange now coming to light are posing questions more provocative than the ransom itself. They center not so much on Castro's extracting of a tribute of medicine, food and other supplies as they do on the manner in which the money was raised for freeing the prisoners.

The salient fact emerging from the Cuban prisoner affair is that the Attorney General, Robert Kennedy, played a leading role in securing the more than $50 million worth of medicine and food and nearly $3 million in cash demanded by Castro. Most of these contributions were made by American industry, chiefly pharmaceutical and food concerns, although the last-minute cash contributions may have been raised outside of these industries. In all of the fundraising, the Kennedy administration exerted strong pressure on industrialists to contribute. Spearheading the effort was the Attorney General.

Considering the often bewildering and multifarious array of antitrust cases and other litigation pending by the Justice Department against American business, it is laudatory, but puzzling, that the Attorney General also was able to find so much time to promote the Cuban rescue.

Be that as it may. The real damage is that the head of the Justice Department has gravely prejudiced the agency's interests. By his action, he has established an intimate connection between law enforcement—and particularly any possible lack of it—and those companies who contributed to pulling the Kennedy irons out of the Cuban-prisoner fire.

If anyone does not sense the conflict of interest involved here, let him consider a possible parallel in which a police chief seeks financial backing for a business venture from a leading citizen whom he someday may have occasion to arrest.

Indeed, a number of the pharmaceutical companies who donated money at the Attorney General's behest have been under fire from Washington. More disturbing was the report last week by a Minneapolis newspaper that help for the Cuban prisoners came from a large corporation that is currently facing a Government lawsuit. The company reportedly received a call from the Justice Department asking it to supply specific items plus an amount of cash. A spokesman for the company is reported to have said: "We knew we were being blackjacked, but there was nothing we could do about it."

Uncertainty about the application of U.S. antitrust laws and other business regulations is already a serious matter. It is well known that the Justice Department exercises considerable discretion in the selection of cases it will pursue in the courts. It is intolerable, therefore, to permit the creation of suspicion that the Justice Department's pursuit of certain litigation can be influenced by business cooperation with the administration in other matters. Yet the Attorney General of the United States has succeeded in arousing such suspicion.

## Thomas Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, it was with regret that I learned of the death last Saturday of Thomas Kennedy, president of the United Mine Workers of America. He was born and raised in the State of Pennsylvania. He died at his home in Hazleton at the age of 75. He had the respect and love of everybody in his native State.

Tom Kennedy was a statesmanlike leader for organized labor. He worked and fought to better the working conditions for the miners.

He had many fine and great qualities including personal modesty. The labor movement has indeed lost a great friend and champion in his passing.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Evening Standard, Uniontown, Pa:

THOMAS KENNEDY

Throughout most of his life, Thomas Kennedy, president of the United Mine Workers of America, who died on Saturday at the age of 75 years, lived in the shadow of John L. Lewis, the volatile retired leader of the miners.

Mr. Kennedy rose from a 4-cent-an-hour slate picker in the anthracite region of eastern Pennsylvania to the international president of the UMWA.

During the 4-year term of Pennsylvania Gov. George Earle in 1935–39, Mr. Kennedy was Lieutenant Governor of the State. He was defeated in a bid for the Democratic gubernatorial nomination in 1938.

When Mr. Kennedy became the UMWA secretary-treasurer he was the principal negotiator for the anthracite districts in wage negotiations.

He was a balancing influence on the fiery John L. Lewis during the many contract battles with the coal operators. Lewis roared, Kennedy was reserved. But they worked together splendidly as a team through the many years of their close association. When Lewis retired in 1960, Kennedy succeeded him.

Mr. Kennedy was deeply concerned with the workingman. He labored to have better working conditions, a fair day's pay for a day's work.

The labor movement lost a great champion in the death of Thomas Kennedy.

## Chicago's Northwest Side Keeps Pace With Modern Living, Builds and Remodels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Jefferson Park (Ill.) Press, which is published in my district by Mrs. Morton Steinman, ran an excellent review of activities in my district during 1962.

Since my congressional district is certainly representative of the entire Nation, I should like to include this excellent review, prepared by Miss Sally Swanson, in the RECORD today.

Miss Swanson has done an outstanding job of writing an interesting chapter about one little corner of our great Nation—its people, its problems, and its progress.

The Jefferson Park Press and Miss Swanson deserve the highest commendation for this fine journalistic accomplishment.

The article follows:

REVIEW HEADLINES OF ENDED YEAR—1962 WAS TIME OF CHANGE HERE—NORTHWEST SIDE KEEPS PACE WITH MODERN LIVING, BUILDS AND REMODELS—AREA PROTESTS NOISE OF JET ENGINES; TALKS ABOUT RELIEVING TRAFFIC JAMS

(By Sally Swanson)

What was the Northwest Side like in 1962?

It was, above all, changing—building new and remodeling old to keep pace with a mode of life influx.

It was complaining about the roar of jet engines.

It was arguing how to relieve congested patterns of transportation.

It was protesting high taxes.

And it was intensely interested in politics.

A review of press papers' headlines for the year just ended tells of merchants giving Jefferson Park a clean, young face—their confident reply to modern shopping centers proliferating near new expressways.

It tells how individuals' grumblings about noise from jetliners were translated into concerted areawide protests through community clubs and elected officials.

Recalled too, are objections to recommendations that Chicago Transit Authority rail service be installed in the median strip of the northwest expressway—objections voiced mainly by the Chicago & North Western Railway, which said the Chicago Transit Authority service, necessitating a public subsidy, would compete unfairly with railroad commuter service.

And 1962 headlines reported a flood of protest votes from Northwest Side wards in April, playing an important part in the defeat of $66 million public improvement bonds, and they recall bitterly fought political campaigns that brought out voters in record numbers to the November election.

FALLOUT SHELTER APATHY ENDS

Through three-fourths of 1962, efforts of civil defense officials to stir up interest in fallout shelters met with uniform indifference.

Northwest Siders received with a shrug news that the area was being surveyed as

part of a public fallout shelter study to determine where 50 or more persons could be accommodated in the event of enemy attack.

And only passing interest was given a cutaway model of a shelter when it was displayed here last spring by Edwin P. Fifielski, 4758 Milwaukee, who as national commander of AMVETS toured the country with the shelter display.

Public apathy ended abruptly in October when the world tipped on the brink of nuclear war after a United States-Russia flare-up over Cuba.

Civil defense officials, who overnight became popular, reported thousands of calls asking locations of public shelters.

The bald truth was that no public shelters existed and private shelters were rare.

Officials, however, promised that the locations would be announced soon, and in November designated 11 Northwest Side schools as community shelters.

TRANSPORTATION CREATES BIGGEST PROBLEMS

People going places fast and ever faster—by plane, train, and automobile—gave the community its biggest headaches.

When in January, streamlined twin terminal buildings replaced O'Hare Field's 5-year-old temporary terminal, public relations men proclaimed the jet age had in truth come to Chicago. But this was no news to Northwest Siders who knew too well, and already were protesting the roar of jet engines disrupting the quiet of formerly peaceful neighborhoods.

Brunt of the complaints was borne largely by the area's representative in Congress, Representative ROMAN PUCINSKI, Democrat, 11th District.

Aroused individuals joined local civic groups in assembling data to present at a congressional hearing scheduled in Chicago to investigate the O'Hare noise problem.

When in March the hearing was postponed, about 20 persons, representing scores of community clubs, attended a Sunday meeting called by Congressman PUCINSKI to thrash out O'Hare problems with him and FAA officials.

Perhaps one of the most vocal of the protesting clubs was the Bryn Mawr-Higgins Community Association, which circulated petitions last summer asking that the east-west runway at O'Hare be extended west instead of east, and that a south-west runway be installed.

A congressional hearing on O'Hare noise finally was held in July in Washington, D.C.

"What started out a few years ago as a minor annoyance has now become a problem of such proportion as to override other municipal problems in our area," 41st Ward Alderman Bell, one of those testifying, told the committee.

In evaluating the hearing, Congressman PUCINSKI listed as two immediate results:

Disclosure that at least one major airline planned to institute underwing markings.

Announcement by the FAA that it would start maintaining running records on frequency of use of the various runways.

In the autumn Northwest Siders had a chance to voice their grievances to the aviation committee of the city council, which subsequently adopted a resolution by Alderman Bell recommending congressional legislation that would impose on the FAA a responsibility to effectuate and regulate a noise abatement program.

By yearend, complaints of jet noise had decreased considerably although there were those who claimed the disturbance was unchanged.

Relief in 1963 has been predicted by Congressman PUCINSKI who said that $3,972,693 allocated by the FAA for improvements at O'Hare next year would help reduce the noise.

Largest expenditure, according to PUCINSKI, is for extending the shorter of two northwest-southeast runways, 1,900 feet to the northwest.

PLAN NEW EXPRESSWAY IN CICERO AVENUE AREA

Plans for a new expressway that would connect Northwest-Edens Expressways with Congress and Southwest Expressways were announced in March by the Illinois Highway Department.

To cost about $150 million the new expressway would be in the vicinity of Cicero Avenue, ending near Midway Airport.

The Chicago Motor Club endorsed the expressway in general, but insisted it should have connections also with the Skyway and South Expressways.

Immediately the club began pushing plans for the crosstown links with all Chicago expressways in a series of meetings of neighborhood clubs throughout the city.

Northwest Federation of Improvement Clubs approved the crosstown expressway with connections to all Chicago expressways, but added that it believed crosstown should be the final Chicago expressway and that hereafter concentration should be on rapid transit service.

TWO SURVEYS RECOMMEND CHICAGO TRANSIT AUTHORITY RAILS IN EXPRESSWAY

More ammunition was collected by the Chicago Transit Authority for its controversy of 2 years' standing with the Chicago & North Western Railway, which objected to proposed Chicago Transit Authority rapid transit in the Northwest Expressway median strip.

Chicago Transit Authority rails in the expressway were recommended in the third part of the Chicago area transportation study, a research project begun in 1955 to determine transportation needs of the Chicago area through 1980.

And in December an 18-month survey financed by the Chicago Transit Authority and Chicago & North Western Railway reported that Chicago Transit Authority expressway rail service was the most feasible way of easing the Northwest Side's traffic congestion problems.

The Chicago Transit Authority's real problem is $39 million needed to complete the road beds and rails for expressway extension of the Logan Square elevated service.

Prospects for the $39 million brightened when President Kennedy urged Congress to enact Federal aid to urban transportation, but dimmed again when Senate failed to pass the legislation, which would have provided matching grants to metropolitan areas to build up their mass transit systems.

However, Congressman ROMAN PUCINSKI, Democrat, 11th District, a cosponsor of the bill in the House of Representatives, said he was hopeful that the legislation would pass during the upcoming congressional session.

YEAR 1962 MARKED BY AROUSED INTEREST IN POLITICS

There was a lively interest in politics, unusual for an offyear election traditionally marked by voter apathy.

The Northwest Side led opposition to $66 million city bonds for public improvements—expected to win easily—which were rejected soundly in April by voters who flocked to the polls in largest numbers recorded at a primary for 20 years.

Locally, party primary interest centered around the Republican nominations for 14th district State representative candidates, where a determined Norwood Park businessman, Hellmut Stolle, 56, of 6111 Northwest Highway, had pitted himself against the party-endorsed candidates for a berth on the GOP ticket.

When primary smoke had cleared, Stolle held an uneasy 52½-vote margin; a recount was demanded; Stolle won again and was slated for the Republican ballot along with incumbent State Representative Oscar Hansen, 66, of 4507 North Long, who won handily in the primary.

In another contest, State Representative Walter P. Hoffelder, 62, of 5641 North Mango, who carried the party label, had little difficulty putting down opposition for the GOP 29th District State senator nomination.

NORTHWEST SIDE A REPUBLICAN STRONGHOLD IN NOVEMBER

The far Northwest Side was a Republican bulwark in the November general election, handing GOP State and county candidates their strongest Chicago support.

The surge of Republican votes was not strong enough, however, to carry into office the GOP candidate for the 11th District congressional seat, Henry Hyde, 38, of 6841 North Tonty.

The contest between Hyde, a Loop attorney going after his first political office, and the incumbent Congressman, ROMAN PUCINSKI, 43, of 2815 North Kostner, was one of the most fiercely fought in recent Northwest Side political history.

During the early hours of November 6, election night, PUCINSKI led by slim pluralities and his job seemed threatened until about 11 p.m., when he moved virtually out of danger with a 9,000 plurality. The Congressman was reelected to a third term by a respectable 12,300 plurality.

The Democratic 29th District State Senator James Strunck, 42, 3459 North Pontiac, lost his post to Republican Hoffelder, who polled an early and overwhelming vote majority.

Republican Hansen and Stolle and a Democrat, Chester P. Majewski, 34, of 3306 Oketo, an attorney and political newcomer, were elected State representatives from the Northwest Side's 14th District.

In the 13th District, which includes Mayfair, the three incumbent assemblymen were reelected: Elroy Sandquist, Republican, 62; James Loukas, 45, and Nathan Kaplan, Democrat, 53.

As 1962 drew to a close, candidates were lining up for another contest, the February aldermanic elections, the first since ward lines were redrawn reducing the 41st ward and creating a new 45th ward on the Northwest Side.

## A Citizen's Protest Against the Invasion and Occupation of Mississippi by Federal Troops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the people of Mississippi who know the true story of the sequence of events which have occurred at "Ole Miss" are justifiably aroused and incensed. As a result, hundreds of letters protesting the Federal Government's actions there have poured into my office. Typical of these is one which I received recently from Mr. N. S. Brown, of Jackson. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following copy of Mr. Brown's letter to

me and commend it to the attention of the House:

JACKSON, MISS., *January 17, 1963.*
Congressman JOHN BELL WILLIAMS,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WILLIAMS: Now that the 88th Congress is underway, the administration and its New Frontier spenders will be manipulating every conceivable device to wrangle the approval of an exorbitant budget for more spending toward the destruction of our State and National sovereignty. But before Congress gives them the green light, as it has done in the past, it would be well for them to invite their constituents, the taxpayers, to inspect some of the worthy (?) Federal projects their hard-earned money is financing.

It would not be necessary for the State Department to cable foreign countries for reservations and entertainment in luxurious resorts, nor to supply funds, Government planes, and expensive side trips to Switzerland for this inspection.

The most unique Federal project in all the annals of history can be seen right here in "occupied Mississippi," conducted under the direct orders of John Kennedy, President of the United States, and his brother, Robert Kennedy, the Attorney General. An average of more than $1 million per month has been spent on this project for 4 consecutive months.

The supposed purpose of this fantastic Government-financed deal—which has practically wrecked the University of Mississippi and embittered and destroyed the morale of 5,000 white students—was to force the undesired person of an unqualified Negro male, who was selected in New York City by the NAACP, into this all-white university.

Air Force psychiatrists who examined this Negro, James Meredith, stated that he had "a condition described as compulsive obsessive neurosis," and that "at times, he starts a crusade to get existing rules and regulations changed." The accuracy of this diagnosis has twice been proven. Once when he demanded that the Army change their guards, and again a few days ago when he called a press conference and announced that unless the policy of the university was changed he would leave.

Immediately following this statement, Robert Kennedy requested that the 5,000 "Ole Miss" students and faculty adjust to this Negro's demands.

While posing as a student, Meredith attends NAACP meetings in Memphis, Chicago, New York, and elsewhere, and may be seen driving along the highways in his big black Cadillac (one of two cars he owns), preceded and followed by a caravan of U.S. marshals. These marshals act as companions and serve him in his domicile and on campus. Even though he owns two cars, Government planes and cars have been furnished for his transportation.

When the Government spends more than $4 million on 1 Negro student without spending a like amount on each of the 5,000 white students, it is guilty of practicing racial discrimination in the rankest form.

Bloodshed, death, and destruction reigned on the "Ole Miss" campus for 18 terrible hours in the wake of the Kennedy invasion and occupation by more than 30,000 U.S. marshals, Federal prison guards, members of the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps. (Enough force to have wiped Communist Cuba off the map.) But, this action was not against communism. It was against Mississippi in fulfillment of Communists and Communist-front demands wired to the President.

"Oh, no," you say, "this couldn't happen here. This is America. You have had a nightmare. You are not in Russia. Wake up."

No, I'm not asleep, although it is a nightmare. A horrible one. But, I'm wide awake, and I know I'm not in Russia. I saw it happen here. Just as it did in Russia, Siberia, Poland, and Hungary. I saw caissons rolling in, miles of them, and multiplied thousands of soldiers, bayonets, guns, tanks, gas, and ammunition. Mississippi citizens were shot in the back. Students who loved their university and their freedom were shot, beaten with rifle butts, cursed, and abused on their own erstwhile peaceful campus by brutal Federal forces. Why? Because Communists and Communist-front groups demanded it and the Kennedy administration produced it.

The conscienceless atrocities the Kennedys have inflicted upon the bodies, minds, hearts, and souls of Mississippians will never be healed, nor can they ever be erased by the steady grind of the sands of time. They are too deep, too bitter, and too damnable to forget.

However, I believe the tragedy we have suffered, gory as it has been, will in the end prove a blessing in disguise since it is serving to awaken the Nation to the fact that our Government is in the hands of tyrants and must be wrested from their despotic grasp.

It is my firm belief that this occupation of Mississippi was planned as the first step toward the armed takeover of the South for a Communist Soviet as outlined in Stalin's plan to use the Negro to incite revolution and bring about the Communist enslavement of this Nation. The presence of hundreds of troops unlawfully stationed on Mississippi soil and the building of barracks adds strength to this belief which is shared by hundreds of our citizens.

We urge you and our Congress to initiate legislation to protect U.S. citizens from Federal Government atrocities.

Sincerely,

N. S. BROWN.

## The Challenge We Face

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Sun-Times recently carried an excellent editorial on the tremendous problem confronting our Nation with the steadily increasing rate of American children who fail to complete at least a high school education.

It is my earnest hope that my colleagues will ponder the wisdom of this editorial which, while it deals with the problem in Chicago, enunciates principles which can be applied to any community throughout the United States.

The editorial follows:

THE CHALLENGE WE FACE

This past September 26,024 students entered high school in Chicago. Of this number fully 35 percent will have left school before their classmates graduate.

These are the dropouts. They total 1,000 every month of the school year in Chicago. They pose a serious problem to the Nation as well as Chicago; in this country 1 million students drop out of school each year.

Why do they drop out?

It is a difficult problem for the educator and the sociologist to determine, but this much is known: the climate for the dropout is established in the home before and during the early school years. Too many families fail to appreciate the technical age we live in. Too many fathers who went to work at an early age and managed to survive economically because of the war years, seniority, strong unions, or whatever, take the attitude toward a son who is experiencing difficulty in school—"I had to work and it did not hurt me. I get by. What is wrong with my kid quitting school and getting a job?"

Educators who study this problem know that the seed of disassociation with school is planted early in life. Herbert Lehmann, director of the cooperative work study program of the Chicago public schools, says that a dropout is conditioned to leave school before he reaches the sixth or seventh grade. If the student has any trouble in learning in the very early grades he encounters real difficulty in the middle grades where comprehension is required and the decision to drop out of school begins to form. By the time the student reaches high school, sometimes before, he drops out.

The employment prospects facing the dropout are not pleasant nor are they rewarding. More and more business concerns are demanding a high school diploma as a requisite for employment. As a general rule management simply does not want a dropout. Most craft unions require a high school diploma before they will accept a candidate for their apprentice programs.

The job market for the unskilled worker is poor. In 1950, 5.6 percent of the employed people in Illinois were classified as unskilled. Ten years later, in 1960, with far more jobs available and filled, the percentage of unskilled workers who were employed had shrunk by almost one-fourth—to 4.3 percent.

In April of 1960, 12.2 percent of the unemployed in Illinois were classified as unskilled, and this percentage shows every sign of increasing as time goes on.

When the industrial revolution mechanized the farms, the great pool of farm labor, relatively unskilled, disappeared. Today the Nation has no measurable unskilled farm labor force.

As the electronic age progresses it is very likely that within a decade the demand for any laborer without technical skills will disappear. Even now most employers demand at least the basic skills of comprehensive reading and demonstrated ability to be trained. The dropout too often quits school because he has trouble reading, and his reading troubles gravely affect his ability to comprehend and be trained.

Walter E. Parker, superintendent of the Illinois State Employment Service, says:

"From my experience of 30 years in this field I will say that the high school dropout is going to be much worse off than his father was in the unskilled groups. The market for the unskilled shrinks daily. Our hard-core unemployment problem is the uneducated. It is really difficult to get jobs for these people."

Herbert Lehmann underlines this by saying: "Once you could put a dropout kid to work in a laundry. Now the laundries are automated and they want someone with some demonstrated intelligence to work in them."

Chicago has started a new program for seventh and eighth grade students called upper grade centers. These are, in effect, junior high schools where the elementary student is given a running start toward high school by being introduced to laboratory classes, shop courses, and increased group activity. These new centers attempt to lessen the sharp cleavage between the elementary and the high school.

The real and necessary area for work toward the elimination or lessening of the dropout is in the first four grades of elementary schooling. Here is the proving ground of education. Prof. Benjamin S. Bloom, professor of education at the University of Chicago says, commenting on the efforts made to save the dropout while he is still in high school or after he is out of school:

"It is apparent to us that these programs begin too late. The help given a youngster comes at a time when his capacity to learn has stabilized. How much more effective an effort it would be if put into the first three grades rather than at the end of his public schooling."

The very fact that 1,000 youngsters drop out of Chicago schools every month is a sobering and shocking statistic. In an age where even a basic high school education is going to be a minimum requirement for a productive earning capacity the Nation is losing 1 million youngsters a year from its schools.

Some of these will find employment. Some will be fortunate enough to be fairly steadily employed during their working lives.

Some—too many—will become welfare recipients.

The evidence is clear. The demand for college graduates for 1963 employment is greater than it was in 1962. Coincident with the demand for college graduates is a demand for people who can be trained as technicians. Soon there will be no place in our society for the uneducated, no place for those who cannot intelligently read, comprehend, and be trained.

The place to begin corrections is in the lower grades. Perhaps it is time to recognize that the teacher who assumes the awesome responsibility of first opening the minds of little children to the wonders of education—and its necessity—should be most carefully chosen and amply rewarded.

If parents would realize that the future of their children truly begins in the home and educators would realize that the child's course is set in the first four grades of elementary schooling a great step forward will have been taken.

## Military Threat From Cuba Undiminished

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, events in Cuba continue to threaten the peace and security of the Western Hemisphere. From almost every source we hear of continuing Russian support to the Castro government, resulting in an ever-increasing arms buildup. While events of this past fall certainly strengthened the U.S. position in all of Latin America, we still have not secured onsite inspections in Cuba.

Mrs. Jeanne S. Perry, writing in the Palm Beach Post-Times, clearly outlines the continuing threat facing this Nation. Since last summer she has traveled extensively in Latin America, and from her contacts there and with Cuban exile sources she is able to report documented facts clearly and concisely. I include Mrs. Perry's article of January 6, 1962, in the RECORD, as follows:

MILITARY THREAT FROM CUBA UNDIMINISHED

(By Jeanne S. Perry)

Cuban Minister of Industries, Che Guevara, clearly outlined future Communist plans in a recent interview with the Daily Worker.

Said Guevara, "Armed struggle against American imperialism is the only way to solve the problems confronting Latin America. To this end, the Communist regime in Cuba would continue to foster communism and support armed intervention in all of Latin America."

Guevara is a man well known to do exactly what he says he will do. His past statements, followed by his subsequent actions bear this out. The Soviets are giving impetus to Che's plans for Latin America by continuing to bring arms into Cuba for the purpose of equipping guerrilla movements. Since the naval blockade was lifted on November 20, more than 30 Communist bloc ships have arrived in Cuba and disgorged their cargoes of arms. Twenty ships from countries outside the Soviet bloc have also contributed their share of weapons during the same period.

Four crack battalions of armored shock troops are still on the island. They are supported by more than 12,000 troops in charge of radar, the air force, heavy artillery, and missiles.

Four Sundays ago, we said we would rather believe Cuban underground information when released than all the administration's denials of this information. Now, we have one more example that shows our faith has not been misplaced. Reports from Washington now confirm underground declarations that 20,000 Russian troops are in Cuba. This information was reported by the underground and published here last September.

In spite of all this, Secretary of State Dean Rusk saw fit to dismiss Guevara's statement as "just talk." One has only to review events just prior to Rusk's comment to conclude that Guevara cannot be dismissed as "just talking." Cuban Communists actively aided and abetted—

1. A determined effort to overthrow the legally constituted government of President Ydigoras Fuentes in Guatemala.

2. Five Cuban Reds were picked up in New York City before they were able to carry out their plans to sabotage department stores there and oil refineries in New Jersey.

3. Communists in Venezuela paralyzed one-sixth of that country's oil production.

Was this "just talk," Mr. Secretary?

On December 10 Dean Rusk told the Washington press that the United States could not accept the continued presence of Soviet troops in Cuba as a "normal condition." This is all very well and good. But, are we then to accept communism in Cuba "as a normal condition"?

We might also add that everyone of our varied underground sources continues to report the presence of missiles and troops in Cuba. Furthermore, this information is also confirmed in letters written to Cuban friends in Florida by relatives still remaining on the island.

We have just learned that the Soviets don't plan to get caught out on a limb with any shortage of fuel for their hidden missiles. The U.S.S.R. is sending special equipment to Cuba so that they can produce their own liquid oxygen. The first shipment is expected shortly at the Cuban port of Matanzas.

Anyone reading Premier Khrushchev's New Year's message knows that Russia fully intends to continue their military buildup in Cuba. Khrushchev stressed "unbreakable, brotherly Soviet-Cuban friendship" and said the U.S.S.R. "will never leave Cuba in the lurch, that revolutionary Cuba will not remain defenseless."

We quote from our column of May 14, 1962: "There are many ways in which the United States is helping Castro financially. Paul G. Hoffman, as head of the United Nations Special Fund, has signed an agreement whereby the special fund is to help Cuba get away from heavy dependence on sugar by diversifying its farm production. The United States pays about 40 percent of the Special Fund's annual budget, which stands this year at about $47 million."

On May 28, we published part of a letter from Brooks Hays, then Assistant Secretary of State. He was replying to inquiries made to the Department of State regarding disbursement to Castro of Special Fund dollars.

Mr. Hays stated that Cuba would receive assistance in agricultural research and research training in such areas as plant diseases, soil conservation, and food technology. The total amount requested from the Special Fund is $1,157,600, of which $763,500 would be for experts and consultants, $200,000 for equipment, $50,000 for fellowships, and the balance for miscellaneous and overhead costs. The Government of Cuba would provide at least $1,878,000 of its own funds to cover additional costs of the project for local experts and technicians, labor, land, and buildings.

"The statute of the Special Fund forbids the Fund from intervening in the internal affairs of any country or from placing any political conditions upon its assistance. On the other hand, projects undertaken by the special fund are supposed to bring early results and have the greatest possible impact in advancing the economic, social, or technical development of the country concerned."

Due to publication of the United Nations offer of financial and technical assistance to Castro (plus the many objections voiced by irate citizens) the project was dropped. This was not the end of the matter, however. Now, it looks like Mr. Hoffman has gotten the ball rolling once more. Castro has again been offered this same bonanza by Paul Hoffman. The total amount of dollars to be given Castro by the Special Fund remains the same. So does the nonpolitical attitude of U.S. officials involved in giving Castro this helping hand. The only difference is that this time the Food and Agriculture Organization is acting as agent for the Special Fund. The FAO and the Cuban Ambassador have recently been winding up negotiations in Rome.

## Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the celebration of Ukrainian Independence Day is a tribute not only to that occasion in history which marked a triumph of the centuries for the Ukrainian people, great as that occasion was. It is also a tribute to the force and steadfastness of ideas that persist despite all the adversities of the flesh that have beset mankind. For the Ukrainian people have, in the course of their long history, known more suffering, more physical violence, more of the tribulations attendant upon wars and invasion than most of the people on earth. Yet they have, throughout centuries of ills inflicted by those who sought to conquer them, maintained their identity, their independence of spirit, and the pride and determination necessary to preserve the dream of an independent Ukraine.

This dream which became a reality on January 22, 1918, was age-old. Despite the long history of subjection the Ukrainian people had never willingly submitted to the indignities of political domination. Superior in their heritage, their civilization, their resources, to the Russians whose force had overcome them, they retained their separate culture and that spirit of independence which has marked them wherever they are. The celebration of Ukrainian Independence Day is a reminder that the freedom of the mind cannot be conquered.

# Appendix

## Definition of a Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. MILTON R. YOUNG**
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Friday, January 25, 1963*

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, defining a true farmer has never been a simple matter. A great many people are proud, and I think justly so, of having some farm background. Others, though their major endeavors may be in some field other than farming, still like to claim they are farmers if they happen to own a farm. Sometimes there is a vast difference between an honest-to-goodness farmer and a sidewalk farmer like myself.

I am indebted to the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association for coming up with one of the best definitions I have heard yet of a farmer. The idea originated with radio station KMA in Shenandoah, Iowa. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the recent broadcast by the Grain Terminal Association included as a part of my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The problems and burdens of the world are heavy on the shoulders of some people, while others carry their loads lightly. Farmers, being people, are like that too. Some are worried and burdened, others happy and carefree.

Trying to define a farmer is no easier than defining a family farm. But there's always somebody ready to make the try. Latest of these offerings on "What is a Farmer," was boomed out over radio station KMA in Shenandoah, Iowa, recently. We are indebted to our alert watchdog on news, J. K. Stern, president of the American Institute of Cooperation, for calling it to our attention.

Let's see how it jibes with your picture of the farmer.

"A farmer is a paradox. He is an overall executive with his home his office; a scientist using fertilizer attachments; a purchasing agent in an old straw hat; a personnel director with grease under his fingernails; a dietitian with a passion for alfalfa, aminos, and antibiotics; a production expert with a surplus, and a manager battling a price-cost squeeze.

"He manages more capital than most of the businessmen in town.

"He likes sunshine, good food, State fairs, dinner at noon, auctions, his neighbors, his shirt collar unbuttoned and, above all, a good soaking rain in August.

"He is not much for droughts, ditches, throughways, experts, weeds, the 8-hour day, grasshoppers or helping with housework.

"Farmers are found in fields—plowing up, seeding down, rotating from, planting to, fertilizing with, spraying for, and harvesting. Wives help them, little boys follow them, the Agriculture Department confuses them, city relatives visit them, salesmen detain them and wait for them, weather can delay them, but it takes Heaven to stop them.

"A farmer is both faith and fatalist—he must have faith to continually meet the challenges of his capacities amid an ever-present possibility that an act of God (a late spring, an early frost, tornado, flood, drought) can bring his business to a standstill. You can reduce his acreage but you can't restrain his ambition.

"Might as well put up with him. He is your friend, your competitor, your customer, your source of food, fiber, and self-reliant young citizens to help replenish your cities. He is your countryman—a denim-dressed, businesswise, fast-growing statesman of stature. And when he comes in at noon, having spent the energy of his hopes and dreams, he can be recharged anew with the magic words: 'The market's up.'"

## Who Owns the Moon?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. GEORGE P. MILLER**
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, January 18, 1963*

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, we have been projected into the space age with the rapidity with which the missile is projected into space. The physical problems and the biological problems that confront us have been tremendous but one that cannot be neglected and must be reconciled is the legal problem of space.

Mr. Andrew G. Haley, past president of the American Rocket Society, and an expert in this field poses the question in This Week magazine with a provocative article entitled "Who Owns the Moon?"

It has been my privilege to attend more than one symposium at which Mr. Haley has been on the panel and it has always been an enlightening experience.

I commend this article to my colleagues and urge them to read it:

WHO OWNS THE MOON?
(By Andrew G. Haley)

For centuries, there has been no question about ownership of the Moon. It has belonged to astronomers, poets, and young lovers. But now that the space race has changed the Moon's role from romantic to strategic, the question of who owns it has taken on life-or-death importance.

I am firmly convinced that unless an effective international treaty governing celestial bodies is signed before the first cosmic Columbus sets foot on its craterpocked surface, the Moon could become not an exciting new frontier but a tragic new battleground.

The urgent need for such a treaty became painfully clear the night of September 13, 1959, when Lunik II planted the Soviet flag on the Moon, ironically near the Sea of Tranquility. I was at the Moscow observatory that night, a guest of Soviet scientists, fellow members of the International Astronautical Federation. I know I should have been thrilled at this triumph of the skill and ingenuity of mankind, but as I congratulated my Russian hosts, I could not help but wish I were somewhere else, preferably on the Moon.

The Russians did not claim the Moon that night. Nor did they claim it 3 weeks later when Lunik III photographed the Moon's dark side. But their flag planting, plus their aerial mapping, laid strong legal groundwork for a future Soviet claim to the Moon, particularly if they achieve the first manned lunar landing.

FIGHT FOR THE MOON

When ships were propelled by winds rather than rockets, new lands were claimed by the planting of flags. But events proved that effective control of a territory could only be achieved by colonization and the exercise of political jurisdiction.

The first nation to reach the Moon can claim it all. But because the Moon is foodless, airless, and waterless, effective colonization of its vast surface before another nation's arrival will be well nigh impossible. The inevitable dispute over Moon land ownership might then be resolved, as were so many New World land clashes of the past, only today gunpowder wouldn't be the weapon.

Peaceful agreement is possible. This was proved recently when a dozen nations having claims on Antarctica signed a U.N.-endorsed treaty setting up that region as a kind of scientific preserve. A start was made toward peaceful use of outer space with the universal acceptance of the astronautical program of the International Geophysical Year. Satellites have since circled the earth many thousands of times without a single complaint of airspace violation, creating, in effect, a freedom of outer space skin to the long-recognized freedom of the seas.

The U.N. took an important step when its General Assembly resolution of December 20, 1961, declared that "celestial bodies are free for exploration and use by all states in conformity with international law and are not subject to national appropriation." But we have never been able to agree on what constitutes national appropriation here on Earth. And it would hardly be necessary to appropriate the Moon in order to set up a missile base on a piece of it.

BASE FOR WAR?

Only a worldwide treaty, setting up the Moon as a kind of outer space Antarctica, with common control among all nations, can eliminate use of the Moon as a base for aggressive war. Such a treaty would be only the first step in cosmic law. Astronomers estimate that there are 100 million habitable planets in the universe, and that life may exist on many of them. We will one day soon need an international commission to negotiate with these beings and their governments. It could also administer projects like the propelling of Saturn into an orbit closer to the Sun, giving it a capability for sustaining life as we know it that might solve our population explosion.

But the closer the United States and the U.S.S.R. get to the Moon, the farther apart from agreement on its ownership we are likely to drift. Let us agree now, while we still can, that—

An international commission shall administer new worlds for the common good.

Any nation which first develops mineral or other resources on the Moon may obtain exclusive rights over those resources but may not own the area from which they are taken.

No nation may fortify the Moon.

Power politics must not be permitted to obscure simple truths like one voiced recently by a young friend of mine. Said he, with the uncomplicated wisdom of the 6-year-old: "The Russians shouldn't own the Moon, but neither should we. God made the Moon for everyone."

## Grants To Aid Construction of Various Health Professions Training Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN E. MOSS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, to provide Federal grants to aid construction of various health professions training schools, and also schools for training public health personnel.

My bill is similar to one introduced in the 87th Congress and which was reported favorably by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It had widespread support.

This bill is in keeping with President Kennedy's request in the fiscal year 1964 budget. The President asks $34,352,000. My bill would provide $60 million a year for 10 years for constructing facilities to train dentists, physicians, optometrists, pharmacists, osteopaths, podiatrists, nurses, and professional public health personnel.

This legislation will have a great effect on the future of every American. Presently, there are 141 physicians for each 100,000 population. Ten years ago, there were 143. By 1970, the figure can drop to 133 and by 1975, to 135.

By taking action in this session, the Congress can contribute to the means of educating the people who will serve the Nation's health needs.

The health professions schools have been turning out more graduates, but not in proportion to the Nation's growing population. We face a critical shortage in 10 years.

Coupled with the expanding population is a change in the demand for medical services. The greatest users of medical services are those under 15 and over 65. Both age groups are expected to grow in disproportionate ratio to the balance of the population.

Three factors contribute to the shortage of medical personnel: limited enrollment capacity of schools, mounting costs of professional education, and the diminishing supply of qualified applicants.

Just to maintain the present proportion of doctors and dentists, we will need 20 new medical and 20 new dental schools by 1970.

Present sources of school financing must increase their contributions. But these sources—State legislatures, alumni, business, and industry, foundations and private donors and voluntary societies—cannot meet all additional needs. Federal funds are the only source able to meet the need in time to avoid a real crippling of medical manpower.

In the last session, the committee heard considerable support of the legislation, from those in Government, education, and medicine and including the American Medical Association.

I intend to support this measure vigorously because I believe it is vitally important to the Nation's health and therefore a most appropriate area for Federal Government participation.

## The Economic Situation of East Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Friday, January 25, 1963*

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I was delighted to read in the January 20 edition of the Louisville Courier-Journal an article, written by Mr. Joe Creason, a staff writer for that newspaper, which I feel places in better perspective what the mountain region of eastern and southeastern Kentucky is doing to pull itself up by its bootstraps.

I do not minimize the economic situation in this area, because it is severely depressed, and much remains to be done before anything approaching a stabilized economy will be reached. Publicity in magazines and newspapers and on television telling of the mountain area's plight has, in my opinion, neglected to give proper credit to the positive side of the picture.

In his article, Mr. Creason writes about the determination, initiative, and optimism of many communities, and in item-by-item fashion details what they are doing to make themselves more prosperous economically.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Creason's article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIVELY SICK MAN

(By Joe Creason)

The impression left by recent magazine articles and television documentaries to the contrary, depression-plagued east Kentucky has not settled back placidly to await the obituary the crepe hangers intimate will be read over the remains of the region any day now.

A check on the region shows that, far from wringing its hands in despair and refusing to help itself, east Kentucky, which covers a quarter of the State, is showing a dogged determination not to give up in this hour of great need.

Problems which seem as high as the dark mountains that stud the region are present in east Kentucky and have produced a depressed economic condition perhaps never before known in any part of the State.

SORRY LEGACY

Coal, traditionally the one industry, has petered out in some areas and is being mined in others by machines, leaving a legacy of mass unemployment, privation, and actual hunger. In some counties, 30 percent of the labor force is without work; many families exist solely on surplus food commodities doled out once a week at the courthouse door.

Nevertheless, eastern Kentucky is fighting back, spurred on by leaders who preach the optimistic gospel that a new day can come to the mountains.

Largely because of this leadership, mountain towns have initiated more projects aimed at helping themselves than have communities in more economically prosperous sections of the State.

FAITH AFFIRMED

Eastern Kentuckians have affirmed their faith in their region in recent months by raising tremendous sums of money via increased taxes, civic-obligation bonds and personal cash to start the changes they feel are necessary to put their part of the State back on its feet.

For instance, on a per capita basis, Prestonsburg and Hazard have put up more money in the last 18 months to finance badly needed projects than has Louisville or Lexington.

Prestonsburg (population 4,000) raised $100,000 over 2 weekends to buy land for a community junior college; collected $40,000 for a high school football stadium, and led the drive which resulted in health and library taxes being approved by voters of the county (Floyd) by a 4 to 1 margin.

MILLION FOR HAZARD

Last year alone, Hazard (population 5,000) obligated itself to the tune of more than $1 million as its share in the cost of projects—sewage-disposal plant, waterline extension, a new municipal building, and swimming pool. Without any outside help, the city is paving 13 miles of streets and has built $50,000 worth of sidewalks and an $850,000 elementary school.

Every source of help—Federal, State, and local—has been explored by eastern Kentucky towns in rounding up funds to plan and start self-improvement projects. These projects range from urban renewal and slum clearance developments to schools and churches, and from vast tourist resort centers to sewerline extension.

In every instance, it has been mountain area leaders who have initiated the projects, since the line of development of even the Federal assistance programs is from the local level outward to Washington and then back, not the reverse.

COMMUNITIES "SOLD"

It has been these leaders who have "sold" their communities on the fact that there will be no return to yesterday, that the coal industry will not be reborn, and that the situation, while dark now, is not hopeless if all avenues of economic development are explored.

This is the philosophy which has resulted in the establishment in many towns of industrial-development groups ready to finance the purchase of land or construction of buildings for manufacturing concerns through bond issues.

It is the philosophy which also has brought about an awareness of the great tourist potential of the region as a source of employment.

There are many who feel that tourism can be the salvation of eastern Kentucky. To that end, the State has expanded its Pine Mountain and Jennie Wiley Parks, and similar programs are planned at Buckhorn Lake and Natural Bridge in the mountain country.

New privately financed resort motels have been opened near Harlan and Paintsville,

while imaginative, multimillion-dollar developments are planned at Hazard and near Whitesburg.

The Hazard resort project is called Magic Mountain, and would cost an estimated $4,500,000. It would be financed privately with the Area Redevelopment Administration lending 65 percent of the money at an interest rate less than 4 percent over 40 years.

LAND OPTIONAL

More than 500 acres of mountaintop and valley land has been optioned. Plans call for a 100-acre lake, a 200-unit motel, convention hall, and nightclub atop one 1,600-foot peak; a ski lift and slope; a cable-car ride from one peak to another; horse-riding trails, and a model coal mine through which visitors would be escorted.

The project would create same 400 new jobs directly. And if all the details fall into place, work might start this year.

The Whitesburg resort development is Cloud City, and it would spread over some 6,000 acres of Pine Mountain at the eventual southern end of the East Kentucky Turnpike and adjacent to the proposed Allegheny Parkway from Cumberland Gap to Breaks of Sandy.

A basic new city would be built, and selected sites would be made available to large resort and motel operators. The initial cost would be about $2,500,000, of which $750,000 would come from private stock sale and the remainder from a combination of Federal and State loans and grants.

Also in the line of tourism, two east Kentucky towns will stage summer dramas this summer. Pineville citizens have pledged $30,000 to underwrite "The Book of Job" for a fifth season, while in Prestonsburg, $10,000 has been pledged to produce a new play by Paul Green.

SUCCESS STORIES

In their determination to improve their lot, east Kentucky towns have the amazing success stories of three communities—Corbin, London, and Somerset—to spur them on. During the last year, development programs paid off handsomely in all three towns.

Corbin, where 4 years ago community leaders took a close look at their town and then set out to bring it up to par in schools, hospitals, recreation, and housing, landed four industries which will employ 800 eventually. London, which years ago was the test city in a Kentucky chamber of commerce community-improvement study, attracted one new plant with 200 jobs, while Somerset landed three plants with 700 employees. Somerset's biggest prize was a plumbing-fixture plant which will be built with a $3 million municipal bond issue and then leased to the company.

With these examples of what can happen before them, other towns all over the region are rife with self-improvement programs.

It would be impossible even to mention all the work that is under way in the region one TV commentator called "impoverished to the point that the will to do anything for itself is about gone."

However, these are highlights of projects in some towns:

Barbourville: One of the first towns in Kentucky to start a municipal housing project, this Knox County seat now is completing plans for 30 more units of federally financed low-cost housing. An urban-renewal project also is being planned, while the county is about ready to start a new $479,000 courthouse.

The county also has built three new elementary schools and a vocational school at a cost of more than $700,000. The city has raised $16,000 in cash to reactivate its chamber of commerce, and a new country club has been organized.

Middlesboro: Leaders there say things never looked better for solid, long-term growth. An ambitious industrial development program has been launched, an industry locater has been hired, and a $500,000 bond issue is available to finance buildings for industries.

Middlesboro is the smallest city in the State with a full-time city planner. It also has a zoning ordinance, subdivision regulations, and a building code adopted and enforced.

SCHOOLS SCHEDULED

Two elementary schools, costing $875,000, will be started this spring. About $350,000 worth of sewer extensions, half the cost being paid locally, will be started this year if Federal assistance through the accelerated public works program is approved. Plans also are being studied for expansion of the sewage-treatment plant.

Martin: This Floyd County town (population 900) is the smallest municipality in the Nation with an urban-renewal project actually underway. The work is centered on a 7-acre plot that formerly was covered with submarginal buildings. The land and buildings were bought with a $75,000 city bond issue, and the Federal Government is providing $238,000 to level the area, build 85 parking spaces, and open 7 lots that will be auctioned off. The State is constructing a Kentucky 80 bypass route through one edge of the site, and a new post office building probably will be built.

The town also has been approved for a 40-unit, $628,000 housing project.

Whitesburg: Including the Cloud City resort, some $15 million worth of projects well might be started this year in Letcher County, of which Whitesburg is the seat.

PROJECTS ON HAND

Projects involving the city directly include a start on the southern end of the East Kentucky Turnpike, a 40-unit municipal housing development, an urban-renewal project, extension of the water system, construction of a new courthouse and completion of a mountaintop airport.

The water-system improvement calls for a $350,000 filtration plant. Under the accelerated works program, 66 percent would come from Washington, with the remainder financed by a city bond issue.

Paintsville: These, among other things, have been done without outside help: a $250,000 city park opened; water filtration plant put in use; new high school built; $300,000 in street paving and widening started; 50 acres of choice land optioned and reserved for industry by the Paintsville Development Corp.; a $350,000 courthouse and an $80,000 health building erected, and the municipal golf course expanded to 18 holes.

With about $250,000 in Federal help, a $1,121,000 sewage-disposal plant has been started. State-Federal money has built a U.S. 23 bypass route around the town, and a 52-unit, $800,000 low-cost housing project has been started adjacent to the bypass.

CRAFTS CENTER HELPS

Also fronting the bypass are the new home of Kentucky Hills Handicraft, and a 32-room motel. Both were built with loans made available through ARA. The crafts center serves as a wholesale shipping point and retail outlet for items made in homes and small workshops in 10 counties.

Pikeville: Recognizing that participation of all the people is necessary to finance the self-help program they visualize, the city fathers passed a 1-percent payroll and a 1-percent net-profits tax. This has produced revenue equal to that from property tax.

Application has been made for a $3 million Government loan to finance construction of waterlines, sewer-collection lines and a sewage-treatment plant. The city's $1 million share of the cost would be paid from bonds issued against the municipally owned water system.

However, the most ambitious project being talked is a $6 million urban renewal undertaking that would all but rebuild the town. The Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad, which now follows a wide bend in the Big Sandy River through the center of town, would be relocated and the right-of-way used for a four-lane boulevard. Pikeville's approximately $1,500,000 share of the cost would be from parking-meter income for the next 30 to 40 years. A $48,000 grant has been requested to determine the feasibility of the idea.

Pikeville College is nearing completion of an expansion program costing more than $1 million, much of which has been raised in the hills.

Prestonsburg: Construction of a junior college is expected to start soon on land provided by the community. Adjacent to the college site, work is being pushed on a 40-unit, $560,000 housing project.

Two urban-renewal jobs are on the fire. Work should start soon on a $1,038,000 sewer line and disposal plant project, with the 42-percent local share in the cost coming from a 70-percent increase in water rates.

A new fire truck and garbage truck have been put in use; two new county schools have been built, and application has been made for a loan to cover 52 percent of the cost of a new courthouse.

Hazard: In addition to the self-help work already mentioned, 98 units of public housing soon will be opened, and application has been made for 30 more units.

The city was the first in Kentucky to complete a federally financed urban renewal project. Back in 1960, a blighted area on Main Street was razed to widen the street and make room for a city-owned parking lot.

On the drawing boards is another big urban renewal job that would clear three blocks of substandard homes and stores on North Main to provide space for a recreation center and diversified new businesses. The feasibility survey has been completed, and the total cost would come to about $12 million. The city's 25-percent share would come from pooling of noncash grant-in-aid credits.

Perry County has some $450,000 on hand to use in building a new courthouse, a step that would do much to improve the appearance of Hazard.

Besides projects listed, Pineville, Hyden, Manchester, Jenkins, Neon, Cumberland, Fleming, Jackson, Harlan, and other eastern Kentucky towns, large and small, have enough projects underway to indicate that the region may be down but not out.

## Tomorrow Must Be Earned—Not Appropriated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Friday, January 25, 1963*

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the December 31, 1962, issue of U.S. News & World Report carried an advertisement, "Tomorrow Must Be Earned—Not Appropriated," sponsored by the Warner & Swasey Co., of Cleveland, Ohio.

Mr. President, this message I feel cannot be repeated too often, and I ask unanimous consent to have it included as an extension of remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOMORROW MUST BE EARNED—NOT APPROPRIATED

Voting more money for schools doesn't make this an educated nation. It isn't billions for more veterans' hospitals that will make America healthy. It is honest production, not shorter hours, that protects jobs. It takes more than costly playgrounds to cure juvenile delinquency. Pouring our billions all over the world doesn't buy security nor peace.

Nothing worth having or worth being is ever reached except by honest hard work, but it is becoming the tragic fashion to think we can shortcut the work, and have everything we want if we only spend enough Federal dollars. And then we mistakenly feel "the Government has taken care of it," so we can sit back and relax.

Another once great nation withered and died when its people were drugged with the same fatal poison. (Perhaps "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" should be required reading in many places today.)

Everything Government offers free is obviously and always paid for by all of us in higher taxes or a worsening deficit—both of them deficits of dollars but, even more tragically, deficits in national character and self-respect. What would ever be worth that?

## State Planners Take Heed—The Kremlin Admits Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL**
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the trend in the United States these days, is to consider the presumed advantages of planning and attempt to apply them throughout the economy and Government at all levels. I have no objections and agree to giving thought to the future—but I am hesitant to confer power in the present that may portend chaos in the years to come.

The citadel of the planned economy, the organization state, and the automated human being—the Soviet Union—has finally discovered through a painful experience I want this Nation to avoid that planning is no substitute for individual initiative within an orderly society of freemen. Nikita Khrushchev himself has berated the crop failures, under production and shortages that have resulted, and has called for a new look at the capitalistic incentive system.

I call the attention of all those here in America fondly dreaming of the perfect ordered society through planning to the following editorial in the December 24, 1962, edition of Barron's National Business & Financial Weekly that follows:

BANKRUPT SOCIALISM—STATE PLANNING, THE KREMLIN HAS CONFESSED, IS A FAILURE

Throughout the free world, so chastened investors are painfully aware, the past 12 months have been a time of agonizing reappraisal. In this country, despite the brisk recovery in stock prices since October, the average portfolio probably has dwindled in value by 20 percent or more; other financial centers, notably West Germany and Switzerland, have suffered heavier losses. Business empires, built on exuberance and easy credit, have tottered; here and there, a few have crashed. Curiously, however, the greatest economic shakeout of 1962 has engulfed not some citadel of capitalism, as might be supposed, but the homeland of communism. In a speech that must have rocked the Kremlin to its foundations, Premier Nikita Khrushchev last month publicly confessed that the Soviet system doesn't work very well. What the U.S.S.R. needs, he added, is less planning and more enterprise. "We should remember Lenin's injunction to be able, if necessary, to learn from the capitalists—to imitate whatever they have that is good and profitable."

In a proletarian dictatorship that condemns people to death for the crime of speculation, these remarks have an ironic ring. Whether they portend a lasting change in either Communist theory or practice, no man—probably not even the Premier himself—can safely say. Nonetheless, Khrushchev's confession (which may be likened to a plea of philosophic bankruptcy) is an historic event. For one thing, while few U.S. demonologists have noted the fact, it marks the end, for all practical purposes, of the vaunted 7-year plan. In the Politburo, long-range blueprints of production and distribution suddenly are out of style. The shift in the party line, moreover, is bound to encourage the few bold spirits at home who lately have dared to urge upon the Kremlin such precepts as proper cost accounting and profit incentives. Finally, it constitutes a wonderful rebuff to all those in the West who, one way or another, are seeking to foist collectivism upon the world. Everyone else may have known all along that the emperor was naked, now the emperor himself has owned up to feeling a chill.

The presence of trouble in the workers' paradise long has been an open secret. While Walter Reuther, Barbara Ward, and other like-minded innocents were marveling at the rapid rate of Russian economic growth, knowledgeable observers were noting the drastic devaluation of the ruble, the wholesale confiscation of savings, the persistent reports of civilian unrest. Last summer a party of U.S. newsmen, including Vermont Royster, editor of the Wall Street Journal, made an 8,000-mile guided tour of the Soviet Union. In testimony before the Joint Economic Committee of Congress recently, Mr. Royster told of visiting collective farms where 17 men do the work of 2; of seeing scores of buildings unfinished "for want of the proverbial nail"; of traveling in a land virtually without roads. A few outspoken Russians have been equally caustic. In Izvestia not long ago, one writer denounced tires and ball bearings that quickly wear out, textile mills that produce shoddy cloth, and production lines that creep and crawl.

One of the loudest critics has been Nikita Khrushchev, who last winter complained bitterly about the perennial shortages of meat. Now, in an astonishing break with tradition, which has worshiped at the shrine of Soviet industry, he has shattered ikons right and left. While the current 7-year plan has yielded impressive statistics, said Mr. K., it has fallen short in production, notably that of power and natural gas, synthetic fibers and plastics, turbogenerators, diesel engines, and oil refinery equipment. Furthermore, he went on, too many items are being produced for which no real demand exists. Finally, the Soviet product mix is growing obsolete. "If we had merely met the target for steel but overfulfilled the plan for polyethylene, we should be substantially better off."

Besides citing specific failures of planning, the angry Premier sweepingly assailed the inner workings of the system. The Soviet economy, he charged, is plagued by phony bookkeeping, excessive integration (from bitter experience with unreliable allocations, most plants turn out their own components), theft of state property (with which some rugged entrepreneurs do a thriving business on the side), bribery (a common means of gaining access to government credit or scarce raw materials), waste and fraud. It is technologically backward and hostile to innovation. Above all, it is inefficient. Hence Mr. Khrushchev proposes to throw the whole creaking apparatus, 7-year plan and all, into the Communist equivalent of chapter X.

What will emerge from reorganization remains to be seen; the Kremlin, which cares nothing for full disclosure, has been vaguer than usual. Some outmoded government machinery has been scrapped, and certain planning functions have been decentralized. More posts apparently have been created for the party faithful. Inevitably, however, none of the reforms cuts to the heart of the matter, and none is likely to succeed. For contrary to good Marxist doctrine, it is communism, not capitalism, that suffers from fatal contradictions. Thus state control of the means of production has not eliminated workers and bosses; it has merely thrust into positions of authority a new class, which, through close affiliation with state and party, enjoys all the fruits of ownership without incurring any of the risks, notably that of going broke.

Similarly, long-range planning has tended to perpetuate the expansion of obsolescent or useless products and processes; no planner in any country has been either able to foresee, or willing to preside over, the often unpleasant effects of technological change. In the absence of a marketplace, Soviet prices frequently bear little or no relation to costs or, for that matter, to each other. Lacking unhampered choice, finally, the Russians willy-nilly also must do without what one of their technical experts has aptly called feedback, i.e., the effective consumer response which sooner or later serves to punish the inefficient or shoddy producer and to reward his businesslike competitor. Like some superstitious savage, who believed that it was literally possible to steal his enemy's thunder, the Soviet Premier has urged his followers to imitate what is "good and profitable" in capitalism. In so doing he has chosen to forget that plenty and freedom—like poverty and socialism—go hand in hand.

As a doctrinaire Communist, Mr. Khrushchev may be pardoned for his lapse. The same excuse, however, hardly suffices for American officials who, through the Alliance for Progress, the 5-year plan for India and similar extravagant designs, are helping to further the cause of statism. By supporting such schemes, the U.S. Government, despite its vaunted pragmatism, is underwriting economic systems that simply do not and cannot meet people's needs. "I have seen the future and it works," the misguided Lincoln Steffens once was moved to exclaim. After decades of deception at home and propaganda abroad, the Kremlin has finally exploded the myth.

## Great Work of Senate Special Committee on Aging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH**
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Friday, January 25, 1963*

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, of the 17 million people in the United States over the age of 65, some 700,000 are in my home State of Texas, and the people of Texas are deeply appreciative

of the public service of the Special Senate Committee on Aging, which is headed by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA]. Many thousands of the people of this Nation over 65 live on small incomes, or small savings, with help from their families, or from tax-financed agencies.

No nobler service can be done for these people than to protect them from medical quackery, crooked promoters, and other fast-buck operators.

Abraham Lincoln once wrote that the legitimate operation of government was to do for the people what they need to have done but cannot do as individuals. The investigative work of the Special Senate Committee on Aging is in the highest tradition of government service to the people.

In a fine editorial captioned "Bilking the Elderly," the Houston Post of January 20, 1963, praised the work of the Special Subcommittee on Aging.

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILKING THE ELDERLY

There are now approximately 17 million Americans over 65, about 9 percent of the total population of the country, and both the number and the percentage are increasing rapidly because of greater longevity. It is estimated that by 1980 there will be more than 24.4 million in this age group, almost three times the number in 1940.

Although the average annual income and the resources of this group of citizens may leave much to be desired, they are today not exactly impoverished as a group, because of social security, private pension plans, savings, and public assistance. As their total number increases, the total amount of money they have to spend, save or invest increases.

It is not surprising that Americans in this age group should receive increasingly the special attentions of confidence men, frauds, quacks and slick promoters out for a fast buck. And there are no more limits on the ingenuity and imagination of these predators than there is on their unscrupulousness.

The pluckings are particularly profitable because such a large percentage of the older people are in need of more income than they have, have chronic physical ailments for which they are always hopeful of some miraculous cure, and because of infirmities of one kind or another, are not able to keep fully informed about new developments in the confidence game.

Repulsive as the idea of swindling the elderly may be to most people, the fact remains that they are being bilked of hundreds of millions of dollars annually through false nostrums, worthless health foods, phony retirement schemes, crooked land sale deals or spurious work-at-home schemes.

The Special Senate Committee on Aging, which is headed by Senator PAT MCNAMARA, of Michigan, is performing a distinguished service by putting the public spotlight on these operations through its current hearings. It is doubtful if the hearings will produce any information that is startling to the lawmakers or other public officials. They may or may not show a need for additional Federal legislation to protect the Nation's older citizens.

But at least they serve to make the public more aware of the problem, and perhaps more of the older people or members of their families will be quicker to recognize some of these fraudulent schemes than they would be otherwise.

With new gimmicks turning up constantly, it also is necessary that all laws aimed at preventing or controlling these activities be reviewed more or less continuously, to make certain that all is being done that can be done to protect the elderly.

In a society that views tolerantly exaggeration in advertising, it sometimes is difficult to draw the line between what is legitimate and what is an outright fraud. It also is difficult to get adequate laws at the Federal, State, and local levels of government. Most professionals know where the legal loopholes are and how to keep from crossing over the line where they might be in danger of criminal prosecution.

Even if it is accepted that most citizens should be able to protect themselves, the same thing cannot be said with respect to older people who, although no more gullible, are less able to recognize the new gimmicks which are being dreamed up constantly to separate them from their money. The committee hearings therefore are a public service for which there is a real need.

## Walter Splawn: A Great American Has Passed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, one of the great minds of America passed to his reward on last Thursday. Dr. Walter M. W. Splawn, twice Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and former president of the University of Texas, will be remembered for generations yet to come because of his profound contribution to the good of mankind and to the cause of good government. To me he was a friend and an inspiration. To the entire Nation he was a benefactor. Few men in our time have done so much.

As a part of my remarks, I include a news article about Dr. Splawn which appeared in the January 18, 1963, issue of the Washington Post, which follows:

WALTER SPLAWN, EX-ICC CHIEF

(By William J. Raspberry)

Walter M. W. Splawn, twice Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission and former president of the University of Texas, died of a heart ailment yesterday at his home, 3133 Connecticut Avenue NW.

The 79-year-old economist, author, attorney, and educator was an authority on railroad law. The Texas railroad laws which he formulated as a member of the State railroad commission served as a basis for the Federal railroad reorganization laws of 1922.

A consultant to the House Interstate Commerce Committee during the early 1930's, Mr. Splawn was largely responsible for the formulation of the Railroad Holding Company Act, the Trust in Securities Act, the Securities and Exchange Act, the Utility Holding Company Act, and the Federal Communications Act, all initiated during the administration of President Roosevelt.

He was a close friend of the late Speaker Sam Rayburn who, as chairman of the House Interstate Commerce Committee, sponsored the regulatory legislation on which Mr. Splawn worked.

Born in Arlington, Tex., he was graduated from Decatur Baptist College in 1904, earned his law degree at Baylor University in 1906, took his master's degree at Yale University in 1908, and received his doctorate at the University of Chicago in 1921.

After practicing law in Fort Worth for a time, he taught social science at Baylor and economics at the University of Texas, where he was president from 1924 to 1928.

During the late 1920's he served as chairman of the Western Railroad, board of arbitration and referee of the War Claims Settlement Act.

Mr. Splawn retired as Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission in 1957 and, despite his having become blind, returned to Decatur College as a teacher.

He was a member of the American Bar Association, the American Economic Association, the Southwestern Political Science Association, the Masons, and the Baptist church.

Surviving are his wife, Zola, and two daughters, Mrs. Thomas E. Taylor, of Lincoln, Va., and Mrs. Joe H. Munster, of Cleveland.

## The 45th Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

SPEECH
OF
### HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my distinguished colleague and friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for reserving time to address the House on the occasion of the 45th anniversary of Ukrainian independence.

I know that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman FLOOD, has been keenly interested in the plight of the Ukrainian people. Their tragic state, their aspirations for freedom and self-determination, deserve our utmost consideration.

Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago the news was received that a group of Ukrainian peasants and farmers forced their way into the U.S. Embassy in Moscow. They told a tale of denial of religious freedom and other civil liberties at the hands of the Communist government.

Their plight has evoked well-deserved sympathy from freedom-loving peoples of the world. More than that, we can applaud the courage of that little group of Ukrainians who dared defy the terror of their totalitarian police state.

Their example should be a reminder to us that the fire of freedom still burns bright in the hearts of the millions of men and women behind the Iron Curtain. History has demonstrated that the undaunted human spirit cannot be suppressed.

Let us remember this as we pay tribute to the brave people of the Ukraine who have amply demonstrated their determination to regain independent national status. Let us pledge ourselves anew to the task of working toward a better world where all peoples can find peace, freedom, and justice.

## The Chances for Education Bills in 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, because of its general interest, I should like to submit an article which appeared in the Sunday Star of January 20, 1963.

Under unanimous consent I insert the article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

THE CHANCES FOR EDUCATION BILLS IN 88TH CONGRESS

(By George W. Oakes)

Prospects for major new education legislation in the new congressional session depend on whether the administration and the Democratic leadership can "put the pieces back together" after the bitter controveries and failures of the last 2 years.

Federal financing for college academic buildings seems to have a real chance of enactment if the church-state issue can be resolved.

President Kennedy in his state-of-the-Union address last week mentioned aid to education first in presenting his recommendations for domestic legislation but did not go into any details.

The Senate 2 years ago passed a large-scale program for construction or teachers' salaries for elementary and secondary schools. The House, traditionally education's stumbling block in Congress because of the Southern Democrat-Republican coalition, defeated the bill due to Catholic demands that private schools be included. Therefore this particular approach to Federal aid at the elementary and secondary level seems doomed and no major school legislation appears possible this year.

LOANS PASSED

The college building program, the most important new education legislation up for decision last year, was beaten in the House after a Senate-House fight over the issue of Federal grants to church-related colleges and a large federally-financed scholarship program. Senate education leaders opposed grants to private colleges, especially those affiliated with the Catholic Church but passed last February a $300 million a year loan program for public and private colleges over a period of 5 years, $250 million in grants for public community colleges for 5 years, and 212,500 college scholarships costing $149 million averaging about $700 per year per student.

THE BILL THAT FAILED

The House last year passed a bill for private and public colleges with $180 million a year in grants for 5 years and $120 million in loans over the same period.

In conference the Senate and House leaders agreed in September on a $2.345 billion academic building and student aid bill for higher education that would have provided:

One billion five hundred million dollars over 5 years—60 percent in matching grants and 40 percent in loans, to construct engineering, physical and natural science buildings and libraries excluding buildings for religious purposes.

Five hundred ninety-five million dollars in student loans of $1,000 per student, of which 20 percent would be for "nonreimbursable loans" (a political device) for needy but outstanding students.

The House defeated the conference report 214 to 186 on September 20, 1962, by a combination of Republican, Southern and some Western Democrats. Most Southern Democrats objected to any Federal grants to church-related colleges, largely because of the Catholic issue. They were joined by such normal administration supporters as Representative UDALL, Democrat, of Utah. The National Education Association, which lobbied against the bill, felt that elementary and secondary education should have had priority in congressional action.

DEMOCRATIC DEFECTION

Although the administration has claimed that three or four more Republican votes in the House could have been decisive, influential liberal House Democrats are convinced that the legislation's defeat reflected the defection in Democratic ranks caused by poor strategy of the administration and the House Democratic leadership.

The religious issue on higher education had not raised its head in a vital way until certain prominent Southern legislators in September stirred up the church-state issue to defeat the conference report.

President Kenedy's education proposals for this year, likely to be sent to Congress the latter part of this month, probably will be included in one omnibus measure as a result of House Democratic strategists' insistence that the administration concentrate its objectives in one bill rather than recommend a deluge of education legislation as in the last 2 years.

The omnibus bill seems certain to include the folowing major proposals for new programs:

1. A revised college building program that would include loans and possible grants to nonchurch related institutions. The total cost might be larger than the 1962 Senate bill of $1.5 billion but, for budgetary reasons, would be stretched out over a longer period of time and therefore cost less on an annual basis. By limiting the grants to nonchurch related institutions the administration hopes to avoid the church-state issue.

2. A proposal for technical education to overcome the national shortage of engineering technicians. Congressman BRADEMAS, Democrat of Indiana, proposed this a year ago and it has been vigorously supported by Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, the President's science adviser.

3. A proposal for expanding the number of teacher training institutes in the humanities and the social sciences modeled on the successful experience of those in the physical and natural sciences operated by the National Science Foundation. Certain national standards might be set to encourage new teachers of ability and to retain present ones.

4. A modest proposal for elementary and secondary school construction in certain urban depressed areas extended over a number of years.

5. A proposal for a work-study plan providing Federal funds for needy students who would be employed, for example, as laboratory research assistants.

CONTINUED PROGRAMS

The following major existing programs in Federal aid to education would be continued:

1. The National Defense Education Act which expires this year. The student loan section of this successful program would be expanded and more graduate fellowships would be added.

2. A 1-year extension of Federal aid to impacted areas which may be the House's first education order of business. The House might provide that a commission renew the entire program, which many in Congress feel has outlined its usefulness.

3. Modernization of the old vocational training program.

These recommendations can only be regarded as a considerably watered-down version of the administration's original programs for both elementray and secondary schools as well as higher education as promised during the 1960 campaign and as submitted on paper to the Congress during President Kennedy's first year.

The major reason for such a drastic cutback is the resounding defeat the President has suffered in education legislation. Many observers, including leading Democratic congressional advocates of Federal aid to education, attribute the disaster to administration mishandling of its program. In recent months the White House seems to have lost whatever real enthusiasm it had for large-scale education legislation. The President is said to have privately expressed his sense of frustration and discouragement. His dispirited attitude has spread throughout the Government and on Capitol Hill and in itself has discouraged Congressmen holding marginal seats from taking a political chance on a program they feel the White House doesn't really intend to support to the fullest extent possible.

However, Francis Keppel, the new Commissioner of Education and the first to be sworn in at the White House, has the enthusiastic backing of the educational community. He is expected to instill a new spirit of optimism and to take an active role in presenting the administration's program to Congress.

The major struggle with Congress this year will be over the college building program. In 1970 the college population is expected to be twice what it was in 1960. Administration officials believe that the election has not improved appreciably the political problem in the House, the main hurdle to be faced. However, the elevation of Representative PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, Republican, of New Jersey, a long-term supporter of higher education, to ranking minority status on the House committee is encouraging.

QUESTIONS REMAIN

Enactment of the higher education legislation mainly depends on how these questions are resolved:

1. Can the administration and House Democratic leaders get the various powerful Democratic personalities in the House to reconcile their views and support a unified program?

2. Will the administration and House Democratic leaders utilize fully the available Republican support in the House?

3. Will Senate Democratic leaders go along with a bill if it passes the House where it may be taken up first?

4. Will the education community, in particular the influential college presidents, agree on what they want and exert every effort to press their views on Congress?

5. Will the Congress face squarely up to the church-state issue and bring it to a vote?

Otherwise, the best possible political alternative might be to use the probably renewal of the National Defense Education Act as a vehicle to incorporate a major college academic building program.

## Polish Insurrection Against the Russians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the centenary of a glorious event in the modern history of the Polish people. One hundred years ago the Poles openly defied the oppressive and auto-

cratic Russian regime in their homeland in the fond hope of regaining their independence. Under the firm leadership of their national committee in Warsaw the movement spread to all parts of the country like a forest fire. In every hamlet and town, in all Polish communities under Russian rule, there were instantaneous uprisings. Irrespective of the sacrifices involved and the sufferings to be endured, the people seemed to have vowed to fight or die for their freedom. At first czarist officials in the country were bewildered by this sudden explosion and for a while they seemed unable to cope with the situation. Most unfortunately for the Poles, however, time was on the Russian side. In due time, in a matter of months, they were able to bring Russia's ferocious might against these ill-armed, ill-organized but gallant Poles and crush this national uprising.

But even in their failure to attain their goals Polish leaders and their united followers showed greatness and gallantry, they also showed nobility in spirit and purity in purpose. In their proclamation they urged the Poles to fight for the emancipation and the complete enfranchisement of every person in the Polish realm without regard to race, religion, or previous condition of bondage. By the display of such broadmindedness Polish leaders were hoping to unite non-Polish elements in the country behind their cause. But they had also counted on outside intervention by certain governments; they were almost sure of French and British aid in their fight against their oppressors. Unfortunately they were sadly mistaken and misled in this calculation, for even if the governments of these countries wanted to intervene effectively they were ill prepared to come to Poland's rescue. So in the end carrying their fight against huge Russian armies for more than a year, their glorious uprising was cruelly crushed by the defeat, capture, and public hanging of their youthful leader, General Traugutt, on August 5, 1864. On the centenary of this most heroic armed uprising in Poland's modern history we pay tribute to the gallantry of Poland's patriotic leaders.

## World Airways Orders $8 Million Boeing Jet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 18, 1963*

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article that appeared in the Daily Commercial News of San Francisco under date of January 15 pertaining to the expansion of World Airways, a company with headquarters in Oakland, Calif.

World Airways is headed by Mr. Edward J. Daly, a dynamic leader and astute businessman, who has developed this organization into one of the leading nonschedule air transportation companies in the United States.

I am sure that you will see planes of this company in all of the ports of the Pacific in which our military establishments are located.

Ed Daly has done a great job in building an organization that is a standout in the United States.

The article follows:

WORLD AIRWAYS ORDERS $8 MILLION BOEING JET

The final phase of a $25 million buildup of jet aircraft by World Airways, Inc., of Oakland, was announced today, with disclosure the company is purchasing a third Boeing 707–320–C cargo-passenger transport for a price of $8 million. The price includes spare parts and engines.

Last May, World Airways ordered two similar jets for a price of $17 million including spare engines and parts, at the same time obtaining an option to purchase the third.

Exercise of the option, according to World Airways President Edward J. Daly, was accomplished through a $5,600,000 loan from the Bank of America's headquarters office in San Francisco, with the balance of the money coming out of World Airways reserves.

The new jet is due for delivery in September, Daly said, with the first two scheduled to arrive in June and July.

SERVICE

The huge planes will be used in the company's transpacific operations for the Military Air Transport Service (MATS), and in supplemental transportation services, according to Daly.

When they go into service World Airways will be the first carrier to operate jets from the Oakland International Airport, where a 10,000-foot runway was completed last fall.

The new jet equipment will augment the company's present fleet of 8 Douglas DC–6A/B's and 11 Super Constellations, which operate in flights for MATS, Logair, and various contract services, including a twice-weekly round trip to the Nike-Zeus project at Kwajalein for the Western Electric Co.

Like the 19 piston-driven aircraft, the new jet equipment will be committed to the civil reserve air fleet, thus being available to the military in times of national emergency.

The first two jets, ordered last May, have been financed by Boothe Leasing Corp., in connection with the Central Valley National Bank of Oakland and the Republic National Bank of Texas.

TERMS

Under terms of the leasing agreement for the first two jets, World Airways has the option to purchase the aircraft from Boothe at any time during the 10-year term, or at its termination.

All three of the new jets will have a cruising speed of 595 miles an hour and a nonstop range of 3,400 miles with full cargo load.

In MATS configuration, the 707–320–C can carry 168 passengers or 95,000 pounds of cargo, or any required combination of passengers and cargo. In economy configuration, 188 passengers can be carried. In either passenger configuration the craft can fly in excess of 6,000 miles nonstop.

They can be converted from passenger to cargo service in less than 4 hours.

Among the points which the new aircraft will serve in World Airways' flights for MATS will be Honolulu, Wake, Guam, Manila, Saigon, Bangkok, Tokyo, and Okinawa. Flights will originate at Oakland International Airport.

## West Allis, City of Homes and Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article which appeared in the January 21, 1963, issue of the Milwaukee Sentinel concerning West Allis, Wis., a city in my congressional district. Written by Sentinel reporter, William Janz, the article is one of a series on the history and progress of communities in the Milwaukee metropolitan area.

Now the fourth largest city in the State of Wisconsin, West Allis has made significant strides since it was incorporated in 1902. Industry found the community a good one in which to settle and expand. It became the home of the Wissin State Fair and as such, the center of the State's industrial and agricultural progress.

But West Allis is also a city of homes. The people who live there have a deep sense of identity with their community and a justified civic pride. Its leaders have been farsighted and progressive. Past achievements and present prosperity point to a bright future for this city of homes and industry.

It has been my great privilege to represent the people of West Allis in the Congress since 1949. To demonstrate further the cause of my pride, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the interesting and informative article which follows:

WEST ALLIS TIES INDUSTRIES, HOMES

(By William Janz)

West Allis is an industrial city whose growth has been marked by the rhythmic pounding of heavy hammers.

Though a suburb, West Allis has become one of the State's major cities. It got there carrying a tool box and a lunch bucket.

The city's astonishing success was predicted in 1920 when Mayor Delbert Miller said, "We are so close to Milwaukee that people do not realize what we have, but if they'll wait, we will show them."

This industrial boomtown that "showed them" was dug out of nearly empty fields 60 years ago like a piece of raw material, heated, hammered and polished.

The sound West Allis makes is loud enough that it cannot be drowned out by the giant, Milwaukee, as Mayor Miller foresaw more than 40 years ago.

The quest for industry that had so much to do with forging this community of factories and homes is still going on.

In the city hall office of Mayor Arnold Klentz, who has been chief executive for 19 years, 13 colored bricks are lined up on a ledge below the windows. Each brick has a small pennant flying atop it with the name of a new industry or commercial venture. The bricks are from the foundations of new businesses.

The successful merger of industry and home wasn't always as peaceful a coexistence as it is today.

In 1920, when Miller was mayor, there was a mass meeting of citizens of the first ward

to discuss whether legal action should be taken so residents could get some sleep and not have to duck falling plaster.

It seemed some new giant steel hammers at a drop forge company were disturbing the usually peaceful slumbers of the occupants of 500 homes near 54th Avenue and Burnham Street.

But this was an early crisis in this marriage of home and factory. Since the end of the honeymoon, there haven't been many noticeable spats, and meanwhile, production has gone on—giant turbines, generating equipment, tractors, machinery and engines used all over the world.

"Our residential growth was naturally influenced by the plants that located here," Mayor Klentz said. "When the early industrial expansion went into high gear, people wanted to live closer to their employment and the result was a residential building boom."

West Allis today has a population of almost 69,000. When the Edward P. Allis Co. (Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co.) moved west from Milwaukee shortly after the turn of the century and triggered the industrial explosion, there were about 1,000 persons in the area.

On Milwaukee's south side, the Edward P. Allis Co. had only room to employ about 3,000 persons. It needed 10,000 workers. So it purchased 100 acres of farmland at $250 an acre in what was known as North Greenfield and in the 1850's had been called Honey Creek.

With the purchase, a run on land began as other industrial concerns moved west with their workers.

Shortly after, in 1902, the village of West Allis was incorporated by a vote of 189 to 33. In 1906, Gov. J. O. Davidson proclaimed the village a fourth-class city.

"There's a funny story the old timers tell about the city being called West Allis," Mayor Klentz said.

He quoted from a book by Father J. H. Burbach, an early West Allis historian and an uncle of the present city engineer, Peter Burbach.

Mayor Klentz said there were those who wanted to retain the name of North Greenfield and those who wanted to call the new village West Allis. A meeting was called at Cuppel's hall at 55th and Greenfield and those favoring the new name arrived first.

The meeting was called to order, a chairman and secretary elected, a motion made and carried to organize a village, to call it West Allis, to have a census taken and to have the village surveyed and mapped.

All this took only 5 minutes and when the supporters of North Greenfield arrived for the meeting, West Allis supporters were kind enough to read them the minutes.

Since then, West Allis has prospered and expanded. It boomed through the war years with its factories working 7 days a week, 24 hours a day. It annexed 6 miles of land in the early 1950's and is now fairly well developed.

"There is no substantial residential area left not committed for subdivisions," Mayor Klentz said. "There are about 300 acres of unoccupied land for industry and commercial use and you can bet we're certainly still looking for industry."

If the State fairgrounds are ever abandoned, as proposed, this will leave a large section of land for use.

The fair site was purchased by the Wisconsin Agriculture Society December 9, 1891. It helped play its part in the city's development because manufacturers were attracted by the ease of travel along streetcar lines put in for park users.

This was the beginning for the city that became known the employing suburb of Milwaukee County. More people used to work in West Allis than live there, although that isn't true today.

The four largest companies in the city presently employ about 17,000 persons, city officials estimated. They are Allis-Chalmers, Kearney & Trecker Corp., Pressed Steel Tank Co., and the Wisconsin Motor Corp.

## Completely Free by 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the January 5, 1963, edition of the Michigan Chronicle under the authorship of my highly esteemed and dear friend, Dr. Broadus N. Butler.

Richly endowed with an irrepressible spirit, depth of perception and intellectual strength, this articulate and inspiring American has continued to offer vigorous leadership in the field of human rights and human development.

The editorial follows:

COMPLETELY FREE BY 1963

(By Dr. Broadus N. Butler)

The tide of events since this declaration was adopted by the NAACP in 1953 has successively borne a Supreme Court school desegregation decision and an equal public accommodations resolution in 1954; a nonviolent spiritual movement in Montgomery, Ala., in 1955; a high-gear series of moral and irrevocable national movements by the Federal Government to achieve equal employment opportunity and open occupancy housing opportunity from 1960 to 1962; and 1962 saw James Meredith and the Federal Government combine to finally seal the moral commitment of the entire country in their University of Mississipppi demonstration that there will be no turning back.

There is now freedom in the air we breathe, but the air is not yet completely free. Segregation and discrimination are like dying serpents—weakly wriggling but still as deadly poisonous as when they were full alive. The bombed church in Birmingham, Ala., the shots that pierced the sanctity of the Meredith home in Mississippi, and the announcement by the Governor of Alabama that there will be more violence when Miss Malone registers at the university are sobering reminders that the freedom year of 1963 is not to be approached with unreserved and irresponsible glee. Nevertheless, the very fact that our Nation has officially and morally recognized that the serpent has been mortally wounded calls for unremitting determination to complete the task of stamping out forever this evil.

Equally important is the imperative that we not leave a vacuum where segregation was; for nothing is more quick to rejuvenate than something that is evil and negative. Unlike segregation and discrimination which are characterized by negations and denials, freedom is a very positive condition which must be produced by the constructive wills of men who set themselves to be free.

Freedom starts, in the words of James Weldon Johnson, with inner assurance. In his memorable book, "Negro Americans, What Now? (1938)," there are these salient closing words: "In the situation into which we are thrown, let each one of us, let the whole race, be ceaselessly on guard against the loss of spiritual integrity. So long as we maintain that integrity we cannot be beaten down, not in a thousand years * * * I will not allow one prejudiced person or 1 million or 100 million to blight my life. I will not let prejudice or any of its attendant humiliations and injustices bear me down to spiritual defeat. My inner life is mine, and I shall defend and maintain its integrity against all the powers of hell."

From this foundation alone is built the personal and social disposition of the truly free man. No matter how decorated a man may be with the mythological garb of superiority, that man is not free who cannot look himself squarely in the private mirror of his own life and see his own integrity intact.

Contrariwise, no forces of men or institutions, nor all of the evil contrivances of slavery systems, segregation systems, or even genocide systems, can bend to submission the will of the privately freeman.

The whole massive slavery system at the height of its power could not weaken the will of Denmark Vesey, Nat Turner, Harriet Tubman, or Frederick Douglass. The entire national educational system aimed to keep the Negro submissive and ignorant could not stay the minds of W. E. B. DuBois, Carter G. Woodson, James Weldon Johnson, and a host of Negro intellectuals. The savage and unspeakable sadistic lynch mobs and murderous bigots could not dent the courage of Mary White Ovington, Arthur Spingarn, William Pickens, Walter White, and Roy Wilkins. The economic sanctions and yearlong absence of transportation could not deter the spiritual purpose of Rosa Parks, Martin Luther King, and the Negroes of Montgomery.

The jails, the burning of busses, the crashing of lead pipes and chains against the heads and bodies could not stop James Farmer and the freedom riders. Nay, not even hot coffee down the backs and pepper in the eyes of the sit-in demonstrators could lessen their demand for dignity. Why? Simply because they were already free. The steel of freedom does not bend to the exigencies of ignorance, vice, malice, or hate.

Freedom is a many-splendored and positive thing that is either there in the soul of the man or it isn't. The two most enslaved types of men in America—the most persistently wracked with fear and the most dangerous to themselves and others—are those who have to admit to themselves and their God that they are bigots and those who are so demeaned by the consequences of bigotry as to look at themselves and believe that they are inferior. Both are enslaved by the systematic loss of their own souls, and both seek irresponsible control over truly freemen.

This year, 1963, marks 100 years since the Emancipation Proclamation. Now that the denigrations, deprivations, and desecrations of the segregation system are reduced to but the wriggle of a dying asp, we must never again permit racial injustice, religious injustice, or any other form of systematic destruction of the dignity of our persons, either by myths of inferiority or by physical brutalities, to hold sway in this Nation. And every man must start within himself, where he is—now. The time of promise is nigh. Be it solemnly resolved: "But as for me, I shall be free."

## Soviet Three Onsite Inspection Offer Rejected by United States in 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on December 19, 1962, Premier Khrushchev

wrote President Kennedy that he would permit two or three onsite inspections annually of the Soviet Union in connection with a nuclear test ban treaty. The President replied on December 28, 1962, that he was encouraged and suggested further negotiations. Later, of the Khrushchev two or three statements, Secretary of State Dean Rusk said the United States is "encouraged to believe that the way is now open for some serious talks." On a Voice of America broadcast the President's science adviser, Jerome B. Wiesner said it "does bring us within shooting distance of some agreements."

Somehow the impression has got around that the Khrushchev letter amounts to some magnificent concession extracted from the Kremlin by some wizardry or other of the Kennedy administration.

The truth and fact is that the three onsite inspection proposition was put up by the Soviets in 1960 and rejected by the United States. Here is what was said of it in the Atomic Energy Commission's annual report to Congress dated January 1961 at page 128:

The Russian negotiators at Geneva have offered to permit only three onsite inspections per year in their country for all unidentified seismic events. The U.S. position is that, in view of the fact that more than 100 locatable seismic events of greater than 4.75 magnitude occur each year in the Soviet Union, 20 percent of these should be eligible for inspection (20 inspections per year.)

This quotation is recalled simply as a reminder to those who might wittingly or unwittingly attempt to rewrite history regarding this particular matter.

---

## LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

### CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

---

## CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

---

## RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

# Appendix

## Address by Herman Robinson Before United Cerebral Palsy Association, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, one of the most moving talks that I have ever read was delivered last October at the national legislative workshop of the United Cerebral Palsy Association, Inc., in Washingon.

The speaker was the Honorable Herman Robinson of Elizabethton, Tenn., who in his own words "was not born to speak, and until 7 years old neither spoke nor walked" because he was afflicted with a form of cerebral palsy. But Mr. Robinson has refused to surrender to his handicap; indeed, today he is a successful newspaperman and a member of the Tennessee State Senate. He serves on the Tennessee Legislative Council and on a subcommittee studying the problems of the handicapped. He represents Tennessee on the Southern Economic Development Commission and also serves on the National Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Robinson's speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Thank you Mr. Lyons, Mr. Bogatin, for inviting me to this great meeting. My being here—to speak to you, briefly is the greatest honor that has ever come to me. An honor, yes, and a challenge—for I have never before undertaken to address so many distinguished people at one time. And just as I consider it my greatest honor, I consider it also my greatest victory. For when I came into this world, the doctors shook their heads sadly and said I would never walk or talk, or even live—and here I am speaking before a great assemblage in a great city. You will pardon me if I seem somewhat overawed.

When I am through, you will not say I made a great speech. You may not say that I even made a good one. You may say that I made a bad one; that I did not enunciate well; that I spoke haltingly; that there were times when I seemed confused. But all this will not matter to me. I will rejoice in the bare fact that I spoke at all—that I mustered the courage to make this attempt. For I was not born to speak, and until I was 7 years old I neither spoke nor walked—because I was afflicted with spastic paralysis, a form of cerebral palsy. So each time I speak in public, each time I communicate successfully with an audience, I consider that I have won a victory—and tonight, as I said, I have won the greatest victory of all.

What does all this prove? It proves, I think, that man can be greater than his handicaps. His mind can be disciplined to overcome the weakness of his body. With determination and perseverance, he can do what he wants to do and be what he wants to be, regardless of any physical deficiencies. In short, if he refuses to accept defeat, he cannot be defeated.

I am reminded of the farmer who had an old blind horse which had outlived its usefulness. One day the horse fell into an unused well, and the farmer found him there, standing knee deep in water. There was no way to get him out, and as both he and the well were useless, the farmer decided to fill the well up, and leave the horse buried in it. He shoveled the dirt into the well as rapidly as he could. But the horse was not ready to be buried. When the dirt began to pour in upon him, he shook the dirt off and kept treading on the dirt under his feet. Gradually the well filled up, and the horse, at the same time, rose higher and higher, until he was able to step out and walk away to the pasture. The moral, of course, is that none of us need be buried under hard times, discouragements and calamities, unless we are willing to be buried.

You did not invite me here, I am sure, to hear the story of my life, but I feel I must tell it to you briefly because I consider myself to be much like that old horse in the well. I just refused to be buried.

Let us go back to 1912 and let us picture a tiny mountain village in southwest Virginia called Castlewood. Now add to that picture a rural mail carrier and merchant and his wife excitedly looking forward to the birth of a baby—me. And now think of that picture becoming dismal and black as the baby is born with birth injuries to the head and nervous system—injuries which led physicians to say the child would not live "and it is better that way."

But the baby did live, though medical specialists continued to shake their heads and say walking or talking, or any vestige of normal life, was out of the question. It appeared they were right, because by the time I had reached 6 years of age I could do no more than sit in a wheelchair—and had to be propped up with pillows even to do that.

Even so, my mother was determined I should go to school with normal children. And, though doctors and school officials alike said no, she persisted. She told them, "He may not be able to talk, but he sure can listen good." They finally gave in. In those days, I think I made a great deal of progress by imitating the other children, their movements especially. In watching the other children, I tended to forget myself momentarily—and that helped.

In about a year, I was able to stumble out of the wheelchair and stand briefly. Then I began trying to walk. I suppose I fell down several hundred times—but finally the day came that I walked out of that chair and never returned to it. It seemed almost like a miracle. Learning to talk was a separate problem—and just as hard as learning to walk. I wanted to communicate what was inside me, but the sounds would not form. I made noises but didn't say anything. My parents kept saying words to me, and I tried to repeat them. Eventually, I succeeded—enough to make myself understood not only at home but at school. I do not mean to say I spoke as well as the other children did, or even as well as I do tonight, but I did speak. And that, to me, was really something.

I kept up well in school. Perhaps this was due in part to sympathetic and understanding teachers. They kept promoting me from grade to grade. By the time I was ready for high school, the family had moved across the State line to Elizabethton in east Tennessee. That is where I live now.

My hero was a football coach whose name was E. N. Brown, but everybody called him "Mule." I decided I was going to play football for Mule. He had other ideas, but in an effort to make me feel a part of the team he made me manager. I guess I was just a glorifield waterboy. I spilled so much water opposing teams accused Mule of wetting down the field.

They were justified. How well do I remember that first ball game in early September when the players called time out because of heat and called for water. Those days the team had a big water pail and a family dipper. I grabbed the bucket with the dipper in the other hand. I went to the team with the water splashing and the crowd in the stands laughing. You know, when I got to the team, I was wet; but I was there. I had made it. The captain took the water pail from my hand and turned it upside, not a drop left. He called for more water. And I'll never forget halftime when the boys asked the coach never to send me out there again. I handled that problem by getting bottles for each individual. And too, we were practicing more sanitation.

Those were good old days. You know, when I would bring the footballs out to the practice fields, very often one of the players would say, "Give me that football before you shake the air out of it."

The manager business was good—but not good enough. I still wanted to play. I got a signed statement from my parents saying it would be all right, and that did it. In modern parlance, I was in orbit when Mule said I could get out there and practice with the team. I don't think I was exactly a star—it seemed at times they were using me as a blocking dummy, but I did make the team and earn a letter. At that time, I could not have asked for more. It seemed to me I had no more worlds to conquer. I had proved I could mix it up with the roughest of them and hold my own.

After high school, I attended East Tennessee State College in nearby Johnson City, but by that time I had been bitten by a bug which left a virus from which I have never recovered—newspaper reporting.

I was interested in writing for the papers—sports, social events, anything. That was in the time of the depression, and publishers were cutting off instead of putting on. They wouldn't give me a regular job, but let me sweep out at $2 a week. Between sweepings, I managed to contribute a few articles that found print. I could not ask for anything more, even money.

Eventually, I worked my way into regular employment, first in my hometown and then in neighboring Johnson City. I have worked for these newspapers ever since, and they have contributed more to my education, I feel, than all the classroom instruction I received. It was through newspaper work that I became interested in politics, which I found fascinating to report. Perhaps it was only natural that this fascination should lead me to enter the "great game" on an active basis and be elected to

the Tennessee State Senate, in which I am now serving my fourth consecutive term. The last three without opposition.

Up until now, I am afraid I have been giving myself credit for what I have accomplished. Perhaps I may seem to have been boasting. I have not meant to do this. Truth compels me to say that I could never have done anything if I had not had patient and loving parents, many faithful and understanding friends—and most of all, a loving wife who came to me (for what reason I do not know) and has stood by me through the years when the going was rough as well as when it was smooth. It was she who gave me social confidence—something I surely lacked even after winning the physical battles. It did not occur to me that I could ever be a part of "boy-meets-girl" life, because I felt no young lady could ever be attracted to me. (And I am still mystified as to how it could happen.) But she brought romance to me, and it has never left me—and I know it never will so long as I have Margie.

This young woman has been my bride for 28 years in December—and she has been my partner in my work. We are a team. I never undertaken anything of importance without getting her advice and consent. We planned our family, waiting 8 years for our first child, a son. We wondered if he would be handicapped. Would my affliction carry over to him? We were anxious, and we consulted the best physicians. I can answer the question of "carry-over" best by telling you this boy is kicking extra points and field goals for the University of Tennessee Volunteers, a football team of which you may have vaguely heard. He is a sophomore studying law. We also have a daughter, 13, who is doing well in the accelerated program of the Elizabethton school system—and equally well in tap dancing, piano, and band. She and our son could hardly be more normal teenagers. And so, you can readily see why I feel life has treated me well. It has responded generously when I have called upon it. It has given me more than I deserve. For all of this, I humbly thank a kind Providence.

I have found that it isn't the handicap that gets a person down. It is the surrender to a handicap. If one is determined, he can conquer the handicap, but if he is sorry for himself, it will conquer him. Look at it this way: Everybody is handicapped. Some are handicapped in body, some in mind. Some have handicaps which show, others have handicaps which are not seen with the eye. Some of the people most envied by their fellows are nursing burdens which sorely test them. From the highest to the lowest—even including the President of the United States—all are burdened. All are put to the test, all are challenged to conquer or be conquered, to hope or to despair, to win or to lose. Nobody is free of handicaps. Yours may be different from mine, but it is there. God did not intend that any human be perfect—in mind, or in body, or in soul. He made us a little lower than the angels, each one of us with frailties which, after all, means that we are human and not divine. But God did not intend that we surrender to our handicaps. He gave them to us as challengers. He intends that we shall fight to overcome them. In a sense, then, they are blessings as much as burdens. They are crosses which, when we bear them bravely, can give life meaning it otherwise would not have.

The greatest victories in life are those we win against great odds. The victory which comes easily brings with it no sweet taste. So whatever may be our lot, let us accept it without bitterness—and determine to improve it.

We can do it, if we will. I know we can. We can grow and we can build, if we but have faith.

A builder builded a temple
He wrought it with grace and skill
Pillows and goins and arches
All fashioned to work his will.

Men said when they saw its beauty
It is never to decay
Great is Thy skill, O builder
Thy fame shall endure for aye.

Fathers and mothers builded a temple
With infinite hands and care
Planting each arch with patience
Laying each stone with care.

Gone is the builders temple
Crumpled into dust
Low lies each stately pillow
Food for consuming rust.

But the temple the parents builded
Will last while the ages roll
For this beautiful unseen temple
Is a person's immortal soul.

## Obvious Critics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask permission to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial, written by Mr. Gordon Fister, in the Allentown (Pa.) Morning Call, praising the work of our distinguished colleague, Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, and the Committee on Un-American Activities.

I wholeheartedly agree with the editor's observations on the outbursts made at a recent committee hearing. Mr. Fister wrote:

Demonstrations * * * serve neither the cause of peace, the interests of this country, or the individuals who seek a place in the sun by making spectacles of themselves.

Under unanimous consent I include the following article for the Appendix of the RECORD:

OBVIOUS CRITICS

There isn't much reason to become excited about abuses sometimes charged to the House Un-American Activities Committee so long as the objections to its procedures come principally from those who plead the fifth amendment when asked about present or former Communist affiliations.

Little more significance need be attached to outbursts by any who like Jack Levine, survived the rigorous training and life of an FBI agent only long enough to launch an attack on this law enforcement agency and its respected chief, J. Edgar Hoover. It takes more than one agen with less than a year of service on his record to discredit such a force.

Demonstrations like those once again being mounted by adversaries of the Un-American Activities Committee at hearings in Washington serve neither the cause of peace, the interests of this country, or the individuals who seek a place in the sun by making spectacles of themselves.

Few Americans who are not Communists now and never have been would hesitate to vigorously deny such affiliations publicly or privately. Few who could not give a negative answer to the simple question would want either their present or former associations with the party on the record. Their reasons for objecting to hearings like these are obvious. Communists, after all, aren't in the best repute among most Americans.

There probably are many well-intentioned and conscientious folks in pacifist groups like the one identified as Women Strike for Peace. There could, however, be some who use this and other organizations with high-sounding names to feed innocent victims poisoned Moscow pap.

The House Un-American Activities Committee, for so many years headed by Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, and the FBI, both are charged by Congress with determining what insidious forces are at work behind convenient cloaks in this country. Most folks want them identified so they can more accurately determine which groups are dedicated to serving this country and which are under the influence of others.

## Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, on Tuesday last, in Wilton and Belfield, N. Dak., the Ukrainians of North Dakota joined Ukrainians throughout the free world in observing the 45th anniversary of the proclamation of a free Ukrainian state on January 22, 1918.

As a part of the observance, Hon. William L. Guy, Governor of North Dakota, issued an executive proclamation setting aside January 22 as Ukrainian Independence Day in North Dakota.

The proclamation is a symbol of freedom for the Ukrainians of North Dakota and throughout the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Governor's proclamation and a press release by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., Bismarck, N. Dak., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation and press release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY IN NORTH DAKOTA

"Whereas on January 22, 1963, Ukrainians in North Dakota and throughout the free world will solemnly observe the 45th anniversary of the proclamation of a free Ukrainian state; and

"Whereas after a defensive war lasting 4 years, the free Ukrainian state was destroyed in 1920 and a puppet regime of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic was installed, later becoming a member state of the Soviet Union, and

"Whereas the once-free Ukraine is now no more than a colony of Communist Russia and its vast human and economic resources are being exploited for the purpose of spreading communism, and

"Whereas some 25,000 Americans of Ukrainian descent now living in North Dakota have made significant contributions to both State and Nation. Now, therefore, I, William L. Guy, Governor of the State of North Dakota, do hereby proclaim the week

of January 22, 1963, as Ukrainian Independence Day in North Dakota and urge all citizens to demonstrate their sympathy with and understanding of the aspirations of the Ukrainian nation to again achieve its rightful inheritance of freedom and independence."

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of North Dakota here in my office in the State capital at Bismarck, N.Dak., this 17th day of January 1963.

WILLIAM L. GUY,
*Governor.*

Attest:

BEN MEIER,
*Secretary of State.*

---

JANUARY 22 PROCLAIMED UKRAINIAN DAY

For many years the 22d of January has been proclaimed and celebrated in our American cities and States from coast to coast as Ukrainian Independence Day.

On January 22, 1963, Americans of Ukrainian descent are observing the 45th anniversary of the Proclamation of Independence of Ukraine which took place on January 22, 1918, in the capital of Ukraine, Kiev.

On that day, a free and democratically elected Parliament and Government of Ukraine issued a solemn act and proclamation of the reestablishment of the Ukraine as a sovereign and independent nation called the Ukrainian National Republic.

The young Ukrainian state was recognized by a number of governments including that of Soviet Russia. But despite the fact that it officially recognized the independence of Ukraine and pledged itself to respect the sovereignty of the Ukrainian nation, Communist Russia attacked Ukraine both by military aggression and subversion and infiltration from within. After almost 4 years of bloody war, Ukraine, deprived of all military, economic, and diplomatic help from Western nations, succumbed to the forces of Communist Russia.

Since 1920 Ukraine has remained under the domination of Communist Russia, but it has never surrendered the spirit of resistance nor given up the hope of liberation and complete independence. During the whole period of enslavement, Ukrainian resistance to the Communist regime and Soviet Russian oppression continued. As a result the Ukrainian people were subjected to harsh and inhuman treatment and persecution. Both Ukrainian churches; namely, the Ukrainian Orthodox and Ukrainian Catholic Church, were physically annihilated by Moscow; the Ukrainian intelligentsia was decimated by purges, deportations, and executions; while over 5 million Ukrainian peasants died from hunger and starvation during a manmade famine. It was Khrushchev himself who declared at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party that Stalin planned the total extermination of the Ukrainian people, which plan failed only because there were too many Ukrainians. How significant was the Ukrainian problem to the Russians was evident in 1959–60 when the Soviet Government sent special agents to kill Ukrainian leaders in the free world, as was the case of Stepan Bandera and Dr. Lev R. Rebet, whose killer was recently sentenced by the German Supreme Court in the fall of 1962, to 8 years of hard labor.

Both the U.S. Government and the President have recognized the plight of the Ukrainian people, enacting and signing the Captive Nations Week resolution, which listed the Ukraine as one of the captive nations enslaved by Communist Russia. During the debate of the United Nations General Assembly, a number of Western statesmen, including Hon. John G. Diefenbaker, Prime Minister of Canada; Hon. Adlai Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the U.N.; the Ambassador of the Republic of China; and others raised their voices in protest against the colonial enslavement of the Ukraine by Communist Russia.

In the summer of 1962, special Senate and House resolutions calling for congressional inquiry into the persecution of religious groups, its genocide of the Ukrainian churches and 18 years of imprisonment of Archbishop Joseph Slipy, were introduced by Senator Milton R. Young and Congressman Don L. Short.

Today the Ukrainian people everywhere are celebrating the memorable date of January 22, 1918, as their greatest national holiday. Today, after 45 years of unrelenting struggle against Moscow, the Ukrainians have made much progress, and their cause is known as never before.

The cause of Ukrainian freedom and independence is no longer a patriotic desire of the Ukrainians. Since the Communist menace has spread to our shores in Cuba and Latin America, it has become a political necessity for the free world, since the independent Ukraine means a substantial weakening of the Soviet Communist empire and therefore the permanent Soviet threat which hangs over an intimidated humanity.

Americans of Ukrainian descent in our great State of North Dakota are planning to celebrate the forthcoming 45th anniversary of the Ukrainian independence on January 27, 1963, in Wilton and Belfield, in a fitting and solemn manner.

Therefore the 45th anniversary of Ukrainian independence provides an appropriate occasion for the American people to demonstrate their sympathy with and understanding of the aspirations of the Ukrainian nation to freedom and independence.

---

## Monkey Wrench in the Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by David Lawrence which appeared in the Washington Star on January 26, 1963, clearly illustrates some of the grave difficulties arising out of the proposed tax cuts accompanied by the largest annual budget in the history of this country.

If the state of the Union is as good as we were assured it is in the President's state of the Union message, then why all of this tampering with the economic system.

Under unanimous consent, I include the following article in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

MONKEY WRENCH IN THE ECONOMY—PRESIDENT'S TAX PLAN VIEWED AS LEADING TO UNCERTAINTY AND POSSIBLY STAGNATION

(By David Lawrence)

President Kennedy has thrown a monkey wrench into the national economy. His message to Congress on taxes was well intentioned, but the confusion, disruption, and uncertainty it will bring in the next few months to business operations in this country could stagnate the economy and result in the very opposite of the hoped-for stimulus; namely, a recession.

For, again Mr. Kennedy has depended on academic advisers who boldly disregard the most important single factor in the national economy, the confidence necessary to future planning.

Instead of getting the widely heralded tax cut, corporations will pay more tax money to the Government during the next 3 years than they did before. They will not actually get on the promised percentage basis of reduction till 1969. It's a stimulus in 1963 that's needed, not in 1969.

This outlook is partly due to the President's scheme for moving up tax collections from many corporations to larger payments during the same year the income is earned. This involves a surgical operation on the cash flow of a company that could block expansion or even the financing of current capital outlays to which many corporations have already committed themselves for the next several years.

On the face of it, moreover, individuals in the higher brackets are being told they will have the rates reduced from 91 to 65 percent over a 3-year period, but the President's recommendations call for such vital changes in the handling of capital gains as well as contributions and other deductions that the net result may be little, if any, decrease in the payments by the taxpayer.

A man with an income of $20,000 a year, for instance, may hitherto have had legitimate deductions of $2,000. Under the proposed plan, the Government would disallow deductions, including interest on the mortgage on his home, contributions, and city and States taxes, equal to 5 percent of his income, or the first $1,000. The deductions allowed would then amount to $1,000. But should he happen to have casualty losses, these would be deductible only in the amount they exceed 4 percent of his gross income, and even this would be subject to the basic 5 percent limitation. Also, he would be required to pay taxes on the premiums paid by his employers on any group life insurance policy above $5,000. There are other new increases in taxes and removal of exemptions, so that the taxpayer could wind up with less net revenue than before.

But what the President's plan does to individual planning for estates is even worse. A capital gains tax on the appreciated value of real estate, for example, will have to be paid at the death of the owner, even if the property isn't sold. This would be in addition to inheritance taxes. There will have to be a revision now of many a will. A person who thought he was leaving a certain sum to his family will find the amount materially diminished.

The repeal of the provision that sick pay is not subject to taxation up to $100 a week will cause dismay to the head of many a family who becomes ill and tries to make ends meet on a diminished income, especially if his work is largely on a commission basis. Also, while heretofore he could deduct medical expenses in excess of 3 percent of income, now he will be given a deduction for such expenses above 4 percent and will be able to take even this only to the extent that his total deductions exceed 5 percent of his gross income. So more of his income will be taxable than before.

When one surveys the confusion to individuals and the diminution of the capital or reserves in the treasuries of corporations, one wonders if the President's advisers gave any thought to the high cost of the transition period in terms of a demoralized national economy.

There are dozens of categories on which increases in taxation will result, yet the President's plan is hailed as a tax cut. It will take many months for such a measure to go through Congress. Meanwhile, what will individuals and businesses do? How can they plan? Will spending be discouraged? People don't spend money expected from tax cuts till they are actually in effect. Since the changes in rates are to be spread over 3 years, while the changes in regulations about deductions and expenses of all kinds,

including certain classes of gifts, are to go into effect next January, it will certainly make people in 1963 cautious about what they spend. This caution and hesitation may last 2 or 3 years, because there will be no certainty that Congress will not be compelled, due to public-opinion pressures, to make more changes next year.

All in all, when the country fully understands the President's tax plan, the Democratic Party will certainly be on the spot. The division in the electorate between the two major parties is a narrow one, anyhow, and it takes only a small percentage shift of voters to produce a landslide for the other party. That could mean a Republican Congress and a Republican President in 1964. Until Mr. Kennedy made public his tax plan, it looked as if he might win again in 1964. But now it looks as if a nationwide protest will develop. This will be felt in Congress, which will hesitate to adopt the President's plan, alluring though a tax cut seemed to the politicians at first glance.

In the final analysis, what good is a cut in tax rates if business conditions turn for the worse and individual incomes begin to shrink? That's the unanswered question in the President's message.

## What Is a Farmer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, farming remains the basic industry in all America. When farmers are successful the Nation is prosperous; when farmers are in economic distress, the Nation falters; should farmers fail completely in their production of food and fibers, all of us would be reduced to inadequate diets, deteriorating health, and unsuitable clothing. A sound and productive agriculture is essential to a stable and successful American economy.

But how about the men and women who operate these all-essential farms? Who are they? How do they think? What are their attitudes, their goals, and their ambitions? What manner of human being and fellow citizens are they actually? Station KMA of Shenandoah, Iowa, recently broadcast a description of a typical farmer which was reprinted in the GTA Daily Radio Roundup of St. Paul, Minn. It summarizes well the sturdy, self-reliant characteristics exemplified by our Nation's farmers and I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A farmer is a paradox. He is an overall executive with his home his office; a scientist using fertilizer attachments; a purchasing agent in an old straw hat; a personnel director with grease under his fingernails; a dietitian with a passion for alfalfa, aminos, and antibiotics; a production expert with a surplus, and a manager battling a price-cost squeeze.

He manages more capital than most of the businessmen in town.

He likes sunshine, good food, State fairs, dinner at noon, auctions, his neighbors, his shirt collar unbuttoned and, above all, a good soaking rain in August.

He is not much for droughts, ditches, throughways, experts, weeds, the 8-hour day, grasshoppers, or helping with housework.

Farmers are found in fields—plowing up, seeding down, rotating from, planting to, fertilizing with, spraying for, and harvesting. Wives help them, little boys follow them, the Agriculture Department confuses them, city relatives visit them, salesmen detain them and wait for them, weather can delay them, but it takes Heaven to stop them.

A farmer is both faith and fatalist—he must have faith to continually meet the challenges of his capacities amid an ever-present possibility that an act of God (a late spring, an early frost, tornado, flood, drought) can bring his business to a standstill. You can reduce his acreage but you can't restrain his ambition.

Might as well put up with him. He is your friend, your competitor, your customer, your source of food, fiber, and self-reliant young citizens to help replenish your cities. He is your countryman—a denim-dressed, businesswise, fast-growing statesman of stature. And when he comes in at noon, having spent the energy of his hopes and dreams, he can be recharged anew with the magic words: "The market's up."

## The Crisis for American Poultry Exports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, the strong protectionist policy adopted by the European Economic Community toward importation of agricultural products from nations outside its group has had a devastating impact on the American poultry industry, which, in recent years, had developed a substantial export market in Europe, particularly in West Germany.

The Virginia poultry industry alone had built to an annual volume of $7,500,000 in shipments to West Germany. In recent months, this business virtually has been extinguished. Other poultry producing States have suffered comparable economic damage.

Conscious of the overall dollar loss to the State, not only in direct payments to poultrymen but also in business generated among those selling goods or services to poultrymen, all segments of Virginia's economy have banded together in a cooperative move to press for more intensive efforts by the U.S. Government toward modification of the oppressive tariff, variable levy and "gate price" policies adopted by the European Economic Community.

As of possible interest to colleagues from other poultry States, Mr. Speaker, I include, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, some background material on the problem:

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Set out below are several items of information in reference to the European common agricultural policy that may be helpful in presenting the case for the poultry industry.

1. The present treatment of American poultry entering Common Market countries is a result of regulation No. 22 of the European Economic Community adopted at Brussels on the 4th day of April 1962. To request the official translation of regulation No. 22, address inquiries to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Foreign Agriculture Service, Washington, D.C., and request Foreign Agricultural Circular FPE 4–62, November 1962.

2. Under the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) nonmember countries' exports are subjected to (a) gate price, (b) equalization fee (variable levy), (c) ad valorem duty (internal), (d) ad valorem duty (external).

See attached sheet for explanation of these levies.

3. It is important to stress that poultry is a nonsupported, non-Government-controlled agricultural commodity, the price of which is established by the forces of the free market. Poultry has the best case of any agricultural product to point out the unfairness of the Common Market action. Poultry is a substantial export item that is sold for dollars and consequently not only helps achieve a favorable balance of trade but also would help to achieve a favorable balance of payments. In short, the export of poultry helps to stop the outflow of gold that is posing for this Nation a serious economic dilemna.

4. The Common Market has stated that it expects to follow a liberal trade policy, and their action on poultry in using a series of levies is a flagrant example of an extremely protectionistic policy in order to establish a domestic production capability.

5. Unless the case for poultry is made now, it will be much more difficult to achieve a solution once they have invested heavily in their own production capacity.

6. Under the forces of a free market system, Common Market poultry cannot compete with American poultry. To emphasize this point, it is estimated that the American industry could place broilers into the Common Market at a cost of 29 to 31 cents per pound. American imports have reduced the price of poultry from a luxury foodstuff to a reasonably priced commodity more nearly within the reach of the average European housewife. The price of chicken per pound in Germany as of December 31, 1962, was approximately 44 cents per pound. Prior to August 1, 1962, and the common agricultural policy, the maximum price per pound of chicken was approximately 38 cents per pound.

7. There is no certainty as to the firmness of levies of the Common Market. The deliberations of the Council of Ministers are closed, and to point this out, a supplemental levy of 2.84 cents was made in the November meeting and announced overnight—suddenly disrupting the American market and confusing exporters and importers. Importers were caught with thousands of pounds of poultry on the high seas purchased at one price but subject to higher levies on entry to Europe.

8. Although Virginia provides only about 3 percent of U.S. poultry production, it has 13 percent of the national exports.

9. It has been argued by Common Market officials that poultry has only recently become a major export item to the Common Market, especially Germany, and, therefore, the American poultry industry has not been hurt. It should be emphasized that only within the last few years could we get into Germany because of extremely high tariff walls. Secondly, the market was built by aggressive sales promotion, through advertising, trade fairs, and other media to develop a consumer demand.

10. It should also be emphasized that the American poultry industry has the experience in growing, processing, and packaging that enables us to develop our markets in Europe. Another major factor is the American capacity and experience in freezing poultry products.

11. The argument is made that we can avail ourselves of the negotiation procedures under the recent Trade Expansion Act. Persons who raise this point are probably referring to the Christian Herter team which will implement the negotiation procedures of the act. However, it should be stressed that the negotiation procedures provided in the act will not be available until some time in 1964.

This entire organization must be planned and put together and until that is done, State Department officials advise that normal diplomatic procedures will have to be followed in communicating with Common Market nations. Many observers feel (foreign and domestic) that strong action on poultry could minimize future unfair trade policies by the Common Market.

The new Trade Expansion Act, section 252(a)(3), gives authority to the President and our negotiators to retaliate against countries which impose unreasonable tariffs on poultry and other agricultural products.

12. There are indications of support of the American industry in several of the Common Market countries, particularly Germany and Italy.

13. Many persons do not look on poultry as being an industry. This is especially true in the Common Market. There are also indications that many persons in this country cling to the idea that chickens are raised by walking out the back door and throwing a handful of grain in the yard. The point must be brought home that the poultry industry is a highly-technical operation that affects and involves many other areas in our economy and a host of related industries from a farm operation to a complex modern marketing operation.

14. In a paper prepared by the Georgia Poultry Federation, it is stated:

"Economists estimate that if there had been no exports in 1960, broilers would have brought a cent a pound less, eggs over a cent a dozen less and turkeys over a half-cent a pound less."

15. Special mention should be made concerning West Berlin and the importation of poultry to that city. The present levies of the CAP are applied in that city to our poultry imports, and a strong position should be taken without admitting, or agreeing, to any of the levies established under the CAP on poultry—that, in any event, the citizens of West Berlin should have made available to them foodstuffs at the lowest cost at which they can be provided to the people of that city, especially in light of the heavy commitment this Nation has made to the defense of West Berlin and to the costs of garrisoning and possibly subsidizing the supply of foodstuffs to that city.

16. There is little or no turkey production in Europe, and the large fowl market is in geese. Similar levies, but at different rates, are applied to turkeys and other large fowl. The market price of geese and turkeys are quite close, and up until the recent holiday season the "variable levy" (equalization fee) on geese and turkeys was about 9½ cents per pound; however, in November the variable levy was dropped by about 6½ cents for geese but held at 9½ cents for American turkeys. Among the principal suppliers of geese on the Common Market are Poland and Yugoslavia, and the result of this action was to exclude turkeys, our major fowl export, from the market which was captured by the cheaper-priced goose. It is understood that the variable levy on geese, as of January 1, 1963, was raised to the 9½-cent level; however, the holiday demand had ceased.

COMMON MARKET LEVIES ON AMERICAN POULTRY

"An equalization fee (sometimes referred to as a variable levy) is to be charged on poultry to correct for the amount by which feed grain prices in the importing country exceed the price of the same grains in the world market. This fee will be levied per kilo of meat (2.2 pounds).

"A gate price—the minimum price at which poultry may enter the Common Market—is also provided. This is designed to prevent dumping by nonmember countries.

"The gate price is based upon the world market price for feed grains and a feed conversion factor which is considered to be typical of the exporting countries. When prices offered by the exporting country are below the gate price, the importing country must charge a fee equal to the difference.

"An ad valorem duty (inte nal) in the amount paid by member countries to each other will be charged all outsiders. For instance, Germany charges a duty of 10.5 percent on poultry from other Common Market countries. Any outside count ies shipping poultry into Common Market countries will have to pay such a fee as of July 1.

"The German duty is now 15 percent on poultry from outside countries. Hence, the United States will benefit from the reduction. The duties vary according to the problem of member countries in adjusting their farm policies to free trade conditions. These duties are all scheduled to be reduced gradually to zero by December 31, 1969.

"Another ad valorem duty (external) of 2 percent is being added this year. It is to be built up gradually to 7 pe cent by 1970. This so-called preferential duty will be charged on all poultry from outside the Common Market."—Taken from an article by Dr. Harry M. Love, published in the Virginia Poultryman, May 1962.

One thousand pounds eviscerated poultry generates the following gross income:

| | |
|---|---|
| Income to producer of feeds (to grower of grain, etc.) | $150.00 |
| Income to flock owner (to hatching eggs produced) | 18.00 |
| Salaries, wages, and other: | |
| To broiler grower | 33.00 |
| To delivering feed and servicing broilers | 14.00 |
| To truck to haul live poultry from farm to plants | 7.50 |
| To wages to process and pack | 30.00 |
| To boxes, paper packaging material | 18.00 |
| To ice | 3.00 |
| To trucking dressed poultry to seaport | 10.00 |
| To repairs, replacements to plant processing equipment | 15.00 |
| Total | 208.50 |

(Taken from statistics supplied by the Georgia Poultry Federation.)

WHAT MIGHT BE DONE

1. Adoption of a resolution by trade associations and other organizations in the Commonwealth which would be forwarded to a coordinating committee that would make proper distribution.

2. Make it a point to discuss this Common Market action with your local newspaper editor, radio station, radio-television station and other news media.

3. Arrange for insertion in trade organs of a story covering the Common Market action.

4. Organize a letter and telephone campaign by different organizations and individual citizens directed to the appropriate agencies of the executive branch of our Government. Correspondence should be addressed to the White House and the Department of State.

5. Organize a speakers team of individuals to address civic clubs, trade associations and other clubs throughout the Commonwealth explaining this matter and requesting their assistance by demanding support of the poultry industry by our Government.

6. Inform your elected representatives of the situation.

7. Arrange for a conference with appropriate officials at the highest possible level in the executive branch of the Government.

## The Power of Belief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, several of us in the Senate were privileged to hear a most inspirational address by our colleague, Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, delivered at the Old St. John's Church, Georgetown, on January 13, 1963.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TALK DELIVERED AT OLD ST. JOHN'S CHURCH, GEORGETOWN, ON SUNDAY, JANUARY 13, 1963, BY SENATOR CLAIBORNE PELL, OF RHODE ISLAND

From the time I was confirmed until I graduated from college, I occasionally contemplated entering the clergy. I used to think, and still think, that the pulpit can be a most wonderful podium from which to change the course of events for the better. But I am afraid I had neither sufficient determination, nor virtue, to follow through with this interest.

So, following a rather indirect route, I became a politician. However, I believe that a politician can also be a force for good, because a good politician—and remember a politician is never a statesman until he is dead—a good politician is also driven by the desire to help and to lead. If we weren't, we'd be doing something else, and usually something a lot more profitable. And, so I am very, very glad indeed to be standing here talking with you now.

Today, when we hear so much about the balance of power, yes, the balance of terror, I would like to discuss the tremendous weapon that we of the West have and the Communists do not have.

To my mind, it is a weapon that can more than hold its own with nuclear missiles over the long haul. Although it must be confessed, the decisiveness of the nuclear missile over the short haul would be pretty decisive.

This weapon is religion. It is a universal weapon, too, because when I say religion, I am not just thinking of a particular faith, nor am I thinking of Christianity with all its rich intermixture of faiths, but I am thinking of religion in general and the common belief of certain origins and certain values.

I wonder how many of us have stopped to think that it can be said that Jesus Christ, Mohammed, and Moses are all descendants of Abraham. I believe one could actually trace out a genealogical cousinship, a consan-

guinity, between these three. It is quite interesting, incidentally, to see with what pride the Moslems consider themselves of the same general religious family as do the Jews and the Christians. I guess this all goes to show that Senator Austin's plea at the Security Council to the Israelis and the Arabs to settle their problems in a truly Christian spirit, may not have been such an unattainable idea after all.

Then, on a more universal scale still, many comparative religions not only show the same misty origins of the world starting with the Great Flood, but will also show a surprising similarity in values, values that oppose the Communist ones: the importance of loving, the importance of generosity, and, perhaps, the greatest difference with the Communist bloc, belief in the afterlife.

Let us see now, the role of religion in the uncommitted, undeveloped areas of the world such as Africa—particularly sub-Sahara Africa and southeast Asia. Here we have a very specific debt to the missionaries.

Until I made a trip to Tanganyika some time ago, I had always given a very long look at the activities of missionaries since I was under the impression that they were often disliked by the people of the emerging nations and regarded by them with great suspicion.

However, my trip to Africa deeply impressed me with the great educational and medical contribution made by missionaries there. In Tanganyika alone, I found that there were 400 American Christian missionaries, or 20 times the number of American Government personnel in that country. In fact, in tropical Africa, as a whole, there are close to 10,000 American missionaries. This is a number more than a thousand percent higher than the 778 American Government personnel there.

Another way of looking at it, and an even more impressive figure, is the realization that there are 23,000 missionaries of all nationalities, including Americans, in tropical Africa, approximately 6,440 Catholic and 15,970 Protestant.

These dedicated men and women may handle very high caliber education, as is the case with the Anglican St. Andrew's School outside Dar-es-Salaam, Tanganyika, where the graduates are able to compete on an equal basis with youngsters finishing the best English school at home. Or, as is the case with the majority of missionary schools, the education may be more simple and elementary, giving the students a basic knowledge of reading and writing. But, no matter what may be the particular level of missionary education in Africa, without it, that continent would be undergoing far greater turmoil and internal strife than is now the case.

In this connection, it is interesting to notice that 16 heads of state and prime ministers of the newly emergent nations of tropical Africa received their education in full or in part in missionary schools. In fact, with only a single exception, every African head of state or prime minister in tropical Africa who is not a Moslem was educated to some degree in a Christian missionary school.

Moreover, in those countries not yet independent, we find the leaders equally owe their education to missionaries.

Altogether, a total of 35 men are included. Of these 35, Christian missionaries educated 25. Catholic missionaries educated 17, and Protestant missionaries educated 8.

In the remote vastness of the mountain lands in the periphery of Communist China, there are many American missionaries, including incidentally, a goodly number from my own State.

In general, in the area of missionaries, our Protestant Episcopal Church is not seen as much in the Far East as others.

Now, let's examine the situation of religion behind the Iron Curtain. Here, I would like to cite two differing views on religion.

The first you are familiar with—Karl Marx's dictum that "religion is the opiate of the masses." But, I believe more in the words of Bela Udvarnoki, who, in an article in Christianity Today last July said, "Man is incurably religious."

The fact, I think, that man is incurably religious is our great secret weapon against the Communists. It is secret only because we are not sufficiently aware of it and do not recognize its importance and strength.

There is another interesting set of circumstances behind the Iron Curtain and that is that in Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Yugoslavia, appropriations of one sort or another are actually granted by the atheistic governments for church or parochial schools.

Religion, too, is a means of expressing their feelings toward communism by the unhappy people behind the Iron Curtain.

Having lived and traveled in Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Hungary since these countries have fallen behind the Iron Curtain, I am always struck by the intensity and fervor with which religion is practiced there today. I can remember, in the churches before World War II, the people attended but they did not attend and pray in the same numbers and with the same intensity.

Yet, I recall that shortly after the Communist coup in Czechoslovakia, the church parades on Saints' Days and Sundays suddenly became two or three times as long as they had been before. Why? Because this was a way for the people to show how much they opposed communism.

In Poland, President Gomulka and the Communist regime have had to accept the church and the practice of religion by the vast majority of Poles.

Cardinal Midszenty still in our Budapest Legation, remains a symbol to many of the Hungarians, and the churches there too are crowded on a Sunday.

Even in the Soviet Union, religion is reemerging a bit more than we realize. The atheism that for two score years has been forced upon the young scientists and the intelligentsia of the Soviet Union does not give the logical answers as to what caused human life: in essence, why are we, and to the question of the afterlife.

The best description of the beliefs of the younger Soviet scientists was offered by V. Tenoryakov when he said, "I do not imagine God as he is depicted on icons. To me, God is a sort of spiritual principle, the stimulus to the evergreen of the galaxies, the stars, the planets, and of everything which lives and reproduces on these planets, from the most elementary cells up to man."

Now, how exactly is religion doing in the Soviet Union? I was there a few years ago and took the opportunity to go through two of the five religious seminaries and two academies that are there. I found that almost 80 percent of the new babies in Leningrad were being baptized. Though, I must confess that in general, I don't believe the babies were being baptized because of their parents being true believers as much as an insurance policy being taken out by the parents in case there was an afterlife.

Just as Khrushchev has followed policies that differ from Stalin's, so the Russian Orthodox Church has tended to become more ecumenical under the direction of Archbishop Nicodemus who succeeded Metropolitan Nicolai.

A rough estimate in the Soviet Union today is that there are some 50 million believers out of a population of 215 million and some 20,000 churches.

The atheistic pressure of the Soviet Government is directed more against the Baptists, and other fundamentalists, than the Russian Orthodox Church, and this was underscored by the sad plight of 32 Evangelical Christians who sought sanctuary in the American Embassy the other day. There is even more pressure being brought against such faiths as Jehovah's Witnesses and the Seventh Day Adventists.

Religion then is one of the principal reasons why it is that communism has the seeds of its own disintegration and destruction within itself. Man is innately religious, and communism goes against his innate human nature in this, as in every way. Under communism, he can't talk freely, work freely, travel freely, collect property freely and, most important, his religious freedom is violated.

So, I believe that it is religion, particularly Christianity, that will play a principal role in the eventual erosion of communism.

Now, for a final moment, let us look inwardly at ourselves. Religion in the United States is presently at a record high. Statistics published in October 1961 showed U.S. church membership at a record high of 114,449,217, or 63.6 percent of the total population of about 180 million.

The breakdown was 63,668,835, Protestants; 42,104,900, Catholics; 2,698,663, Eastern Orthodox, 5,367,000, Jews; 589,819, Old Catholic, Polish National Catholic, and Armenian Apostolic; 20,000 Buddhists.

Yet, in their annual statement in November the U.S. Catholic bishops warned of a "widespread moral apathy" in America touching virtually every group. They said this makes it vitally necessary for Americans to "make open profession of religious beliefs and moral convictions."

In conclusion, then, as well as weapons in our nuclear arsenal, we can each help forge the principal and most permanent weapon we have—religion—and especially, Christianity.

Let us remember, too, the thought expressed on a plaque in a church in my neighboring town of New Bedford, "Church is a hospital for sinners; not a haven for saints."

We sometimes tend to become a bit too smug. We preach a good life, but practice it too little. We listen to fine words on the Sabbath, but do not always practice them in the remaining 6 days of the week. For instance, there are far too few applicants for the Peace Corps. We, as parents and leaders in our community, could do a lot to see that more applied.

So, I guess the only thought I would like to leave is the hope that throughout the week we may try to believe in our hearts and practice in our lives the words which we have heard with our ears and said with our lips on the Sabbath.

## The Lord Giveth and the Government Taketh Away

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, the President's tax proposals tend to once more confirm the truth of the old adage, "All that glitters is not gold."

There is complete agreement when he says present taxes are so high they are

selfdefeating. There is less than unanimous agreement, however, when he proposes spending at an alltime high, piling deficit upon deficit, and sending our national debt beyond all bounds of fiscal responsibility.

All agree further that all loopholes should be closed, but as one commentator suggested, why not close the granddaddy of all loopholes, the oil depletion allowance? Oil may produce a fire too hot to handle.

The following editorial in the January 25 edition of the Wall Street Journal points up some facts not commonly recognized.

Under unanimous consent I insert the following editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE GIVING AND THE TAKING

The Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away, that is the not particularly surprising theme of President Kennedy's detailed tax proposals sent to Congress yesterday.

Politically such a hodgepodge of giving and taking faces a dubious fate at the hands of the lawmakers; if they approve any tax cuts at this session, the package seems unlikely to bear much resemblance to the Kennedy message.

Economically the claim that it would be a tremendous boost to business sounds more and more specious, especially since Mr. Kennedy adamantly sticks to his philosophy of planned deficits and calls them a piddling price to pay for prosperity; that way confidence does not lie.

Unlike the U.S. Government, we don't presume to know how consumers will react when they digest the import of these tax recommendations. But what they will digest is far from wholly palatable.

Out of the $11 billion cut individuals are supposed to get over 3 years, the message plans to recoup about one-fifth, among other things through drastic limits on deductions for home mortgage interest, contributions, medical expenses and local taxes. Only that portion of the total amount which exceeds 5 percent of the taxpayer's income could be deducted. And the present provisions modestly curtailing the double taxation of dividends would go out the window.

In other words, the individual's taxes are going up as well as down, and the net result depends on many factors, including steeply rising social security taxes, State and local taxes. Perhaps all this will send the consumer on a grand and glorious spending spree, but it is permissible to be slightly skeptical.

Much the same is true of corporate taxes. Reducing the top rate from 52 percent to 47 percent seems like a useful step, though grudging and incredibly belated. It doesn't look so great, however, when you consider that it is spread over years, and the only cut in 1963, affecting small business—is of minor economic significance.

Indeed, it is mildly ironic that the first tax event to occur is to boost the corporate rate beyond what it would otherwise be for the rest of this year. By existing law it would automatically drop to 47 percent in a few months, but the President insists it must be kept at 52 percent until next January.

Moreover, the net effect of the proposed speeding up of the timetable of corporate payments could be to increase taxes. In theory what is taken faster is given back; in practice a company may not get it back unless it liquidates or ceases to be profitable.

Then, when all the business reforms are thrown in, the claimed economic adrenalin doesn't feel particularly potent. Stricter treatment is to be accorded the oil-gas industry, stock options and stock dividends. Whatever else may be said of these recommendations on other grounds, they cannot be ranked as investment incentives, which is one of the chief ostensible purposes of the whole elaborate exercise.

As in anything so ramified, there are some improvements, though not of momentous economic potential. A somewhat more sensible approach is taken, for example, to the tax treatment of authors, professional athletes and others whose income is sporadic. Yet even these efforts at equity are offset by monumental new inequities, like taking about 1 million people off the tax rolls entirely.

And that is one of the basic troubles with this kind of reform. For many months the Nation has been alerted to expect a bold, dynamic new concept of taxes that would inject tremendous new zest in the economy, and in a famous phrase get America moving.

We have always believed the President is right in denouncing the present tax structure as an obsolete checkrein on the economy; moreover, that now is the time for radical correction.

But to be effective a tax program requires two things: Control and reduction of Federal expenditures, which weigh so heavily on the economy and are the inescapable other face of taxes; and a true simplification of the dangerously complex tax structure. All the experts know that the vast bulk of tax provisions could be swept away and rates drastically lowered to a flat percentage of all income, with no loss of revenue.

Instead of anything of that sort, we are being given much heavier spending, huge and chronic deficits, new tax inequities and confusions piled on red tape. The totality may please some people, but it certainly takes away a lot of the Nation's high tax hopes.

## Kennedy Asks 36,500 More Jobs, Contradicts Pledge of Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Washington Evening Star of January 21 gives an added insight into the President's budget message. In addition to economy, it seems as though we badly need a little more candor in Government.

Under unanimous consent I include the following article:

KENNEDY ASKS 36,500 MORE JOBS, CONTRADICTS PLEDGE OF ECONOMY

(By Joseph Young)

Members of Congress are still befuddled by the logic of President Kennedy's budget message which proclaims a vigorous Federal job economy program and winds up asking for 36,500 more Government jobs.

Mr. Kennedy was so proud of the administration's new manpower utilization program, which seeks to eliminate minimal Federal jobs as well as trim other jobs by demanding greater employee work productivity, that he devoted an entire section of his budget message to it.

Economy-minded Members of Congress sat beaming as they heard the President proclaim the administration's Government job economy program in his budget message.

This reporter, after the speech, ran into one of the economy-minded members of the House Appropriations Committee. With a happy smile, the Congressman asked us, "How many thousands of Government jobs will be eliminated by Mr. Kennedy's 1964 budget request?"

"Congressman," we said gently, "he is asking for 36,500 more Government jobs."

"But why all his talk of cutting job costs through greater efficiency and productivity?" the bewildered legislator asked.

"Well," we answered, "President Kennedy said there would have been an even greater increase in Government employment had not he initiated his economy program and kept the job requests down. The population keeps growing all the time, you know."

The legislator groaned, "But hasn't there already been an increase of 200,000 Federal workers since Mr. Kennedy took office?" he asked.

"Yes, but the President says it could have been worse," we reminded him.

"Well," he asked pleadingly, "hasn't the President proposed any job cuts anywhere in Government?"

"Of course," we replied. "He is asking an overall reduction of 30 jobs out of the Army's present 345,284 civilian employees. Army would then, only have 345,254 civilian employees."

"Well, that's something, I guess," the Congressman remarked bravely.

Knowing the Congressman's special antipathy regarding our foreign aid program, we sought to cheer him up even more. "The Agency for International Development is going to eliminate 48 whole jobs from 16,588 down to 16,540," we told our friend.

"Oh. This is an encouraging start," he exclaimed, his eyes misty with emotion. "And to think that only last year AID told us that not a single employee could be spared, and now we find that 48 of the 16,588 employees are expendable after all. We are making progress indeed."

As we prepared to take our leave, the Congressman wrung our hand and said in an emotion-filled voice, "And to think that only a few minutes ago I was so discouraged that I was thinking of giving up my appropriations post for a place on the District of Columbia Committee."

## The Need To Encourage Our System of Government-Free Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on January 9, 1963, I introduced a bill, H.R. 49, to provide a tax credit for amounts paid on account of tuition, fees and similar educational expenses at a level above the 12th grade. I first introduced this bill in the 87th Congress—H.R. 12771, 87th Congress, 2d session. I am reintroducing it in the belief that its enactment is vital to the continuance and further expansion of our present educational system.

Under the bill a taxpayer would be permitted to reduce his taxes equal to 20 percent of the cost of such educational expenses for the taxpayer or his dependents.

A tax credit of 20 percent has the same effect as the deduction in full of educational expenses for a taxpayer being taxed at the rate of 20 percent. This is equivalent to allowing the full deduction of educational expenses for a taxpayer in the first tax bracket.

An outright deduction for educational expenses would be of no benefit to more than 37 million taxpayers, who elect either to use the tax tables or to take the statutory standard deduction instead of itemizing their deductions. By the use of a credit, however, such taxpayers will be in a position to avail themselves of the benefit of the educational tax credit in their returns and also use the tax tables or standard deduction in the computation of their tax liability.

Many of my colleagues in this body have likewise recognized the need to encourage further growth of our educational system through tax incentives to the individual. In the last Congress alone, there were approximately 100 bills introduced which would have provided some form of tax relief for educational expenses.

Our educational system, free from Government control, is one of our greatest national assets. It is essential to encourage the expansion of that system, and to make its benefits available to the greatest number of people. This bill will aid in the attainment of that objective.

## The President's Budget and Our Global Responsibilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. William Randolph Hearst, Jr., who has recently returned from a global tour of Europe and Asia, has made some interesting comments in his recent newsletter regarding the President's budget recently submitted to the Congress, as it relates to defense and world expenditures. I believe many of our colleagues and others will be interested in reading Mr. Hearst's comments in this connection and I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from his published newsletter be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD, which follows:

When we were in Moscow this time, there wasn't the same anxiety to sound off in interviews that Khrushchev and his crew had shown on our previous trips. Frank Conniff, Bob Considine and I got the distinct impression that the Kremlin biggies hadn't yet figured out their new course and didn't want to give that fact away in talking.

But trust Nikita S. Khrushchev to put on a good act to cover any uncertainties. When he shook hands with U.S. officers over the Berlin wall on last Thursday, grinning and mugging for the crowd, he could almost make you believe he considered the wall the Red victory he pretends it is.

The fact is, and he knows it very well, the wall in Berlin represents to the world communism's inability to keep people happy. Nobody risks being shot to death trying to escape from a paradise.

As I have noted before, there is another important difference between family quarrels of free nations and those of the Communists. On our side there can be playing for selfish angles, but the overall idea is to come through eventually with agreement for the common good. On their side, it's a battle for supremacy that can reach a life-or-death climax.

In his special piece yesterday, however, Frank Conniff points out that our allies are led by men of such ability and determination that we cannot rule out the possibility of our being left behind within the Western family. That is, unless we are sure we, too, are on the move to destiny.

The point is valid and I think it especially deserves consideration when we debate the merits of President Kennedy's budget submitted Thursday. Getting on the move is its avowed purpose. The figures taken in themselves are awesome, to say the least. Look:

Ninety-eight billion eight hundred million dollars Federal spending ($55.4 billion for defense, $4.2 billion for space projects, $39.2 for the rest), biggest ever in peace or wartime.

Eleven billion nine hundred million dollars deficit calculated on expectation of $86.9 billion Federal revenue.

Thirteen billion five hundred million dollars tax cuts for individuals and business spread over 3 years, expected to be partly offset later by $3.5 billion in tax reforms.

By orthodox, traditional economics, that is a picture to turn hair white. But I, who am not a trained economist, see the question rather from the viewpoint of a newspaperman who came out of college in 1930 in the dark days of depression and watched the United States climb back to being the world's richest Nation.

In the 33 years since then, and I don't see how you can avoid describing that as our times, there have been only 5 years in which our Federal Government did not operate on a deficit. Three were under Democrat Harry Truman, two under Republican Dwight Eisenhower.

In other words, we've been living under deficit financing as a national economic system most of our lives just as surely as most of us have been living that way personally, where we call it installment buying. How many of us, for instance, buy our automobiles with spot cash?

The United States started with deficit financing. From 1789 to 1800, the record says, the Federal Government had an average annual intake of $5,717,000 and an average annual outgo of $5,776,000. We balanced better most of the time after that, but from the war entry years of 1917 on, the first time the budget went into 10 figures, and 1941, the first time it hit 11 digits, the budgets have borne closer resemblance to astronomical distances.

Let's not kid ourselves, in that period our country has surmounted two wars, one whopper of a depression and several smaller recessions, and all kinds of cold war milking of our substance. And we have seen it give proof through the night that our flag was still there, right on top of the world.

I can remember when my father, who took positions on the issues as he saw them and couldn't be properly taped as conservative or radical more than a few weeks running at a time, advocated printing $5 billion more money to help yank ourselves out of the depression of the 1930's.

If that isn't deficit financing, what is?

Anybody who'd call President Eisenhower a radical economist would be ridiculous, but Ike pulled us out of two recessions with heavy deficit spending, including the Nation's great roadbuilding program for which the Hearst papers can take a big bow.

The old saw that economics is not an exact science is as true as ever. Our world has expanded beyond the imagination of the men who projected orthodox economics long, long ago. Now more than ever we have to think in a global framework, because economic blocs make that imperative if we don't want to get hurt.

President Kennedy believes his pump-priming plans can spur the U.S. economy to growth that would bring the Government more tax dollars at cut rates within a few years—because there would be more business activity to tax.

You cannot prove that either way without trying it.

I'm for a bigger, more prosperous and more powerful United States, first, last and always, and I think that America's growth is the world's best bet. If, because of traditional shibboleths, we drag our feet in a fast-moving world, it could be the biggest mistake in our history.

## Report on National Defense to the Board of World War I Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD a copy of a report to the National Board of Administration of Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, Inc., prepared by Mr. Kai A. Koch, director of defense and secretary for the World War I veterans.

Mr. Koch is a long-time resident of Omaha, Nebr., and for many years has been active in positions of responsibility and leadership in veterans' organizations in our State.

I was pleased to see the strong stand taken by World War I veterans in regard to our national defense and foreign policy matters. I am very pleased to submit a copy of Mr. Koch's report to the national board:

REPORT ON NATIONAL DEFENSE TO THE BOARD OF WORLD WAR I VETERANS

As your national director of defense there are a number of things pertaining to our national security that I would like to bring to your attention and for your consideration and possible action and I am sure many of these items are of interest to all American citizens and particular veterans.

At the national convention held in Buffalo, N.Y., there were two resolutions passed, one commending President John F. Kennedy for the the firm stand he took pertaining to the Cuban situation, and the second one that the Universal Military Training and Service Act be extended in its present form until June 30, 1967.

While we have been informed that the missiles have been removed from Cuba we are of the opinion that we should insist that an on-site inspection by a neutral party be made to determine that all missiles have been removed, also that the 15,000 to 17,000 Russians soldiers now stationed in Cuba be sent back to Russia as they pose a threat to our ecurity. Furthermore, while there has

been a lot of agitation about the Cuban prisoners being released and sent to the United States, we fail to see much about the 21 or 23 American prisoners being held there and we are of the opinion that they should have been released before any of the Cubans and we should ask our Government to take action with regards to these prisoners.

We advocate that there will be no appeasement in either Cuba or Berlin including the associated issues of ground and air access by the United States and our allies to Berlin.

We must realize the strategic value of the naval base in Cuba and the need of it in our defense of the Caribbean Sea, the Panama Canal, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Atlantic coast of the United States against the Russian submarines operating in these waters.

We should insist on adherence to the Monroe Doctrine as it would tend to keep the Communists out of the Western Hemisphere and keep the independence and freedom of the Americas protected, which also means that the Red aggression in Cuba must be eliminated and Cuba returned to the community of free nations.

That Red China will not be allowed to become a member of the United Nations as this would be a repudiation of a major feature in the U.S. policy, and if such an act should come about the United States should withdraw from the United Nations.

We should balance, modernize, and stabilize our Armed Forces which calls for increased strength, properly balanced in every category—land, sea, and air.

We should increase our Navy's antisubmarine program, keeping in mind that Russia has nearly 500 submarines, also remembering the Germans had only 57 submarines in the Atlantic during World War II and nearly won the battle of the North Atlantic Ocean.

A positive civil defense program should be established.

We should support the Joint Chiefs of Staff system as this is the most efficient method for overall military planning.

After spending millions of dollars perfecting the Skybolt missile and succeeding with the sixth trial, our Government wants to scrap this missile due to the fact that it takes super aircrafts to carry them to the target, a procedure that General LeMay, Air Force Chief of Staff, has advocated for some time; and as per the newspapers there is a move afoot to remove him as Chief of Staff due to his activities in this matter. We are of the opinion that we should continue to manufacture the Skybolt, also retain General LeMay as Air Force Chief of Staff.

We are of the opinion that everyone of the World War I veterans is conscious of the fact that our country is in peril if we do not stop this communistic menace and all red-blooded and patriotic Americans should rally to the aid of our country even to the extent of war.

Again may we offer the above mentioned items for your consideration.

KAI A. KOCH,
*Director, National Defense and Security, Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A.*
OMAHA, NEBR.

## Warning on Deficit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the Stevens Point Daily Journal of Stevens Point, Wis., on January 21, 1963, carried a very interesting editorial based on the warning of the Honorable William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. The editorial is as follows:

WARNING ON DEFICIT

As Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, William McChesney Martin, Jr., is closely attuned to matters affecting world currency transactions. He knows the relative strength of the dollar in comparison with other currencies.

Mr. Martin, in a speech to the American Finance Association and the American Economic Association, cited that the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit was disappointing in 1962. Instead of the anticipated deficit of $1.5 billion, he said, the final tally will probably show the United States well over $2 billion in the red for last year.

Adding such a large deficit in a year which began with the United States owing more gold to foreign creditors than it possessed, weakens the dollar's standing at home and abroad. Should gold demands by creditors reduce U.S. gold stocks below the Federal Reserve certificate requirement, the dollar almost certainly would encounter devaluation pressures. Only a few billions in gold separate the United States from this prospect.

"Whatever other consequences would follow from a devaluation of the dollar," Mr. Martin warned, "I am convinced that it would immediately spell the end of the dollar as an international currency and the beginning of a retreat from the present world role of the United States that would produce far-reaching political as well as economic effects."

It is not a cheering prospect, but Mr. Martin's warning is likely to be heard again and again throughout this session of Congress. And it should be heeded, especially when money bills affecting U.S. balance of payments come before it.

## Anti-Semitism in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union proclaims itself as the champion of minority rights. Premier Khrushchev boasts that the Soviet Constitution guarantees individual and group liberties. These self-serving declarations are indeed hollow when viewed against the background of anti-Semitism in Russia today. The Soviets have gone beyond the limits of an anti-religious campaign in their treatment of Jews within their own borders. Their tactics have entered into the realm of racism. The anti-Semitic campaign in the U.S.S.R. today is reminiscent of the dark, despotic days of Stalin and Hitler.

The story of discrimination against the Jewish minority in the Soviet Union provides a somber lesson for all peoples of the free world. The emerging nations of Asia and Africa should note the facility with which the Communists resort to racism in pursuit of their goals.

A group of religious leaders of all faiths have made a direct protest to Chairman Khrushchev. Their cablegram was published as a full-page advertisement in the New York Times, the Providence Journal, the Washington Post, and the Jersey Journal. This message was echoed editorially in newspapers throughout the Nation. The injustices it chronicles merit reading by all. I include this message as part of my remarks:

PREMIER NIKITA S. KHRUSHCHEV,
*The Kremlin, U.S.S.R.:*

The Soviet Union declares it is a champion of human dignity and equality. No nation has been more persevering in pronouncing itself a defender of minority rights.

Soviet spokesmen cite your country's constitution, wherein equality of citizens is guaranteed, as proof that religious discrimination is not countenanced in the U.S.S.R. You yourself have said: "The question of a man's religion is not asked in our country. It is a matter for the conscience of the person concerned. We look upon a person as a person."

But what are the facts?

The Soviet Government's persistent enmity to religion is a matter of historical record. While most faiths are permitted bare necessities, such as requisites for worship, sacred literature, theological seminaries and central bodies, their activities are sternly circumscribed. Devout citizens suffer harassment. Nowhere, not even within the walls of church or mosque, is religion secure from surveillance. This is a fact of Soviet life.

It is also a fact that within the narrow framework of permissible religious practice, discrimination is enforced. Jewish citizens of the Soviet Union, numbering close to 3 million, are denied minimal rights conceded to adherents of other creeds.

Hard pressed as they are by blanket restraints, none of the other major religions of the Soviet people, neither the Orthodox, Armenian or Protestant Churches, neither Buddhism nor Islam, have been subjected to the extraordinary disabilities inflicted on Judaism and its followers.

Legally constituted Jewish congregations are isolated from one another. They are forbidden to organize a central body. They are allowed no contact with Jewish religious groups in other countries. Their leaders are singled out for abuse.

Since June 1961, synagogue presidents in six cities have been arbitrarily removed from office; Jewish communal leaders in Leningrad and Moscow have been sentenced to prison for the alleged crime of meeting with foreign visitors to their synagogues.

Scores of synagogues have been closed by the state. The few that remain are served by rabbis who were ordained more than 40 years ago. For more than a generation, Jewish theological seminaries have been banned, except for a lone yeshiva in Moscow, opened in 1956. Its enrollment, never permitted to exceed 20, was reduced to 4 in April 1962.

No Jewish Bible has been printed in 40 years. No articles for Jewish ritual can be produced. This year, for the first time in Soviet history, even the sale of unleavened bread, essential to observance of the Passover, was banned. The prayers of Judaism are said in Hebrew, yet the teaching of that language is prohibited.

Although half a million Jews declared Yiddish as their mother tongue in the Soviet census of 1959, their hundreds of schools, their once-flourishing theaters, have been stamped out. Much smaller ethnic or linguistic groups have schools, theaters, books, and newspapers in their own languages.

These conditions conjure up memories of the anti-Semitic Stalin regime, which you yourself have denounced.

According to the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the con-

stitutions of enlightened countries, freedom of conscience and expression is vested unconditionally in every human being.

Unless the Soviet Government conforms its behavior to this universal standard and to its own professed principles, it forfeits the confidence of all peoples.

When will synagogues and Jewish seminaries be reestablished, imprisoned synagogue leaders set free, the ban on unleavened bread rescinded, ritual articles and Jewish prayerbooks made available?

When will the Yiddish-language institutions that sustained Soviet Jewish culture and education be restored?

When will Jewish congregations, like those of other religions, be enabled to form a central body, to join in fellowship for the continuity of their faith?

The world awaits your response.

By deeds alone, can your Government confirm that the Soviet Union in truth upholds the rights of minorities and the equal dignity of man.

## Minneapolis-St. Paul Area Helps Earthquake Victims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, last fall the people of the Minneapolis-St. Paul area performed a remarkable act in providing assistance to victims of the major earthquake in Iran. The project is described in the following article from the People to People News of October 1962:

SEND 18,500 BLANKETS TO IRANIAN VICTIMS

A thing called compassion stirred residents of Minneapolis-St. Paul to community action resulting in the collection and shipment of 18,500 blankets to Iranian earthquake victims who are facing winter with no shelter.

It began when a group of Minneapolis citizens—members of people to people—resolved to help Iranian students at the University of Minnesota and at Macalester College, St. Paul, to send aid to their anguished countrymen.

"What shall we do to help?" they asked.

Mrs. Gertrude Swanson, chairman of the Minneapolis People-to-People Committee, called Elmer "Tweet" Tvetene, manager of Pan American Airways in the Twin Cities for advice.

PAN AMERICAN AIRWAYS HELPS

"I'll call you back in 15 minutes," he told Mrs. Swanson. He did and informed her an entire cargo plane would be available in 1 week at Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport bound for Teheran. "Make up your minds what you want to put on the plane," he said.

The people-to-people committee continued to meet for most of that night. They called the Iranian Embassy in Washington and learned that blankets would be the most helpful single item that could be sent on the plane. Thousands were needed.

The committee decided to invite St. Paul and suburban residents to participate in the blankets-for-Iran project.

TWO MAYORS' SUPPORT

Mayor Arthur Naftalin of Minneapolis and Mayor George Vavaoulis of St. Paul issued proclamations on the state of emergency in Iranian earthquake disaster areas and urged Twin Cities residents to show friendship by donating blankets.

Fire stations were designated as collection depots throughout the area. Firemen enthusiastically participated in the people-to-people effort by folding, sorting, counting, and bundling the blankets as they were brought in by residents of all races, religions, and social groups.

A goal of 10,000 blankets was set. The first 2 days brought in a disappointingly small number of blankets.

Then area radio, television, and the press took up the cause and the blankets poured in. A week later, when the plane was ready to leave, nearly twice as many blankets as the cargo plane could hold had been baled at the old air terminal building. James Grant of WTCN–TV spent many hours writing press releases for the project, using air time to tell residents of the Twin Cities how they could help.

American agencies, such as CARE, are administering distribution of the blankets to the needy in Iranian disaster areas.

A telegram expressing the deep appreciation of the Iranian people was sent to mayors of St. Paul and Minneapolis by Hossein Ghods Nakhai, Ambassador of Iran to the United States.

## Nuclear-Age School—New Mexico Students Pursue Knowledge Underground

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, I include an article by David Nevin which appeared in the January 26, 1963, issue of the Saturday Evening Post referring to the undeground elementary school in Artesia, N. Mex. Mr. Vernon Mills, superintendent of the Artesia school district, is to be commended for his foresightedness in initiating the construction of this nuclear-age school. Rosewell architect, Standhardt, demonstrated imagination and ingenuity in his design of this unique structure which has brought high praise from architects and school officials the world over. The construction of this underground school was made possible through the efforts of the city of Artesia together with the Office of Civil Defense. This school was dedicated in June 1962 by the Honorable Steuart L. Pittman, Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Under unanimous consent I insert the following article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

NUCLEAR-AGE SCHOOL—NEW MEXICO STUDENTS PURSUE KNOWLEDGE UNDERGROUND

Betsy Anne Hart, a fourth-grader in Artesia, N. Mex., learned something new at school the other day. "Mother," she burst out when she got home, "did you know there is a room for dead people at our school?"

Having a morgue on the premises is just one of the things that makes Betsy Anne's school unusual. For Abo Public Elementary School, named for a nearby oil formation, is the only school in the Nation which lies entirely underground, and which doubles as a fully equipped fallout shelter.

Abo opened for the first time last fall, with some 460 pupils. The experiment has attracted considerable interest among both schoolmen and civil defense officials around the country. Some educators have condemned the whole idea out of hand. Others haev adopted a wait-and-see attitude. They feel that, taken simply as a teaching plant, Abo deserves high marks for efficiency and interior beauty. But, they wonder, can the school be taken that simply?

From aboveground all that shows of the school is a huge concrete slab, which serves as a playground for the children who go to school beneath it, and the covered walkways which connect three block structures housing the stairwells. These entrances are narrow, dimly lit and painted a dark red. Somehow they seem vaguely threatening.

Inside, however, the building looks like a school, and an attractive school, at that. The central corridor is 14 feet wide, wider than usual, to prevent claustrophobia, and the tiled floors and walls are green balanced with a warmer rose. The fluorescent lighting has a daylight quality. One has no sense of being in a basement or even, save for the lack of windows, of being underground. Automatic air conditioning keeps the temperature at 72° and the humidity at 50 percent. The 18 classrooms, each approximately 28 feet square, are superbly equipped. An air of quiet industry pervades the building, due partly to the insulation of acoustical plaster on the inside and solid earth on the outside, and partly to the somewhat sobering effect the school appears to have on its pupils. On the whole, Abo seems a remarkably pleasant place in which to tackle the three R's.

NUCLEAR SCHOOL

But this is not only a school, it is also a carefully planned fallout shelter, and the children are well aware of the fact. Bedding and survival food for 2 weeks are stored in spare rooms. Two deep wells can supply safe water. There are air filters, an emergency power system, and decontamination showers. If an attack should come during school hours, the school would shelter its own students and those from nearby schools. At any other time, it would accommodate the first 2,160 people to reach it. Then, 1,800-pound steel doors at each entrance would be bolted shut, barring those who came late, the parents, perhaps, of the children inside. Some time this year 2,000 Artesians will spend a night at Abo to test its shelter facilities.

This dual-purpose concept of school construction sprang directly from Artesia's experience with two windowless, but aboveground, schools built in 1959. With its near-desert climate, Artesia switched to schools with solid walls when it found that the rapid heat transference in its old glass-walled buildings made economical air conditioning impossible.

These buildings, designed by architect Frank Standhardt of Roswell, N. Mex., were among the first windowless schools in the Nation. Since then the idea has spread as far as California and Florida. But meanwhile, back in Artesia, the board's thinking had gone a step further.

AN AF BASE IS NEARBY

It had discovered that, with the cold war periodically threatening to turn hot, and with both an important Air Force base and the White Sands Proving Ground uncomfortably nearby, there was not a single building in town which could serve as a public fallout shelter. Since it felt responsible for the safety of its students—and, less directly, for the public in general—the board reasoned: Why not build another windowless school, and this time put it underground?

Architect Standhardt accordingly designed a subterranean structure with 12-inch concrete walls and an overhead slab of 21-inch

reinforced concrete which could resist a 20-megaton blast at 10 miles. His plans called for a building with classrooms along the four outside walls, then the hall, then an inner block of classrooms. The voters of Artesia approved the project by passing a bond issue, and the school was built—at a cost of $469,847, of which $134,067 went for putting it underground. The Federal Government readily paid the latter sum, since it planned to use Abo as a pilot project for a study of the shelter-school concept.

At this early date only a preliminary report is possible. The indications, however, are hopeful. The teachers like the building because they find it more comfortable than most other schools and also because they believe that the students' performance is better. Mrs. Gertrude McCaw, the most experienced teacher there, said, "They simply are less rambunctious. You spend more time teaching and less time disciplining." She believes the quiet and the lack of windows, with their distractions, are responsible, and the other teachers agree.

The children say they like the school too. Artesia can be brutally hot, and they enjoy the air conditioning. Russ Baldwin, a fourth grader with a long face that breaks into a sudden, winning smile, explained, "You get your brain cooled off down here. It runs better when it's cool."

They think their school is pretty and say they learn a lot there. Surprisingly, several volunteered the information that its lack of windows helps keep them from getting into trouble with their teachers. But Andy Ashton, fifth grader, probably summed it up best when he said, "I like it because we go to the only underground school in the world." He meant, of course, that he liked the attention, the publicity, the sense of being different and therefore, somehow, superior.

Sociologists recognize that people who take part in novel experiments often enjoy the experience and are stimulated to do better work than usual. This stimulation, however, is only temporary, and one suspects that in the long run the students at Abo will like their school no more and will learn no more than students at schools aboveground.

Most outsiders' reaction to Abo is twofold. First, they wonder if it isn't cruel to deprive a child of the sight of the outdoors. Second, and even more important, they wonder if sending him underground, where he can't help being reminded daily of possible nuclear horrors, won't necessarily implant in him a fear psychology, an unhealthy preoccupation with safety and protection.

The success of aboveground windowless schools and the easy adjustment of the children to life without windows tend to answer the first objection, but the second cannot be set aside so easily. The president of the Artesia board, however, tries hard. She is Mrs. C. P. Bunch, a peppery little woman with graying hair. "I'm tired of hearing about the horrors of going underground," she snaps. "This is much overplayed. I've lived in large cities, no one says anything there about becoming moles when they ride the subways. No one says, 'I'm going underground to shop,' but I never met a woman who wouldn't go into a basement for a bargain."

Supt. Vernon Mills, a short, portly, soft-spoken man, explains more mildly, "What matters is the approach. This is a school which could serve as a shelter, not a shelter that doubles as a school."

Nevertheless, some of the youngsters do seem deeply affected by their school's second purpose. All are aware of it and of the implications of nuclear weapons and fallout. When asked, they say this does not disturb them but in several roundtable discussions, interesting remarks cropped up.

Martha Terpening, a six-grader with a classically beautiful face, said softly, "What I'm afraid of is that my mother is a teacher and she would be safe, but my daddy works at the post office and he wouldn't have any place to go." Russ Baldwin said, "You think a lot about the danger while you're here. Sometimes I have the feeling that fallout is coming now, that it is out there now, and then I go out and it isn't." Rusty Heckel, aged 9, who worries about his parents, said, "Being underground gives you a funny feeling, but you know you're safe."

Yet even while blithely making remarks that sounded dire indeed to the adult mind, the children seemed happy. It was Martha Terpening who, when asked if the stairs leading down into the ground upset her, replied, "It makes my legs tired, but my mother says it develops them, so I don't mind."

Dr. George Collins, chief of elementary and secondary education for the Office of Education in Washington, believes that chronic worry is symptomatic of our times. He finds that children in other schools in other cities also worry about the bomb and the future.

PARENTS ARE NOT ALARMED

The parents of Abo pupils do not seem to think their children are being damaged. Mrs. Preston Greve, blond mother of a fifth grader, spoke for the majority. "Well, I don't think that war will come, but if it does, I guess a fallout shelter is a good place to be."

Criticism of the school-shelter concept comes mainly from observers outside Artesia. At its most recent annual meeting, the National Council on Schoolhouse Construction said flatly that "shelter provisions are not compatible with educational requirements." The State of California has taken a vigorous stand against such dual-purpose buildings. For California, at least, Charles Gibson, chief of school planning, finds the expenditure of any educational funds for fallout protection ridiculous. The two ends, he insists, simply don't fit.

The Artesia School Board has encountered some local opposition, too. Dr. Gerald Slusser, an Artesia surgeon whose child does not go to Abo, asks rhetorically, "Is driving our children underground to become a way of life? Is this the future we give them?" And Bill Hart, Betsy Anne's father and the vice president of a bank, is disturbed to realize that his young son probably faces 9 school years underground, for a new junior high school with many of its classrooms belowground, facilities like the gymnasium will go aboveground, will be built soon.

But the board is inclined to discount this sort of criticism. The bond issue for the new junior high passed by a margin of 2 to 1, and the board not unreasonably regards this as an indication of local approval for its actions. Now that support from those who know Abo best has brought the underground school concept past the pilot stage, other school districts will surely study the idea with heightened interest. And in view of the prospect for continuing international tension, the chances are good that parents in communities far from Artesia will be asked, one of these days, to decide whether they, too, want their children to go to school underground.

## What Price Slavery?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, in an earlier day this question was put to a few Americans and they pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor for individual freedom, individual privilege, and liberty.

Today the question is in reverse. Americans are not being asked what price they are willing to pay for liberty but what price they are willing to accept for the liberty that has been theirs.

The old adage has it that "every man has his price"—the planners are simply determining what that price is. They are willing to pay it, particularly so long as it is your money they use to pay your price.

The American farmer was the first to be bought off. Agricultural tariffs were reduced or wiped out. As agricultural imports poured across our border and onto our tables and upon our backs the farmer was required to take his land out of production to make room for these imports. Of course, he was paid by the Government to remove his acres from production.

In January 1963, over 30 million pounds of dressed beef, lamb, and mutton were imported from New Zealand and Australia alone. It is difficult to determine the American acreages these shipments supplanted, but with the imports of beef alone in 1962, over 2½ million head of 1,000-pound beef supplanted the production of more than 45 million American acres.

The planners, of course, paid the farmer a certain stipend for each acre they forced him to take out of production to make room for these imports. The Department of Agriculture "leaked" their plan in December 1961 to subsidize and remove 2 million farmers from the land—that subsidy is the price these farmers must accept for the sale of their freedom.

Those planners who would force every American to sell his freedom were able to ram through Congress last session a bill known as the Trade Expansion Act which was intended to do to industry and labor what they have already done to the farmer and forced him to accept, even if against his will, a price for his freedom.

Already the mines of America are coming in for payment under this act for the business that is taken from them by low tariffs and foreign mineral imports, forcing the mines of America to sell their freedom for a price.

Factories are reducing output, or closing, and accepting a subsidy price in exchange for their freedom to compete. Labor, idled by imports, is seeking its subsidy—the price it is receiving for its freedom.

Independent businessmen in almost every community across the Nation are making plans to come to Washington for free money for community development. They, of course, must agree to comply in order to get it.

WHAT PRICE SLAVERY?

Three interesting letters came to my desk in the morning mail. One enclosed an editorial from the Bennett County Booster, Martin, S. Dak.; the second was the reprint of a broadcast from the public relations division of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association of St. Paul, Minn., and the third was a letter

enclosing an editorial from the Custer (S. Dak.) Weekly.

I have asked permission to reprint each because of the story the three tell. The first outlines the Socialist Manifesto, as set forth by former Congressman Samuel Pettengill, the second urges the wonders of farming under "regulated abundance through intelligent Government programs," and the third depicts "intelligent Government programs" in operation; its title is "The King Can Do No Wrong."

With a view of presenting not where we are going, but where we are, I present one morning's mail:

[From the Bennett County Booster, Martin, S. Dak.]

DOWN THE ROAD

The Constitution of the United States does not guarantee that America will remain a republic forever. It does guarantee the American people the right to change the form of government to whatever a two-thirds majority of any generation may desire it to be.

Back in 1944, Congressman Samuel Pettengill described the unconstitutional methods used by socialists to destroy free government. He called it the 12 points of the Socialist Manifesto. We believe it will be good for all Americans to review his words:

"The people must be made to feel their utter helplessness and their inability to solve their own problems. While in this state of mind, there is held up before them a benign and all-wise leader to whom they must look for the cure of all their ills. This state of mind is most readily developed in a time of economic stress or national disaster.

"The principle of local self-government must be wiped out, so that this leader or group in control can have all political power readily at hand.

"The centralized government, while appearing in form to represent the people, must dutifully register the will of the leader or group in control.

"Constitutional guarantees must be swept aside. This is accomplished in part by ridiculing them as outmoded and as obstructions to progress.

"Public faith in the legal profession and respect for the courts must be undermined.

"The law-making body must be intimidated and from time to time rebuked, so as to prevent the development of public confidence therein.

"Economically, the people must be kept ground down by high taxes which, under one pretext or another, they are called upon to pay. Thus they are brought to a common level, and all income above a meager living is taken from them. In this manner economic independence is kept to a minimum, and the citizen is forced to rely more and more upon the government that controls him. Capital and credit is thus completely within the control of government.

"A great public debt must be built up so that citizens can never escape its burdens. This makes government the virtual receiver for the entire nation.

"A general distrust of private business and industry must be kept alive, so that the public may not begin to rely upon its own resources.

"Government bureaus are set up to control practically every phase of the citizen's life. These bureaus issue directives without number, but all under the authority of the leader to whom they are immediately responsible. It is a government of men, and not of laws.

"The education of the youth of the nation is taken under control to the end that all may, at an early age, be inoculated with a spirit of submission to the system and of reverence for the benevolent leader.

"To supplement and fortify all of the foregoing, there is kept flowing a steady stream of governmental propaganda designed to extol all that bow the knee, and to vilify those who dare to raise a voice in dissent."

How far down the road of this Socialist Manifesto has America gone?

---

BROADCAST BY FARMERS UNION GRAIN TERMINAL ASSOCIATION

Did you ever think very seriously about what is going to happen in the future on your farm? Farmers are the people most concerned so they hadn't ought to lag behind in looking ahead.

The other day we told you about a research groups set up by businessmen and education leaders to dig into the whole problem of the economy of the region. It's called the Upper Midwest Research and Development Council and one of its latest studies does some farm prognosticating way ahead in 1975.

Are you going to be rich or poor, worse off or better off? Who's going to be farming and who isn't in 1975? The report of this research group points out what most everyone already knows—farms are getting bigger and farmers fewer. Also it says that farm income depends on national policies which is another way of saying what we've always said, that farm prices are made in Washington.

But let's get down to some specifics about 1975 and, as the report says, that's of special concern to young fellows 20 years and under who are on their dad's farms today. Less than 15 percent of them are likely to find positions as farm operators of adequate-sized units in the words of the report. So now is the time to educate many of them for other jobs, maybe in towns and cities or in the rural areas connected with agriculture. Does that make good sense to you?

What's going to happen to the land itself? The businessmen and educators seem to agree here with progressive farmers. It believes that Government programs ought to aim at regrassing big acreages. That ties in with more livestock production. Also a little more growing of specialty crops, like safflower, might fit in. Uncle Sam, says the report, should help get some of the less desirable land into trees for industry and recreation. And by 1975 it recommends a lot of land should just be idled under Government programs. Again, do you agree?

Farmers will continue to feed the Nation and probably a good piece of the world, of course. They'll produce more per acre, so the Upper Midwest Research and Development group sees a need to reduce crop acres even more by 1975. It believes that acreages of wheat, corn, soybeans, oats, barley, and flaxseed should be reduced by almost 16 percent and we'll still have abundance. But (and this is a point that the businessmen and educators emphasize) it has to be regulated abundance. The report speaks of "coordinated effort at local, State, and National levels." In other words, farm programs to avoid unmanageable surpluses and severely depressed farm prices and incomes.

You might wonder why businessmen and college people have a deep concern about the welfare of farm people as long as they have plenty to eat. They answer that question when they point out that "agriculture is the key factor in this region's economic future."

So again, even looking to 1975, we see that regulated abundance through intelligent Government programs is the course most people are thinking about. That makes it easier to understand the importance of the wheat vote coming up this spring.

---

[From the Custer (S. Dak.) weekly]

THE KING CAN DO NO WRONG

On various occasions, particularly when editorials have pointed up the present problems in the lumbering industry, the Custer Weekly has been accused of being "anti-Forest Service." This is not the case—we are in conflict with various Forest Service policies, but not with the service as a whole.

Howard Lee, supervisor of the Black Hills National Forest, recently pointed out that a community benefits from the spending of Forest Service personnel who live there. This is a factor of which Custerites have long been aware, though when controversies and tempers flare, it is one we sometimes are inclined to forget, and Mr. Lee's point is well taken.

We would even go a step farther than the forest supervisor and add that economic benefits are not the only ones reaped when Forest Service people live in a community. Many of these families have wide interests and excellent educations and share them to enrich the community socially and culturally. We have noticed, too, that many Forest Service people seem to go out of their way to participate in civic betterment. Although we're not completely sure, we suspect this is a part of Forest Service policy—if so it is one with which we are completely in accord.

The Forest Service has been with the Custer community for a long, long time. During this period, many lasting friendships have been formed, local people have found employment within the Forest Service and Forest Service wives have not infrequently worked in local businesses. Most of us realize the community is dependent upon this Government agency to a degree that it would be very difficult to prosper without it.

The problem here is that the community is also dependent upon the lumbering and ranching industries which are frequently at odds with Forest Service rulings, many of which seem reasonable when made at a higher level, but seem neither reasonable nor fair when applied to local situations.

We take issue with the apparent policy of the Forest Service to grow ever bigger and more powerful—insofar as land, people, and money are concerned. The Custer Weekly firmly believes in free, private enterprise, feeling that the arm of Federal Government should reach into a problem only when private enterprise has failed or refused to cope with an urgent situation—We grant here that men—and agencies—do not always agree on what is urgent and what is not.

The Forest Service, well aware of the important part tourism plays in many forest regions, points with pride to the recreational facilities which it has developed. Who can say this would not have been done by private enterprise—after all, one doesn't just go into a national forest and start developing.

There was a time when lumbermen went into a virgin forest and laid it waste with never a thought for the morrow; there was a time when few ranchers knew or cared they were overgrazing. Though both elements are better informed today, it was probably vital to conservation that the early day Forest Service intervened. But today, it many times seems just too much of a good thing.

It particularly becomes "too much" when an individual, meeting up with a regulation which works a hardship asks for a reprieve and is confronted with what seems to be an attitude of unyielding superiority. The Magna Carta, limiting the powers of the king, and laying down as a principle that justice may not be denied or delayed, was signed in England 747 years ago. American government was based in part upon this important document which freed the common people from complete royal dictate. It is a sorry situation when an agency of that same American Government appears to operate under the premise, "The king can do no wrong."

## Monroe Sweetland—A Memorable Name in Oregon Politics, Journalism, and Public Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the current newspaper strike in New York has focused attention on the importance of the daily newspaper. In my home State of Oregon there is a small weekly newspaper which has had a salutary influence in the community under the able editor-ownership of Mr. Monroe Sweetland. Last fall Monroe Sweetland, long active in Oregon politics and journalism, sold the Milwaukie Review as Mr. Sweetland had accepted a position as executive vice president of the Indonesian-American Society of the United States.

Mr. Sweetland is a Democrat and has served his party as a member of the legislature and as national committeeman. A tribute is paid to him by another well-known Oregon publication, the Oregon Voter, which is more inclined to present the Republican view.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD that tribute from the Oregon Voter of September 29, 1962:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWSPAPER SALE—RECALLS SWEETLAND INFLUENCE IN MILWAUKEE'S POLITICAL HISTORY

Sale of the Milwaukie Review and the North Clackamas Shopper by State Senator and Mrs. Monroe Sweetland to a corporation owned by Dale Johnson and Robert G. Swan, both Oregon newsmen, recalls the Sweetland influence as a Democratic newspaper editor during the two decades in which he was at the helm of several Oregon weekly newspapers. Early in the fourties he purchased the Molalla Pioneer which he sold in 1947, then buying two struggling publications at Newport from which he created the Newport News, which he sold in the early fifties, buying the Milwaukee Review in 1954. In the meantime, Senator Sweetland had acquired the Oregon Democrat, which he operated for 9 years, and which succumbed shortly after he disposed of it several years ago.

Wherever Senator Sweetland has taken over a newspaper his enterprise as an editor and publisher has been a factor in increasing the Democratic registration in the area; the newspapers showed improvement in appearance, advertising, and news content, and especially in sharp political news and comment. During this period Mr. Sweetland's influence in the Democratic Party steadily increased and he rose, not only in party leadership in Oregon, but maintained active touch with the party's national leaders. To what extent the Democratic Party was a factor in his acquiring the several newspapers is not known to us, but in each case he took over weekly papers more or less Republican in their political philosophy, converted them into aggressive and sometimes militant Democratic newspapers with results that were soon evident.

Now, for the first time in 20 years, the Sweetlands have no newspaper property in Oregon. Senator Sweetland a year ago became executive vice president of the Indonesian-American Society of the United States and has spent little time in Oregon. The Sweetlands however retain their home on McLoughlin Boulevard in Milwaukie, and there has been no announcement that the corporation he headed, Milwaukie Publishers & Printers, Inc., will be dissolved or continued.

The sale to the new corporation brings Dale Johnson, a former Oregon (Portland), and Idaho (Boise), newspaperman, and more recently an executive in the investment firm of Atkinson & Co., in as editor of the Milwaukie Review, but Stan Federman who has been editor during the Sweetlands' absence remains with the newspaper. The sale will have some impact on the local community as the new owners have announced the paper will be printed offset at a plant, probably in Hillsboro, removing some of the mechanical operations from Milwaukie. Four printers and a pressman have been notified they will no longer be needed. The Sweetlands had a contract with the Tyopgraphical Union due to expire in July 1963.

Since 1952 Mr. Sweetland has been in the Oregon Legislature, the first Democrat elected to the house from Clackamas County in 14 years, and when he went to the senate in 1954 the first Democrat from his district in 20 years. He was reelected to the senate in 1958 and did not seek reelection this year, indicating he will continue in his Far East educational work. The Indonesian Society office is at 218 North Canon Drive, Beverly Hills, Calif.

The Milwaukie Review was established April 14, 1921, and its first editor and publisher was George A. McArthur, at the time a 50-year veteran among Oregon printers, who was also one of the printers who assisted Tom Dillon and M. H. Vorhees when they started the East Side News in Portland. The latest sale of the Milwaukie Review recalls, also, that on November 21, 1850, Lot Whitcomb, founder of Milwaukie, then a bitter rival of Portland, started the Western Star, dedicated to making Milwaukie the metropolis of Oregon, giving it 2 weeks seniority over the Weekly Oregonian in Portland. The Star carried under its first masthead this patriotic boast:

"As far as breeze can bear or billows foam, survey our empire and behold our home."

Milwaukie was a town of 500, a year old, about the size of Portland, but his paper's financial losses caused Lot Whitcomb to lose the paper to his unpaid printers, who on June 5, 1851, overnight, moved the plant to Portland as the Weekly Times, from which were graduated some men destined to become notable in the history of Oregon politics, before the Times died in 1864. The colorful newspaper history of Clackamas County, and the Milwaukie community in particular, makes fine reading in George Turnbull's "History of Oregon Newspapers" and Senator Sweetland's sale led us to his pages. Politics has almost always had a place in Milwaukie's newspaper history.

## Her Concern Is Progress in the "People" Area of AID

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy in his state of the Union message did an admirable job of detailing the compelling reasons for the continuance of our mutual security program. Our aid program has been a major bulwark against the threat of Sino-Soviet imperialism. As the President stated so well:

If these programs were ever to be ended, our failures in a dozen countries would be sudden and certain.

I am pleased that President Kennedy's eloquent words have gone out to the Nation. When Americans have realized that the sacrifices they are making contribute to our peace and security, they have been unfailingly willing to bear the burdens required.

Another fine contribution to public understanding of the importance of the mutual security program to the United States is contained in a recent Washington Post article by Sue Cronk. In her article Sue Cronk reports on an excellent speech given by Assistant Secretary of State Leona Baumgartner before the Woman's National Democratic Club.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert the Washington Post article, headed "Her Concern Is Progress in the 'People' Area of AID," published January 11, 1963, in the Appendix of the RECORD.

DR. BAUMGARTNER OUTLINES FOREIGN AID PROGRAM: HER CONCERN IS PROGRESS IN THE "PEOPLE" AREA OF AID

(By Sue Cronk)

Lack of public understanding and support of America's foreign aid program is one of the chief problems faced by the Agency for International Development, one of its assistant administrators said yesterday.

"I've never known a program so misunderstood by so many and so unknown by so many more," Assistant Secretary of State Leona Baumgartner told the Woman's National Democratic Club.

She noted that AID, which has changed its name and its administrator with dizzying rapidity in recent years, seems "like a whole lot of different pieces (of various foreign aid programs) all glued together."

Nevertheless, its purpose has always been the same: "to help produce the kind of political and economic development in the world in which the United States can best pursue its own way of life."

Foreign aid isn't something invented since World War II to plague American taxpayers, Dr. Baumgartner said. "We've been in this business a long time, ever since Congress voted $50,000 for aid to Venezuela during the War of 1812."

Nor is Uncle Sam the world's only sugar daddy in the field of foreign aid. "Nine other countries also are in the foreign-aid business, some of them countries we helped to get back on their feet with the Marshall plan," she said. "And although we contribute 57 percent of the total foreign aid, we spend smaller percentage of our gross national income on it than they do."

Dr. Baumgartner is no starry-eyed do-gooder in the AID job she accepted last November 1. "In all honesty," she admitted, "we respond to a lot of political pressures, both from foreign countries and in our own country. We do a tremendous lot of hand holding with green ministers of health and education in developing countries. At times our short-range foreign policy goal may be to shore up the internal stability of another government which may not be a very good one, but the only one available."

However, she said, the important facet of American foreign aid is "its long-range goal, which boils down to transferring what we know in a modern industrial country to developing countries.

"We've built a tremendous number of things—roads, dams, airfields, factories, hospitals, schools. We've increased crop yields. We've promoted land reform, tax reform, and self-help community development. We've trained teachers, doctors, technicians, and government workers. We've steadily eliminated malaria."

As head of the newly created AID Office of Human Resources and Social Development, Dr. Baumgartner is particularly concerned with the human element of the foreign aid program.

"People who are hungry and sick, who are without shelter and have few skills, are not the people who are going to build a stable government," she said. "The human side cannot be ignored."

Unfortunately, she noted, progress in the people area of the foreign aid program is not as readily noticeable or impressive as "a new dam or silo which anybody can see. The process of educating people, of wiping out disease," is not so tangible.

Yet she pointed with pride to several such AID achievements:

In 1954, 100 percent of the residents of an Asian village had malaria. They were taught to spray their homes for the disease and five years later the number of malaria victims had dropped to one-tenth of 1 percent.

In the Turkish Army, 175,000 of the conscripts were illiterate. The soldiers were taught to read and write and 3,000 of them have been trained as teachers.

In Guatemala, village residents too poor to pay for the meals provided by Food for Peace agreed to work for them instead and have built schools and roads.

Not all of our foreign-aid projects have turned out so well, Dr. Baumgartner admitted. "We assume our scientific and technological methods will work anywhere, and they don't always. Some need a great deal of adaptation." Furthermore, AID is hampered by "so little continuity in either leadership or in the funds voted for it by Congress."

But all in all, she said, "our programs have achieved a remarkable degree of success. And the success of our efforts is intimately related to our own future."

## Department of Agriculture Follows Recommendation of House Small Business Committee in Ordering an Investigation of the Domestic Poultry Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I was gratified to note in the press, the Washington Post, under the byline of the Associated Press, dated January 25, 1963, that the Agriculture Department is to launch a broad-scale investigation of pricing and other trade practices in poultry marketing.

A special subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee held extensive hearings during the 87th Congress concerning trade practices relating to processors and the broiler aspect of the poultry industry. This subcommittee, under the chairmanship of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable TOM STEED, of Oklahoma, held hearings on this subject in Washington, D.C., and at the express request of Members of Congress held hearings in Missouri and Indiana.

The special subcommittee submitted a report on these hearings—House Report No. 2566—which points up the difficulties being faced by small processors in the poultry industry and suggests a number of recommendations which could help alleviate the situation. Also, the final report of the full committee—House Report No. 2569—contains recommendations pertinent to this field. Included in these recommendations is the opinion that, "Farm organizations and the U.S. Department of Agriculture should actively assist such voluntary measures," that could go far toward correcting the existing inequities and that "cooperation with the U.S. Department of Agriculture should be expanded."

The recent announcement that the Department of Agriculture will look further into this problem is evidence that our executive agencies are following the work of the Small Business Committee in working to solve critical domestic problems.

The article referred to concerning the impending investigation by the Department of Agriculture follows:

PRICE PROBE OF POULTRY UNDERWAY

The Agriculture Department yesterday reported that it is launching a broad-scale investigation of pricing and other trade practices in poultry marketing.

Roy W. Lennartson, associate administrator of the Department's Marketing Service, said numerous complaints had been received in recent months that many producers, particularly smaller ones, are being treated unfairly by some buyer-processors.

A series of hearings on similar complaints was conducted by a subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee late last year.

The broiler industry, which has grown tremendously in recent years, has been marked by periods of overproduction and low prices, both at the producer and retail levels.

CHAIN OPERATIONS EYED

Figuring in the inquiry will be sales operations of chain stores which periodically offer poultry at cut-rate prices.

Lennartson said the investigation will not be a "witch hunt," but an attempt to get facts about operations with the idea of correcting wrong ones through new regulations, enactment of new legislation or prosecution of law violators.

He said the inquiry, which may take a year, will seek to determine to what extent, if any, processors and others in the industry are violating the Packers and Stockyards Act. This act directs the Department to police the livestock and poultry industries against unfair, unjustly discriminatory or deceptive trade practices.

MARYLAND INCLUDED

Lennartson said preliminary investigations made in Arkansas, one of the major producing States, indicated there is need for a full-scale inquiry.

Lennartson said that some of the complaints claim that some producers are being discriminated against because they joined producer associations or cooperatives; that others were discriminated against because they testified at the House committee hearings, and that some processor-producer contracts contained provisions that are in restraint of trade because they limit producer dealings with a single processor.

## No Time To Abolish House Un-American Activities Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I deem it a great privilege to have received appointment to one of the outstanding committees of this Congress, the House Committee on Un-American Activities. I am mindful of the abuse that will automatically be directed at anyone who enlists his support to the vital work of this committee.

I am also mindful, Mr. Speaker, that I am filling the vacancy created on the retirement of an illustrious Ohioan, Hon. Gordon H. Scherer. You note I did not say I will be filling the shoes of Representative Scherer because I do not believe that I can do this. The void created by his absence in the 88th Congress will not be replaced by this speaker or anyone else. Mr. Scherer's fine work, patriotic zeal, and statesmanship will serve as an inspiration to me.

Mr. Speaker, an excellent editorial appeared in yesterday's Cincinnati Enquirer and under unanimous consent, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Cincinnati (Ohio) Enquirer, Jan. 27, 1963]

NO TIME TO ABOLISH HUAC

In much the same way they look forward to flu, taxes, and death, the American people have become accustomed, during the past quarter of a century, to expecting a biennial campaign to abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee.

This year, oddly enough, the campaign has assumed particularly energetic proportions. And we use the term "oddly enough" because it should be clear in 1963, if it was never clear before, that the HUAC is a vitally important feature of the Nation's total defense against international communism. To abolish it now would be roughly tantamount to dismantling the Defense Department or abrogating the North Atlantic Alliance.

The phase of the Communist conspiracy to which the HUAC devotes its attention is not, of course, the only phase. But to expend scores of billions for defense and to ignore the internal threat to our freedoms scarcely makes sense.

Yet that is what the committee's enemies would have us do.

THE IMPETUS COMES FROM SOVIET SOURCES

The 1963 campaign against the House Un-American Activities Committee has enlisted the support of thousands of well-intentioned, non-Communist Americans. But the campaign's impetus comes from the Communist apparatus itself. Communist Party headquarters not long ago sent word to its members that "we must join forces with the anti-HUAC forces wherever they

are." The party's chairman, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, has sounded a clarion call to destroy "this disgraceful witch-hunting committee."

Accordingly, an organization known as the National Committee to Abolish the HUAS has gone to work. Its coordinator is Frank Wilkinson, of Los Angeles, identified on several occasions as a Communist. Wilkinson was released a year ago after serving a 1-year sentence for contempt of Congress. His strategy is to convert the HUAC battle into a sacred war for civil rights, fairplay, and all of the other high-sounding notions that international communism traditionally perverts and distorts for its own insidious ends.

The 1963 campaign is aimed primarily at abolishing the committee and its functions outright.

If that goal proves to be unattainable, the HUAC foes will settle for the establishment of a subcommittee with sharply curtailed activities. Another alternative is transferring the committee's present functions to the House Judiciary Committee. And if all of these tactics fail, the committee's enemies will seek to cripple the committee by sharply reducing its funds.

Two years ago, when the last major attempt to destroy the HUAC was undertaken, the House of Representatives rejected the attempt by a lopsided vote of 412 to 6. In ordinary circumstances, a mandate as impressive as that would discourage the HUAC's enemies. But such is far from the case.

THE HUAC IS NOT A NECESSARY EVIL

For, even if the 1963 effort fails, it will have the subsidiary effect of discrediting the committee's work in the eyes of millions of Americans. The facts altogether too frequently don't catch up with reckless accusations. There are, as a result, many Americans who look upon the HUAC as a necessary evil, when, in reality, it is an altogether legitmate and normal feature of the legislative process.

Campaigns like the one presently afoot have the additional effect of intimidating Members of Congress who have the temerity to serve as HUAC mebers.

In this connection, we have this impressive testimony from Cincinnati's former Representative Gordon H. Scherer:

"When, soon after my election to Congress in 1952, I accepted a place on the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I had neither misgivings nor forebodings. Our boys were dying in Korea. The mischief wrought by Soviet agents was no longer a matter of surmise; enough of it had been exposed in detail to alarm the American people. To help dislodge these internal enemies seemed to me a task any patriotic American could undertake proudly.

"What I failed to foresee was that mere act of joining the committee would make me a target for organized slander, regardless of how I might conduct myself. I was not unfamiliar with the rugged give-and-take of political life, but not until I joined the struggle against Red sedition had anyone impugned my patriotism, honesty and decency. Thereafter, I had to accustom myself to being called, to my face, in print and on the air, a witch-hunter, a character assassin, an inquisitor, and Fascist. I had become an enemy of the Bill of Rights.

"But my real dismay is not with the Communists and their friends who are engaged in protecting themselves and their cause. What distresses me is that a large portion of the public swallows the Communist distortions and blandly echoes the Red billingsgate."

From the day the committee was created a quarter of a century ago up to this crucial moment in the cold war, the story has been the same.

Fortunately, Mr. Scherer and his associates in the work of the House Un-American Activities Committee have won, in addition to the abuse of the Communists and their apologists, the applause of conscientious Americans.

"For years," J. Edgar Hoover notes, "the Communist Party has campaigned against the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The Department of Justice and the FBI have not been spared, and we have come to judge our effectiveness by the intensity of the Communist attacks."

The furiousness of the 1963 anti-HUAC drive only underscores the importance of retaining the committee, its powers and its appropriation.

## Federal Highway Administrator, Hon. Rex M. Whitton, Reviews Progress in Construction of Interstate Highway System in Address Before National Limestone Institute Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the 18th Annual Convention of the National Limestone Institute was held at the Statler Hilton Hotel in Washington, D.C., the week of January 21. One of the high points of the agenda was a luncheon address by Federal Highway Administrator, Hon. Rex M. Whitton, who emphasized the need for effective Federal-State cooperation in the construction of our Interstate Highway System.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Public Works, and its Subcommittee on Public Roads, it will be my privilege to work closely with Mr. Whitton and his associates during the 88th Congress, as he administers the vital Federal-aid highway program.

Speaking before representatives of the various segments of the limestone industry, Administrator Whitton stressed that a sense of partnership must prevail between the State and the Federal Government if we are to complete on schedule the huge network of freeways envisioned in the Federal-aid highway program. He indicated that some form of work is completed or underway on 70 percent of the Interstate System, but that some States are lagging due to problems in design, acquisition of rights-of-way, and in providing State matching funds. Mr. Whitton likewise emphasized the role of the Bureau of Public Roads as the agency responsible for overseeing this vast national project, and charged with assuring both sustained progress and efficient administration in Federal-aid highway construction.

Mr. President, I request that the remarks of Mr. Whitton before the National Limestone Institute Convention January 23, 1963, be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD:

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRESS OF THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM

(Remarks by Rex M. Whitton, Federal Highway Administrator, Bureau of Public Roads, U.S. Department of Commerce, at the 18th Annual Convention of the National Limestone Institute, Congressional Room, Statler Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C., Wednesday, January 23, 1963, 12:30 p.m.)

I want to thank you for this chance to talk with you today. I know I'm among friends. Here's Bob Koch, your president; and some of the people from my home State, Missouri; and others from both Washington and all over the country that I know well.

I can tell from your printed program that this annual meeting is well planned. The subjects for your discussion range from broad problem areas, to those of current and practical concern. I am sure you will find that the sessions will be of real value, both to you who are producers, and to some of us who are in effect your customers.

Again, I want to tell you how proud I was to receive your Distinguished Service Award. I am very grateful. I must say that work deserving such an award is accomplished with the help of many people who work with me in the Bureau of Public Roads, in the State highway departments, in associations such as yours, and at the top of the list is Mrs. Whitton.

Let me start, today, by sketching just what the Federal-aid highway program is. It has grown a lot since its modest start in 1916. Almost 880,000 miles of roads and streets are included in the Interstate and ABC Systems, and are eligible for improvement with Federal aid. That's about one-foutrh of our total road and street mileage, and generally the most important part. Today, Federal aid accounts for over 40 percent of all funds spent for road and street construction by all levels of government.

Yet the basic concepts created by Congress 46 years ago still prevail. The Federal-aid program is a Federal-State cooperative effort in which the States might be called the "initiating" partners. They choose the system routes and the projects to be built. They select the detailed locations and draw the plans. They let the contracts and supervise the construction. The States maintain the highways without Federal assistance.

The Congress has decided, by methods prescribed in the law, how much Federal highway aid each State is to get, each year. And Federal-aid payments are made to the States, project by project, only for work completed and accounted for.

In this whole process, from choice of routes to payment for projects, the Bureau of Public Roads' function is that of review and approval—or disapproval. Disapproval does not come frequently, and it is more apt to be a reservation than a flat denial.

Of course such cases seem to make news. I assure you that disapprovals come only after careful thought. And they occur through differences of judgment based on engineering and economic analysis. Further study often resolves such differences, and the Bureau and the State thus reach agreement.

Now, I have said that the States are the "initiating" partners in this program. Nevertheless, Public Roads believes that it is dutybound to provide both guidance and controls. This, to me, is both right and proper. We are not hamstringing the States with an overabundance of regulations. But we certainly are expected, by the Congress and the public, to assure them they are getting full value for the money they invest in Federal highway aid.

We have recognized that both our own procedures, and those of the States, must change from time to time. The growing size and complexity of the highway programs surely merit that attention.

During the past few years we in Public Roads have taken a number of major steps to strengthen our controls in the Federal-aid program. None of these have been taken without careful study. We think they are reasonable and necessary, and that they do not infringe unduly on the States' functions or rights.

One major step taken last year was the creation of two new primary units in our headquarters organization.

One of these is the Office of Right-of-Way and Location. These are areas of great importance. Route location is often the subject of strong and heated argument. Right-of-way purchase is a field new to many highway officials. It is difficult in that right-of-way costs cannot be measured and compared with standards as easily as construction items.

Our second new major unit is the Office of Audits and Investigations. It handles a dual job. One is that of auditing State claims for Federal-aid payments. The other is to maintain vigilance over all phases of our programs.

This office investigates all charges of incompetence and fraud. But it does much more. It surveys the procedures of both Public Roads and the States, to see that they are properly applied and that they work well.

We are not interested in witch hunts. But we are interested in providing good checks and balances. And we know that these must tread a middle path that assures good workmanship without slowing the work to a standstill.

One of our techniques now in use is called inspection in depth. Individual projects, chosen at random, are examined in detail from start to finish by Public Roads staff. If there are faulty procedures, or if good paper procedures are not being carried out, they will show up in this inspection in depth. The process is most helpful both to the States and to Public Roads.

We have also applied this process to the right-of-way procedures of every State. The 35-point review has shown possible weaknesses in some cases. We have worked with those States in overhauling and tightening their right-of-way policies and operations.

We have developed a current billing method for Federal-aid payments, called concurrent auditing. The process calls for a good deal of preparation, and we are helping the States to organize for it, one by one. The system, among other things, first requires a thorough review of procedures.

In use, it permits the States to get Federal reimbursement much sooner than before, when projects were not audited until they were finished. And it also turns up more quickly any procedure flaws or nonallowable items. Thus corrective action can be taken promptly.

You will note that our so-called controls are mostly concerned with procedures and their actual use. We are primarily interested in improving our and the States' operations.

Still, we know fraud and carelessness can and do occur. We intend to keep on hunting out such instances, and taking drastic action when necessary. But we are convinced that fraud, incompetence, and poor work in the Federal-aid program are of very small proportion. We and the States want to keep it that way.

Now, let me turn to more positive reporting. All of you are interested in the Interstate Highway System. Some of you produce materials for its construction. All of you are potential users, both with your own cars and with your company trucks.

We are about 1,700 miles further ahead with the system than we were a year ago. Well over 13,000 miles of these freeways are open to traffic and are in daily use.

Of this total, about 8,000 miles have been completed to fill the needs of traffic expected in 1975. Another 3,000 miles have been improved enough to handle today's traffic well, but they require further work to bring them up to the 1975 standards. And 2,300 miles are toll facilities, included in the system as permitted by the law.

We also have nearly 5,000 miles under construction, and close to 11,000 miles with preliminary engineering or right-of-way work going on.

So some form of work is finished or underway on 70 percent of the Interstate System. It's a good record. But this national figure is an average for all of the States. Compared with that 70 percent, some States have already passed the 90-percent mark. Some others haven't reached 50 percent as yet.

We in Public Roads think it is important to move ahead on a mileage objective. In a sense, the public is already sold on the Interstate System. Through Congress, they have provided the money. To be convinced that it is worth the cost, they have only to ride on it, and see the better, cheaper, faster, and safer travel they are buying.

It is for this reason that we are urging the States to plan their interstate schedules with certain goals. One is to develop long, usable sections of completed freeways, particularly those connecting major cities. Another is to concentrate on replacing badly deficient or dangerous existing road sections.

We also are urging a target of half the system mileage open to travel by the end of 1964, the halfway mark in the 1957 to 1972 time schedule.

Our present estimates and the States' show that we have a good chance of reaching that goal. But it, in turn, is only a halfway mark. The Congress expects us to complete the entire system by 1972.

Some States, using bond or other financing and knowing they will receive their Federal aid later, are going ahead rapidly. A few will finish well before 1972. Others are lagging on a mileage basis. Some will have to complete five times as much mileage annually in the next 10 years as they did in the past 6.

Mileage isn't the only measure of program progress, of course. But the fact remains that Congress has given us a time limit.

A number of States are facing very real problems. There are 2,500 miles of the Interstate System where locations aren't settled. Twenty percent of the States have some lag in design work. Thirty percent are having difficulty in acquiring right-of-way. Twenty percent face trouble in providing State matching funds.

The need for careful, long-range planning becomes clear if we view the successive steps of the program from the far end. To complete the system in 1972, the final construction projects should be awarded to contract in 1970.

Then the last right-of-way purchase and clearing should be started in 1967 or 1968. And, in turn, all Interstate project design work ought to the underway in 1966.

Final route location has to be settled before then. Location requires preliminary studies of alternates, public hearings, and reaching agreement with various Government and planning agencies. So it is evident that final route location work should be in progress right now.

It is obvious that we cannot hold up all or many remaining Interstate projects to these several terminal dates. If we do, there well be a construction "pile-up" in the last few years before 1972, with above-normal building costs and an impossible strain on inspection staffs.

It is for this reason that long-range planning of all operation phases is essential.

I have been dwelling at some length on the Interstate System program because of its importance. But this does not mean I attach less importance to our ABC program for the improvement of the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems in urban and rural areas.

Perhaps less needs to be said about the ABC program because it has been going on for 46 years now, and getting bigger every year. This past year the Congress authorized $950 million for the program for fiscal year 1964, and $975 million for 1965. Your own organization with Bob Koch speaking ably for you, strongly supported that legislation.

For the record, during fiscal year 1962, Federal-aid ABC projects were completed on more than 18,000 miles of roads and streets. This work cost over $1.5 billion, of which nearly $800 million was Federal aid.

Some of this work was new construction, extending our total road and street mileage. But much of it was for improvement of existing roads, better curves and grades, and stronger and wider surfaces. About one-fifth of the 5,000 miles of primary projects completed in fiscal 1962 were four-lane highways. A good many of them had partial or full freeway design. We certainly expect this trend to continue.

In fact, we expect the great speedup in road building, begun in the last decade, to continue throughout this one. And the 1970's will probably see an unslacked continuation.

I won't forecast dollars far ahead, but in this year of 1963 we expect to see highway construction outlays of $6.1 billion; up $600 million over last year. That's just construction, excluding right-of-way, engineering, maintenance, and all the rest of the annual highway costs.

The use of materials in the highway program is staggering. In 1962, in all road work, 582 million tons of aggregates were used for construction and 172 million for maintenance. In the 1962 to 1972 decade we expect 9 billion tons of aggregates to be used for roads.

Aggregates, of course, include sand, gravel, and slag, as well as crushed stone. Limestone will certainly account for a healthy share of the latter.

One of the problems in which you and I share concern is that of specifications. Last year the Bureau of Public Roads published a report of real interest to you.[1] It was called "Aggregate Gradation for Highways." It pointed out the benefits that would result if aggregate gradation specifications could be simplified, standardized, and made more uniform.

You, as producers, would benefit because you would not have to prepare and stock such a wide variety of aggregate sizes and mixes. We, as customers, would benefit from possibly lower costs and less confusion.

We believe there is considerable room for improvement in most other specifications areas, too. Material usages could be more standardized, and construction methods made more uniform. Roadbuilding production rates could be increased and the end product would be better, if such steps were taken by the States.

And the States are taking just such steps. The American Association of State Highway Officials is now preparing a complete book of construction specifications. The book has already been through several drafts and is now under committee review.

Some time this spring the final draft will go out for review and comment to State highway people, to equipment manufac-

[1] Your organization had a committee that worked with us over a period of 2 years in developing this report.

turers, and to materials producers. I know your organization can be counted on to offer helpful and constructive comment. And you can be sure your comments will be given careful attention.

Thereafter, the book will have final review by AASHO and will be voted on by the States. I am hopeful of seeing the final product before the summer of 1964. Then we will have a complete and modern guide specification book for the construction of highways. I am confident it will lead to what we aspire among the State specifications—standardization, simplicity, and uniformity. It is an objective that will help all of us.

While I'm on this subject I want to tell you that the Bureau of Public Roads is fostering a greatly expanded research program, on its own and with the States. One important research area is better quality control in highway construction.

I don't mean restraints, either. But we have a great need for a scientific approach to sampling and testing. In the end, it will mean less interference with the contractor; and assurance that materials and methods are checked out before it is too late.

One final word, for the future. When one tries to look 100 years ahead, one wonders what kind of transportation systems we may have, perhaps radically different.

But, for a somewhat lesser range, we must remember that planning for, say, 1980, is already on the drawing board or in the thinking stage. The United States will be even more urbanized then. But I cannot foresee drastic change in the shape of our cities or in the forms of our transportation.

By 1980 we may have some forms of automated highway in the development or tryout stage. We will probably have more rail transit in our very largest cities. I certainly expect much more urban bus service, perhaps some of it in little local buses, such as are to be tried out here in Washington, as well as express buses running on special or reserved lanes of freeways.

But the public is unlikely to forego, by 1980, its great desire for personal mobility. We will probably have additional mileage of freeways in the Interstate System, financed by Federal aid or otherwise, and thousands of miles of primary highways will be rebuilt to higher standards; thousands of dirt roads will be surfaced.

In our lifetime, you need have no fear of running out of a market for limestone.

In closing, once again I express my gratitude for the award you conferred on me last night, and I appreciate this opportunity to talk with you.

Your organization has cooperated fully with us and with the States, in the past, and your help has been very real. I know we will continue that friendly and useful relationship.

---

## Is Oxford the Rehearsal of the Takeover?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including a thought-provoking article written by Mrs. Katharine Phelps Close, a native of the State of Maryland, which I feel deserves the attention of this body:

IS OXFORD THE REHEARSAL OF THE TAKEOVER?

(By Katharine Phelps Close)

Well, the sound and the fury seem to have quieted down for the time being in Oxford, Miss., and I have been watching for some reply to David Lawrence's cogent article (Oct. 3d) on the "tragic silence" concerning the validity of the controversial 14th amendment to our Constitution, but I have seen none so far. Therefore, I am impelled to add my few words that may help clarify the Southern point of view to some readers who may not be familiar with the Reconstruction era in American history. As a Southerner from the State of Maryland I had ancestors who fought on both sides of this terrible conflict—brother against brother—and one of my grandmothers was from Mississippi, so I was raised on stories of the Old South and the terrors of Reconstruction. They lived through a crisis not unlike that which happened recently in the Congo.

The Southern people can never forget. But through the ensuing years following the horrors of the Civil War they have tried to work out a decent solution to the Negro problem, giving the Negroes equal but separate facilities which were improving with every year, and they lived side by side in peace and mutual respect, until lately. (Had Abraham Lincoln not been killed, his plan was to send all the freed slaves back to Africa to settle Liberia, a name derived from Liberty, and whose capital is Monrovia, so called for our patriot James Monroe of the famous and now forgotten Monroe Doctrine.) As a Southerner, but a nonprofessional one, I am proud of it, and I feel it is unfair that the brutal subjugation of the Southern people following this war has been glossed over by historians (Northerners most of them. Surely the basic sin was slavery at all, from which the Northern slave-traders profited handsomely.) There is an old proverb which so aptly says: "The past foretells the future."

The War Between the States ended April 10, 1865, after 4 bloody and terrible years. The 14th amendment giving citizenship to the freed Negro slaves was first proposed June 12, 1866. By July 28, 1868, the prostrate former Confederate States were forced by Federal arms to ratify this amendment, and it was a shocking and brutal scandal at the time. The 15th amendment, giving the freed slaves the right to vote was put into force in March 1870. (The American Indians were only franchised in 1924.)

In those days following the Civil War many of the Governors of Southern States were Negro puppets put in power by the Federal conquerors, and their legislatures were a rabble of white renegades and newly free black men, many of them illiterate. The intolerable situation created by the Federal victors in the South during the Reconstruction, as it is called, gave rise to the Ku Klux Klan (since shamefully degenerated) but which was, in those days, a respectable organization made up of white gentlemen in an effort to protect their homes and their women against barbarism. These Southern white men had been stripped of all they possessed, their homes and plantations had been burned and property destroyed or confiscated (stolen) by the swarms of carpetbaggers from the North—and by roaming bands of bewildered free Negroes used to a paternalistic way of life and who, faced with the responsibilities of freedom and of earning their own keep, resorted to pillage and rape and brought terror to their homeland. All this was graphically shown in an old and historic movie by D. W. Griffith of the silent picture days, called "The Birth of a Nation," which has now been muzzled as it is no longer politically popular to remember the painful, historic truth as regards the South.

It would be interesting to know just why this 29-year-old Negro, James Meredith, was chosen by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, over many applicants, to be the martyr-hero he now is to his race in breaking, with the aid of thousands of heavily armed Federal troops, the solid white barrier at the University of Mississippi. It would be even more interesting to know how much James is being paid to endure this education. It would be further absolutely fascinating to know how deeply the Communists have penetrated in this powerful and rich political lobby of the NAACP, which, in appealing to the huge Negro vote in the United States, is now a power to be reckoned with in our national politics. It is not as if Meredith were unable to obtain a satisfactory education in his own State of Mississippi, for he had been attending a well accredited Negro college there for several semesters (and which his colored wife is still attending), when he demanded and got a transfer to the previously all-white State university. Some may say, "There is a principle involved and by the recent Supreme Court decision this man was given the right to go to the university of his choice." But what about the majority? Don't the majority have any rights any more? (The Negro minority, certainly in the South, pay no taxes, or, if they do pay taxes at all to the State or Federal Government they are negligible in proportion to the rest of the population.)

And what about the serious consequences of using force to push through this issue at this time, knowing full well what the reactions of the white citizenry would be? Of the wisdom of sending 14,000—or was it more?—armed military including Negro troops (an added insult) to this small town of little more than 5,000, so that one stubborn Negro could make himself a public figure, a hero, to his people, and crack the hitherto barrier there, backed up with all the strength of Federal might. (The old wounds of the Reconstruction days have been opened up afresh all over our South. A wedge, driven at the national Achilles heel, has been driven in to divide our people once again.) And what about the other students? Certainly the tense atmosphere of an armed camp is not conducive to quiet study for anyone, white or black. Will having this Negro there make others more acceptable? I don't think so. This one needs guards day and night, shameful as it is, and he will continue to need them as long as he remains there. If education is really what this Negro wants, wouldn't the more tranquil campus of his former Negro college with the companionship of his wife, be preferable? On being admitted to the University of Mississippi in the midst of the wildest melee seen there since the Civil War, James is reported to have said, "This is not a happy occasion." This remark wins my personal prize as the understatement of the year. Then to further enhance his importance publicly and in the eyes of the Negro voters, this colored student—a true troublemaker if there ever was one—gives interviews to the press, criticizing the Federal Government that had just saved his life with the aid of an army invasion into the State, by saying that not enough Negro troops had been used in Mississippi, claiming this as segregation of the Negro service personnel, and useful to the boys in the Kremlin for propaganda purposes. (The very fact of having any Negro troops there, armed against the white citizenry of the South, was enough to madden the population, remembering as they all do the days when a Negro was in control with his henchmen.)

If a principle is involved in this Mississippi situation, then, as David Lawrence so rightly and sufficiently pointed out, the whole subject of the legality of the 14th amendment, as well as the Supreme Court decision based on it, "should be opened up for trial after 94 years of tragic silence by the Supreme Court of the United States." This matter of school integration was never put up to the States for a decision, knowing that the Southern States would probably never ratify it. It is one of the slickest deals ever pulled off by a powerful lobby group in the politics of our country. The naked military force shown in the little town of Oxford, Miss., poses the question "What has become of State rights—of State sovereignty—of the very cornerstone of our country, and the basis of the name, United States?"

The real neglected minority is the American Indian, the first and true American, because his voting power is weak and unimportant. This whole integration problem is for political purposes, for votes at home and to try to win over the Afro-Asian block in the U.N. In spite of all the high-flown moral reasons given, votes are the real basis for the deplorable situation * * * but at what cost in prestige abroad and at the risk of open rebellion among our own people. It will take a long, long time for the wounds of this new-Reconstruction to heal.

## The Chief Joseph War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a very interesting article reprinted from the winter, 1963, issue of Montana, the magazine of Western history, written by Rowena L. and Gordon D. Alcorn, of Tacoma, Wash. Both Dr. and Mrs. Alcorn have been deeply interested in the Nez Perce Indians for more than a quarter century and Mrs. Alcorn is internationally famous for her paintings of outstanding Indians of the past and present.

This story concerns Sam Tilden, a nephew of Chief Joseph, one of the oldest survivors of the famous retreat in 1876 of the Nez Perce from central Idaho through the Lolo Pass, down the Bitteroot Valley of Montana, thence southeasterly into the general area of Yellowstone Park and then north, heading for the Canadian border. This retreat is sometimes referred to as "the Chief Joseph war." Many colorful sidelights are set out in this account of this famous retreat in which the Indians, although greatly outnumbered, were successful in many pitched battles and, in fact, were never defeated until the last battle which occurred in northwestern Montana east of the Rocky Mountains. The Indians thought they had reached Canada when the troops, under Gen. O. O. Howard, caught up with them and Chief Joseph, because of the exhaustion of his entire band, was forced to surrender.

The article follows:

OLD NEZ PERCE RECALLS TRAGIC RETREAT OF 1877

(By Rowena L. and Gordon D. Alcorn)

"Under a buffalo skin robe, I was sleeping soundly in our tepee beside Chee-Nah my grandmother. Suddenly a rifle shot, then neighing of startled horses roused us. Chee-Nah rose to peer out and a bullet pierced her left shoulder * * * blood streamed from the wound as she pushed me from the tepee crying, (Suhm-Keen run to the trees and hide.' I raced up the slope as fast as I could * * * bullets kept whizzing past clipping off leaves and branches all around me. I was very afraid * * * soon some other boys joined me there and we watched trembling at the awful sight below. Our tepees were set afire and our people shot as they tried to run for cover in the timber."

Thus recalled our aged friend Sam Tilden, whose Nez Percé tribal name, Suhm-Keen, means "shirt on." We visited him again last summer (June 1962), and he was telling us boyhood memories of the historic Battle of the Big Hole on August 9, 1877. Tilden was 10 years old when he went along on that tragic retreat. Five nontreaty bands of the Nez Percé Nation were forced to flee their homeland in what was a part of Washington, Idaho, and Oregon, to seek sanctuary in Canada, "Land of Redcoats."

After they had crossed over the Lolo Trail of the Rockies, the tribesmen hoped they were safe from pursuit by Gen. O. O. Howard's U.S. Army forces. So, exhausted from their arduous trip (encumbered as they were with old men, women, and little children) they at last stopped to rest at Big Hole, which they called "Is-Kum-Tse-Talik" (Place of Ground Squirrels).[1]

Scouts should have been sent up the pass to be sure they were not being followed, but in the council of chieftains, Looking Glass vehemently insisted that it was not necessary: "Montana people our friends." This decision that speed was most imperative was to cost the Nez Percé many lives.

Lulled into a false sense of security, they made camp. Tepee poles were cut, squaws dug camas bulbs, and soon roasting pits to cure them were smoldering. They would need as much of this nourishing food as they could prepare for the long trek to Canada. Two camas bulbs and two kous roots could sustain one for a day.

Tilden continued his account of the battle: "About 4 a.m. before dawn, one of our old men, Nata-Le-Kin who had poor eyesight, heard the ponies stirring restlessly up on the hillside where most of them were hobbled. It was a chilly night, so he drew his blanket around his shoulders and rode up to investigate the cause of that disturbance. Colonel Gibbon's troops were hiding up there ready to attack the sleeping camp, when Nata-Le-Kin appeared. They shot him and the report of the rifle roused our encampment and our warriors rushed from their tepees to do battle. Many of the tepees were set afire by the soldiers, who shot our people as they tried to run for cover in the timber. The first warrior to be killed was Rainbow (Wah-Chum-Yus) who had always told us that if he had to fight before dawn, he would surely be killed."

It was not yet light when the battle started. Five Wounds (Pah-Kah-Tos), lifelong friend of Rainbow, had made a pact with him that they would die on the same day as their fathers had died many years before. When Five Wounds saw that Rainbow was slain, he deliberately walked out into the enemy fire and died. Tilden also saw other great warriors killed: Red Moccasin Tops (Sarpsis-Ilp-Pilp), Shore Crossing (Wah-Lit-Its), Woodpecker (Woo-Kaw-Kaw) and Circling Sun (Wet-Yet-Mas-Lik-Leinen).

In spite of the surprise attack, the Nez Percés were able to drive off the enemy, and even managed to capture the one howitzer hidden in the timber. Then, while a number of warriors held the troops pinned in rifle pits, the other tribesmen buried their dead. Then they hastily fashioned travois from poles of the unburned tepees. On these they placed the wounded and left the sad "Place of Ground Squirrels," and again headed toward Canada. Riding on fast ponies, the fighting men joined the others when they made a camp after traveling "one sun" from Big Hole.

The name of this place they called Tak-Seen (The Willows). Here Ollokot's wife, Ai-Hits-Palo-Jam (Fair Land) died of the wounds she had received the day before. She left an infant baby. Husis-Ow-Yeen (Wounded Head), whose Indian name was given to him from the severe head wound received at the battle, had tallied the dead at Big Hole on his buffalo drinking horn: 63 had been killed, 32 of them men. All the others were women and children. There was much grieving and wailing in camp that night.

Sam Tilden was born in 1867 when his parents were camped on the Musselshell River during a buffalo-hunting trip. His father was We-Ahch-Chech-Kan (Packing Blankets), his mother Ka-Too-Cham-Miyah (Horse Chewing Grass Noisily). The name of Samuel Tilden was given to young Suhm-Keen by a teacher, Frank Kettenbach of Lewiston, Idaho. The names were freqently given to Indian children by teachers or ministers.

Chee-Nah, Suhm-Keen's grandmother, was the sister of Chief Old Joseph, and she was known as Martha Joseph. The wound she received as the attack at Big Hole started, gradually healed during the retreat. She was captured at Bear Paw and taken prisoner with Chief Joseph. She returned to Lapwai where she died after the war, many years later.

"During the early summer of 1877," Tilden remembers clearly, "we were camped on the bank of the South Fork of the Clearwater River, not far from the present village of Stites, Idaho." After the Battle of White Bird Canyon on June 17, 1877 the Nez Percé moved up onto the Camas Prairie and then down to the South Fork of the Clearwater River (Koos-Koos-Kie). There they made a camp in the sloping meadow directly across from what is now known as Battle Ridge. There, Tilden's family joined the other tribesmen.

On July 11 and 12, a band of 24 Nez Percé warriors, led by Yellow Wolf, Ollokot, Wottolen, Peo-Peo-Tholekt, Rainbow, Five Wounds, and others, held off the Army forces along this high promontory. Meanwhile salvos from the two howitzers landed in the Indian encampment. Finally it was decided that their camp should be moved for safety, and so the Nez Percé headed for Kamiah while the warriors held the soldiers on the ridge. The last to leave was Yellow Wolf, who helped Springtime, Joseph's young wife, to mount

[1] Located on State Highway 43 in western Montana, the spot is now marked by a monument maintained by the National Park Service. It is 12 miles west of Wisdom and 21 miles from its junction with U.S. Highway 93. Shallow, grassy trenches and many battle-scarred trees remain as evidence of the historic encounter here.

her rearing pony frightened by the roar of the howitzers. With the cradleboard containing her baby, she could not handle the terrified animal. Together, Yellow Wolf and Springtime rode to join the retreating Nez Percé.

Tilden recalls the stormy council of chiefs—Joseph, Looking Glass, Ollokot, White Bird and Too-Hool-Hool-Zote—after the next attack which came the following day on July 13 at Kamiah Crossing. Chief Joseph suggested that they go back down into the rugged terrain where they could easily elude the soldiers. This was the Salmon River area which is gashed by awesome canyons. Joseph was overruled by the others who wanted to leave Idaho and go to the "Land of Redcoats," and so preparations were made to leave at once.

Several of the warriors who had fought bravely at White Bird Canyon, the Clearwater Battle and at Kamiah Crossing, decided to remain behind at Kamiah with Chief Red Heart and his band which had just returned from Montana where they were hunting buffalo. These tribesmen were all taken prisoner and were later held for a year at Fort Vancouver. Among them was Halfmoon, and an old man, Chief Jacob, who had signed the Treaty of 1855. What a change had taken place in 22 short years.

"On the way up over Lolo Trail," Tilden told us, "we had plenty of wild game. I was usually put on night duty to guard the horses. Chief Joseph was my uncle and he asked me to do this."

After the Battle of Big Hole, the Nez Percés were attacked again at Camas Meadows (Kamus-Nim-Takin). This was on August 20. It was while they were still in this area that some of the Nez Percés warriors led by Yellow Wolf and Peo-Peo-Tholekt ran off some of the army animals in a night raid. This was a daring maneuver, especially since the redmen had to stampede them into joining the herd of Indian ponies. However, when it grew daylight, the raiders were chagrined to discover that there were only three horses; the rest were mules. Suhm-Keen (Tilden) laughed when he remembered this incident. "I helped to guard those animals—those mules which they thought were horses in the dark."

On and on the fleeing Nez Percés traveled northward toward Canada. Then at Canyon Creek, Col. Samuel Sturgis' troops tried to corner them on September 13. Only one warrior was killed in this encounter. Tee-Wee-Wow-Nah's pony became terrified by the shooting and bolted, running out into the open where the soldiers found the redman an easy target. Canyon Creek, although not a narrow place, was skillfully defended by the expert marksmanship of the Nez Percé.

"It was growing colder every day as we headed northward," Tilden continued. "On September 29 when we finally arrived in the Bear Paws at the place we called 'Ali-Kos-Pah' (Place of Manure Fires), it was already starting to snow. I helped to gather buffalo chips and before long many fires were burning."[3]

"We are at least two suns ahead of the soldiers and only two suns from the 'Land of Redcoats,' so we can rest here awhile." This was again Chief Looking Glass who had spoken. However, the other chiefs seemed to agree that they might be safe now to remain there at least "one sun."[3]

Several scouts had arrived at the camping spot ahead of the main body of the Nez Percé, and had shot some buffalo. Soon meat was roasting over many fires. The Indians, their hunger appeased and warmed by the buffalo-chip fires, felt at ease now that they were such a short distance from Canada. All night long the fires were kept aglow by the squaws. To keep warm enough this was necessary, for many of their thick buffalo robes had been destroyed when their tepees had been burned at the Big Hole.

A light snow had fallen during the night and it was bitterly cold as dawn broke. The camp was just stirring when scouts were sent out in different directions as a precautionary measure. "But we were not worried," says Tilden.

"The scouts had been gone just a short while when suddenly we heard a distant rumbling * * *. We all knew that this was not Hein-Mot (real thunder). It was the ominous sound of stampeding buffalo * * * this could mean only one thing. At that very moment one of our scouts appeared on top of the highest ridge. He yelled, then he fired his rifle in the air, at the same time he waved a blanket giving us the signal, 'Soldiers coming—soldiers coming.'

"While this scout was still waving the blanket to warn his tribesmen, there suddenly appeared two long lines of cavalry from the ridges; as they raced toward us, they formed two wide arcs to encircle our encampment.

"My mother screamed at me, 'Suhm-Keen, grab your packsack and get away to the Redcoats.' I ran to my pony and galloped him as fast as he could. The noise of shooting had stampeded the Indian ponies and they were running away from the encampment. As I left the others, ahead I saw another Indian on a pinto pony. He had a long warbonnet on. This Indian rode toward me and tried to shoot me but missed." (He was no doubt one of the Cheyennes who were helping the soldiers. Some Crow Indians were also at Bears Paw, and it was a great shock to the Nez Percé to see that these Crows who were supposed to be their friends, had turned against them. The help of these Indians to the troops made the plight of the Nez Percés even more desperate.)

"It was again snowing as I rode on to the north. Toward evening I crossed the Milk River which was almost dry. Here I stopped for the night; my horse was too tired to go on. I had no food, no blankets except the one I used for the horse's saddle-blanket. Along came an Indian, and when we 'threw the signs,' I discovered he was a friendly Cree. He was kind and generous, for he gave me a pair of moccasins and some food. He was a good-looking Indian."

Sometime later, about 30 or 40 Nez Percés arrived at the Milk River, and among them, to young Suhm-Keen's joy, were his parents. They had waited until dark, and then slipped away from the camp, and fortunately had located some of their ponies which had run away when the shooting started. Later, more Crees came along and provided these shivering refugees with a few blankets, food and moccasins. Many had arrived barefoot, and it was very cold.

Several days later this bedraggled party slipped over across the border of Canada and at last arrived at the camp of the Sioux Indians. There, Chief Sitting Bull welcomed them and they were treated well. (Sitting Bull rode out to assist the Nez Percé when the word came that the tribesmen needed his help. While he was en route to the Bears Paw, he met some of the tribesmen who were on foot led by Chief White Bird. When Sitting Bull saw their said plight, he dismounted and stood there and wailed in sympathy for their lost cause.)

When Chief White Bird arrived with the news that Ollokot was dead, Too-Hool-Hool-Zote was dead, and Looking Glass was dead, they were shocked but almost worse was the dreadful news that three of their bravest warriors had been killed by mistake, by one of their own tribesmen. White Bird told them too that Joseph had surrendered on October 5, and there was much grieving and wailing among the Nez Percé in far-off "Land of Redcoats." They all knew now that this was the end of all the things they loved.[4]

Tilden's parents remained at the Sioux encampment until 1878, then they crossed into Northern Montana where they lived about 2 years on a small ranch near the border of Alberta, Canada. The father worked for some white settlers there, milking cows and doing other farm chores. In 1880 they moved onto the Flathead Indian Reservation where they stayed until 1910; then they returned to Lapwai, Idaho.

Gradually more and more Nez Percé tribesmen drifted back into the United States. Some were caught and sent to the Indian Territory where Chief Joseph was being held with all who had surrendered with him at Bears Paw. Chief Joseph was permitted a last visit to the Wallowa Valley, the "Land of Winding Waters," in August 1899.[5]

Sam Tilden says "I was one of the two first Nez Percé Indians to attend Carlisle Indian College. When I returned from there, I was through school, so I married Amy who was half Nez Percé and half Yakima. We moved back to the Flathead Reservation where I worked as a teamster. We had three boys, Harry, Lawrence, and Ralph. In 1914, I became a member of the Flathead Indian Reservation police force, and served on that force for 20 years. During World War I, I was on duty guarding the border between Montana and Canada."

Sam Tilden, a gentle soft-spoken man, lived 30 years of his life in Montana, but when he retired from the police force, he returned to live near Lapwai, Idaho (Valley of Butterflies). His home was between Lapwai and Spalding in a grove of tall locust trees. In the early 1940's Ralph, his eldest son who was deaf, was run down by a train just a few hundred feet from their house. His son Lawrence and family now live in this house, for Sam Tilden has for the past 2 years made his home in the Orchards Nursing Home at Lewiston, Idaho.

For many years he took part in special Indian celebrations throughout the North-

[3] This site of the last major Indian battle in the United States is located 16 miles south of Chinook in eastern Montana. It is a little more than 40 miles from the Canadian line, across which Joseph believed he would find refuge for his people. It is now a Montana State Park.

[3] According to some historians, Joseph and his chiefs believed they had actually reached safety in Canada when they arrived in the Bears Paw country of northeastern Montana. "The mistake was discovered when General Miles attacked on September 30," states the Montana Guidebook. "A 4-day battle forced Joseph to make a decision—he must either surrender or abandon the wounded, the old women, and children."

[4] Chief White Bird (Peo-peo-hih-kis-kiok), known as a great medicine man as well as warrior, never returned to the United States. He died about 5 years after the surrender and is buried near Fort McLeod.

[5] Max Wilson, an attorney who has lived almost all his life in Joseph, Oreg., recalls this sad visit by Joseph to Wallowa. Although he was only 14 years old at the time. Wilson followed the famed chief around during the 3-day visit. So much had changed during the 22 years which had passed that Joseph realized there was no hope of his people going back to their beloved homeland in Idaho, although he continued to press for permission until his death.

west. He was active in the Stevens Treaty Centennial at Walla Walla in June 1955, and was always there for the Chief Joseph Days held each summer at Joseph, Oreg. Although he no longer takes an active part in most of these things, he rode in the Lewiston centennial parade in the summer of 1961. He was dressed in his unusually handsome white beaded buckskins.

"I am very proud that my uncle, Chief Joseph, asked me to go back to Washington in 1903 (the last time he made a trip there to plead for the return of the Wallowa country to his people). He told me that I was one of the few people left that he could really trust." (On that trip, James Stewart, Joseph's relative, went along as an interpreter. Tilden speaks perfect English, but there had to be an official interpreter along).

"Chief Joseph wore civilian clothes back there, but always wore moccasins. He never put on shoes of the white man. We went to the White House to meet President Roosevelt * * * you know, the roughrider. We had dinner, too, with General Miles; we ate buffalo meat. Then, Congressman Charles Curtis from Oklahoma took us to the Congress where we shook hands with many people."

The next year, Chief Joseph was dead, many said from grief.

Sam Tilden is not the lone survivor of the retreat over the Lolo Trail in 1877. There are two other Nez Percé still living who were with their fleeing tribesmen.

One of them is Josiah Red Wolf, grandson of the famous Chief Red Wolf who ruled with Chief Timothy over the Alpowa Band. (Both were signers of the 1855 treaty at Walla Walla.) Josiah Red Wolf's mother and baby sister were killed at Big Hole. When Chief Joseph surrendered at Bears Paw, Josiah Red Wolf went into captivity to "Eekish-Pah" (Hot Place). He was 5 years old in 1877, so he remembers everything.

Then there is Lillie Lindsley, of Lapwai. She was only 2 years old in 1877, so she can recall nothing of the war. Last summer, death came to Shining Light (Johnson Hoyt) who had reached the century mark. He, too, had been on the retreat, and had escaped at Bears Paw when he raced to the Canadian border on his pony as the shooting started.

The oldest living Nez Percé tribesman was 101 on November 19, 1962. He is Albert Moore, whose Indian name is Peace Pipe (Tuk-Tar-Mal-Way-Une). He watched the Battle of the Clearwater from the Nez Percé camp on July 11 and 12, 1877. When the five bands started over the Lolo Pass after the Battle of Kamiah Crossing, Peace Pipe wanted to go, but his mother, In-Mah-Mah, persuaded him not to go. "There are too many soldier-coats along the way. Our people will never reach the Land of Redcoats."

So Peace Pipe stayed behind. But he, along with the remaining few old Nez Percé, witnessed some awesome history. It is more than likely that 1962 was one of the last years in which any of us will be permitted person-to-person contact with them.

## Salute to Thailand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. DONALD C. BRUCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the people of Indiana saluted the people of Thailand. The city and State of Indianapolis, Ind., joined with the Indianapolis Council on World Affairs and the Indianapolis Symphony Orchestra January 12 and 13, 1963, in the Salute to Thailand. The 2-day civic and cultural activities were cosponsored by the U.S. Information Agency and the Voice of America.

The tribute to Thailand marked the beginning of a second decade of Hoosier salutes to other lands and people of the free world.

Welcoming His Excellency Visutr Arthayukti, Thai Ambassador to the United States, were Indiana Gov. Matthew E. Welsh, Lt. Gov. Richard O. Ristine, and Indianapolis Mayor Albert H. Losche. Indiana news media, businessmen, and civic and social leaders also joined with the sponsoring organizations to make the salute a success.

An exotic Thai menu and ball was held the evening of January 12, attended by the Ambassador from Thailand and ranking city and State officials and members of the Indianapolis Council on World Affairs and the Indianapolis Symphony Orchestra.

The musical salute to Thailand January 13 was the 11th annual salute by the city of Indianapolis and the orchestra to a foreign land. Included in the program was the Thai national anthem and a delightful Thai composition, "Kridaphinihan Dance." As in the past, official exchange of greetings took place at intermission time, with His Excellency Visutr Arthayukti representing Thailand.

The President of the United States sent a special telegram commending the orchestra and the council for their participation in the annual program of musical and civic greetings. The programs, which are recorded by the Voice of America for rebroadcast overseas, have been heard by an estimated 50 million people throughout the world. Obviously, they constitute an important diplomatic activity for the United States.

And the programs are an excellent implement for spreading the name of Indiana worldwide. Further, the programs are an invaluable economic tool for firms of Indiana doing business in the respective countries. Lieutenant Governor Ristine informs me that some 50 Indiana firms have offices or business representation in Thailand—including such distinguished firms as Eli Lilly & Co. and P. R. Mallory. In addition to Hoosier agricultural products, made-in-Indiana drugs and chemicals, machinery, and automotive and transportation equipment are sold in Thailand and other southeast Asian markets.

The success of the Salute to Thailand, the enthusiastic support of the people of Indiana, and the appreciative response of the Thai Ambassador are indicative of the fine work done by the salute committee: Izler Solomon, conductor of the Indianapolis Symphony Orchestra; Virgil Hunt, president of the Indianapolis Council on World Affairs; Harold Boxer of the Voice of America; and Mr. and Mrs. E. F. Taggert, Albert Losche, Jr., Richard Spikerman, and Harold Sundstrom.

Editorial comment and stories from the Indianapolis Star and the Indianapolis Times about the Salute to Thailand are typical of Hoosier reaction to this important people-to-people program, and I insert at this point in the RECORD the following:

Editorial, "Salute to Thailand," Indianapolis Star, January 12, 1963.

Editorial, "Salute to Thailand," Indianapolis Times, January 13, 1963.

News feature, "Salute to Thailand Is Set January 12–13 in City, State," Indianapolis Times, January 6, 1963.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Indiana are proud to recognize the people of Thailand and to have hosted that nation's Ambassador and his party in their visit to our State. Let the splendid example of the citizens of Indiana serve as a constant reminder to all of our people that in the area of self-government and relations among mankind there are no political partisans. All of us, Republicans and Democrats, are Americans first, interested in the world about us and in the preservation and advancement of the cause of freemen everywhere.

The material follows:

[From the Indianapolis Star, Jan. 12, 1963]

SALUTE TO THAILAND

It casts no aspersions, in any direction, to confess that the land which will be saluted in Indianapolis this weekend is chiefly known to most of us as the locale of "Anna and the King of Siam," and its musical version, "The King and I."

Thailand is remote and mysterious. Its name conjures up all those mental pictures associated with "the mysterious East"—exotic temples in sultry jungles, dancing girls laden with jingling bracelets, incessant, restless rhythms in cymbals and minor-key music. And so on.

This is all the more reason to rejoice that the occasion of a "Salute to Thailand" brings both incentive and opportunity to get a little better acquainted with this storied land.

Few cherished illusions need be shattered. Thailand is indeed a land of oriental charm and beauty and mystery. It has clung to the deep-running, quiet culture of the East, yielding but little and but slowly to the impatient bustle of Western fascination with growth rates and the industrial revolution. It promises unforgettable experiences to the perceptive visitor. The chance to learn a little about Thailand, and hear some of its music, promises delight to weekend audiences in Indianapolis.

Let it not be thought, either, that Thailand has stood in the shadows while the world passed by. It plays a significant role in the complex and constantly moving affairs of modern Asia. Its government is strong and dependable though turbulence and fear and uncertainty lap at its borders. In any roster of the friends of freedom and the West, the Thais stand up to be counted.

We are happy and proud to join the Indianapolis Symphony Orchestra and the Indianapolis Council on World Affairs in this weekend's salute to Thailand. We welcome the visit of the Ambassador from Thailand, and hope he will find this a warm and hospitable city. We wish the two sponsoring organizations gratifying success in this enterprise, and many happy returns of the occasion.

[From the Indianapolis Times, Jan. 13, 1963]

SALUTE TO THAILAND

King Phumiphon Aduldet, of Thailand, is so skilled a musician, and so modern in his

tastes, that he once played his clarinet in a jam session with Benny Goodman. But he doesn't approve of how the classic musical, "The King and I," treated one of his ancestors.

The present king is proud of his lineage and proud of the glorious history of Siam. But things are different now, even to a new name.

Still blessed with the beauty, culture, and traditions of the ancient East, Thailand is building to a meaningful place in the modern world. Politically and economically, it believes in the things we believe in, and it is a firm ally.

Its industry is booming. Its lovely capital, Bangkok, is the transportation center of southeast Asia.

Today, the Indianapolis Symphony Orchestra salutes Thailand in a concert sponsored by the Indianapolis Council on World Affairs. We salute this project.

The Thai Ambassador and other dignitaries are visiting us. We are proud to welcome them.

---

[From the Indianapolis Times, Jan. 6, 1963]

Agricultural abundance is a common bond linking Indiana farmers with Thailand, the nation being saluted January 12 and 13 by the State of Indiana, the city of Indianapolis, the Indianapolis Council on World Affairs, and the Indianapolis Symphony Orchestra.

A billion-dollar farm State, ranking in the top 20 percent of the Nation's livestock and crop producers, Indiana can be proud to salute Thailand. Fertile soil and willing farmers have made Thailand a rarity among her negihbors in southeast Asia. In an area where poverty and starvation are the rule, Thailand's agriculture-based economy is on a steady upswing, and she is one of the world's largest exporters of rice.

Located in the tropics beneath Red China, 7,700 miles across the North Pole to the other side of the globe, Thailand has almost a year-round growing season. More than 75 percent of the 25 million acres of cultivated land is in rice production. Tobacco is grown in the north, but the Thai import U.S. tobacco to blend with the locally produced variety in order to make an American-blend cigarette. Corn crops are grown twice a year but are almost entirely exported, with little used for food or animal feeding. Casava, cotton, peanuts, soybeans, sugarcane, and coconuts are other agricultural crops.

Agricultural comparisons point up the efficiency of the Hoosier farmer. Thailand is 5.5 times larger in size and population (200,000 square miles and 26.2 million people) than Indiana (36,200 square miles and 4.6 million people). The 18 million acres of farmland in Indiana have a farm population of approximately 670,000 people against Thailand's 25 million acres and 9 million farmworkers.

In the livestock area, Indiana produces over 5 million hogs each year compared with Thailand's 4.7 million in 1959. Indiana's 2 million cattle and calves and 500,000 sheep and lambs match up favorably against Thailand's 5.7 million buffalo. In 1959 Thailand produced 57.5 million chickens, 20 million ducks, and 500,000 geese. Last year Indiana had 13.8 million chickens on the farm and produced 38 million broilers. Thailand does have one variety of livestock that Indiana farmers will never come close to matching—12,500 elephants.

Add to these production figures Indiana's 300-million-bushel corn crop, her $100 million worth of soybeans, $60 million worth of wheat, and you begin to realize how productive the Indiana farmer is. In a land much larger than Indiana and which has as good a climate for agriculture, 13 times as many Thai farmers work the land but produce less.

Indiana farmers, relying heavily on modern U.S.-developed technology, are continuing to increase yields. Pesticides, weedkillers, vaccines, better breeding practices, resistant varieties of crops are all familiar ideas to Hoosier agribusinessmen. They are almost unheard of in Thailand, where hand labor is the norm. Yet Thailand manages to produce more than she nee's, mostly by relying on a favorable climate and hard work.

Another agricultural link between Thailand and Indiana dates back to 1955, when a missionary collected a soil sample in a Thailand rice paddy and sent it to the Indianapolis laboratories of Eli Lilly & Co. From the soil sample Lilly scientists developed the agricultural antibiotic Tylan,[1] now used to combat chronic respiratory disease in poultry and to boost weight gains and feed efficiency in swine.

Typically, the United States is not jealously safeguarding its agricultural secrets. Improved breeds of poultry, hogs, and cattle have been imported from the United States in a cooperative program to develop the livestock industry. Once-prevalent animal diseases are being combated, and Thailand is now starting to export meat to the markets of Hong Kong and Singapore. American and Thai technicians have joined forces in helping farmers develop cooperatives for farm machinery, marketing, and credit.

At present Thailand imports about $8.3 million worth of agricultural goods from the United States, with cotton and tobacco the major items. It has been predicted that the rising economy of the Thai nation will likely result in a growing demand for U.S. agricultural and manufactured products. This is already evident, as the people are beginning to eat bread and drink milk.

A graphic example of the contrasting technology of the two agricultural areas is in the field of farm power units. Indiana farmers own 165,000 cars, 188,300 field tractors, 90,000 trucks—for a total of 443,300 units. Thailand has a total of 134,000 registered motor vehicles, and 78,000 of these are located in Bangkok, the capital city.

In other areas that Indiana farmers and citizens take for granted are these comparisons: Thailand has 3 million radios and 80,000 TV sets, and used 440 million kilowatt hours of electricity in 1960. In Bangkok there are 17 telephones per 1,000 residents. Indiana citizens own 1.2 million radios, 1.2 million TV sets, have 40 telephones per 1,000 residents, and used 19,753 million kilowatt-hours of electric power in 1962.

Although technologically Thailand does not yet compare with Indiana, she is not a backward nation. A free world bulwark against communism in southeast Asia, Thailand is moving forward in industry as well as agriculture. The people are progressive and are proud of their freedom (Thailand means "land of the free"). Just as the United States did in the past, the Thais are using agriculture as the springboard to a higher standard of living. Their past successes and present efforts are being watched carefully by their neighbors.

---

[1] Tylan (tylosin tartrate, Elanco).

---

## Reds Active in Central America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, many Members of this body have mentioned the force of communistic revolutionary subversion in the Caribbean with the result that letters are sometimes received requesting information as to the numerical strength of Communist parties in the countries of that area.

An informative article by Al Burt of the Miami Herald giving the number of members in the Communist parties in the countries of Central America was published in the December 9, 1962, issue of the Washington Post.

In order that its data about the conspiratorial fifth column now at work in the Caribbean may be readily available to all concerned with the security matters, I include it as part of these remarks:

REDS ACTIVE IN CENTRAL AMERICA

(By Al Burt)

GUATEMALA CITY.—Communism speaks directly to some 10,000 hard-core followers in Panama and Central America. And this organized strength feeds on the sympathy of between 60,000 and 75,000 fringe believers.

Panama, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Honduras, El Salvador and Guatemala have the Communist danger inside their houses, and they know it. The Communist strength runs to students and laborers, and thrives on domestic situations that create widespread dissatisfaction. Unemployment, lack of freedom, government corruption, and the miseries of the poor and illiterate are their favorite poison.

In general, Fidel Castro has lost his messiah's license, but sympathy still exists for the Cuban revolution. There is a feeling that Russia and Cuba may have lost more prestige in the current crisis than the United States did in the Cuban Bay of Pigs invasion fiasco in 1961. But optimism is tempered by the knowledge that each country has its own crop of Communists eager to make a new Cuba.

In capsule, the countries line up like this:

Panama: Estimated hard-core Communist strength, 1,000; sympathizers, 10,000 to 20,000. Strong influence at the university, among labor. Aided by unemployment, concentration of wealth and power, United States-Panama friction over the Panama Canal. Justice Minister Marco Robles: "Panama is the most important objective of the Communists because of the canal." A Robles crackdown during the Cuban crisis kept unrest at a minimum.

Costa Rica: Estimated hard-core strength, 300; sympathizers, 10,000. Making strong pitch to bananaworkers and trying to organize peasant leagues among the campesinos. Problem regarded as less serious here, proportionately, but an "elite" Communist group is making strong effort. Government has support of people.

Nicaragua: Estimated hard-core strength, 1,000; sympathizers, 10,000 to 20,000 and growing. Strong among students and laborers. May 1 prade drew 5,000 protesting against the United States for Cuba. Take advantage of widespread unrest resulting from 26 years of rule by one family, the Somozas. Working to recruit large group in 18–25 age bracket who have never voted and have no political affiliation.

Honduras: Estimated hard-core strength, 2,000 to 5,000; sympathizers about 10 times that number. Effectiveness rises and falls directly with Cuba's fortunes. Down now. Honduras has reputation of being most heavily infiltrated of the six countries. The Government says this is exaggerated. Take advantage of economic problems, particularly unemployment, of underdeveloped country. Government pushing social reforms.

El Salvador: Estimated hard-core strength, 1,000; sympathizers, at least 5,000. Prin-

cipal threat in urban areas with Communist-front organizations among labor, teachers, student groups. Strong Government cracks down hard. Antisubversion law passed this fall gives broad police powers, provides up to 7 years in jail. In September, Government headed off trouble by grabbing agitating leaders, hustling them to airport and sending them out of country. Take advantage of overpopulation problem in small country. Government critics complain police work goes beyond efficiency.

Guatemala: Estimated hard-core strength, 1,500 to 2,000; sympathizers, 5,000. Take advantage of discontent with present Government. Strength in rural areas. Popular support in rural areas for return of former President Juan Arevalo, generally blamed with leading country into communism before. Previous Communist experience makes literate wary, but illiteracy high.

## Panama Canal: President Theodore Roosevelt's Decision on Type

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the long history of the Panama Canal there have been many state papers but none of greater importance than President Theodore Roosevelt's message to the Congress of February 19, 1906, submitting the reports of the International Board of Consulting Engineers and of the Isthmian Canal Commission concerning the vital question of the type of canal to be constructed.

Strongly supporting the recommendations of Chief Engineer John F. Stevens for a canal of the lake-lock type, President Roosevelt's stand led to a scorching congressional debate known as the "battle of the levels" in which Stevens played an important role in preparing addresses for Members of Congress. The outcome was decision for the high-level lake-lock plan of the general type as proposed by the minority of the Board of Consulting Engineers as authorized by act, approved June 29, 1906. The successful completion of the Panama Canal, with its opening to traffic in 1914 within cost limits, and the subsequent transit, in both peace and war, of hundreds of thousands of vessels of various types has completely established the wisdom of the 1906 decision of the Congress and the President for the high-level lake-lock type—the great decision.

Since the enactment of Public Law 280, 79th Congress, approved December 28, 1945, as the result of the hysteria over hypothetical questions of security, the Panama Canal has been in another battle of the levels. Featured by arguments based on the newer term "security," rather than the earlier one, "vulnerability," the ensuing debate was, in effect, a reenactment of the 1906 struggle.

With only minor revision, President Roosevelt's 1906 message is just as applicable today as it was then. In order that this important state paper may be read by every Member of the Congress and all the cognizant officials in the executive department, and be known to the Nation at large, I quote it as part of these remarks:

To: The Senate and House of Representatives.

From: Report of the Board of Consulting Engineers for the Panama Canal.

I submit herewith the letter of the Secretary of War transmitting the report of the Board of Consulting Engineers on the Panama Canal and the report of the Isthmian Canal Commission thereon, together with a letter written to the chairman of the Isthmian Canal Commission by Chief Engineer Stevens. Both the Board of Consulting Engineers and the Canal Commission divide in their report. The majority of the Board of Consulting Engineers, eight in number, including the five foreign engineers, favor a sea-level canal, and one member of the Canal Commission, Admiral Endicott, takes the same view. Five of the eight American members of the Board of Consulting Engineers and five members of the Isthmian Canal Commission favor the lock canal, and so does Chief Engineer Stevens. The Secretary of War recommends a lock canal pursuant to the recommendation of the minority of the Board of Consulting Engineers and of the majority of the Canal Commission. After careful study of the papers submitted and full and exhaustive consideration of the whole subject I concur in this recommendation.

It will be noticed that the American engineers on the Consulting Board and on the Commission by a more than 2-to-1 majority favor the lock canal, whereas the foreign engineers are a unit against it. I think this is partly to be explained by the fact that the great traffic canal of the Old World is the Suez Canal, a sea-level canal, whereas the great traffic canal of the New World is the Sault Ste. Marie Canal, a lock canal. Although the latter, the Soo, is closed to navigation during the winter months, it carries annually three times the traffic of the Suez Canal. In my judgment the very able argument of the majority of the Board of Consulting Engineers is vitiated by their failure to pay proper heed to the lessons taught by the construction and operation of the Soo Canal. It must be borne in mind, as the Commission points out, that there is no question of building what has been picturesquely termed "the Straits of Panama"; that is, a waterway through which the largest vessels could go with safety at uninterrupted high speed. Both the sea-level canal and the proposed lock canal would be too narrow and shallow to be called with any truthfullness a strait, or to have any of the properties of a wide deepwater strip. Both of them would be canals, pure and simple. Each type has certain disadvantages and certain advantages. But, in my judgment, the disdvantages are fewer and the advantages very much greater in the case of a lock canal substantially as proposed in the papers forwarded herewith; and I call especial attention to the fact that the chief engineer, who will be mainly responsible for the success of this mighty engineering feat, and who has therefore a peculiar personal interest in judging aright, is emphatically and earnestly in favor of the lock-canal project and against the sea-level project.

A careful study of the reports seems to establish a strong probability that the following are the facts: The sea-level canal would be slightly less exposed to damage in the event of war, the running expenses, apart from the heavy cost of interest on the amount employed to build it, would be less, and for small ships the time of transit would probably be less. On the other hand, the lock canal at a level of 80 feet or thereabouts would not cost much more than half as much to build and could be built in about half the time, while there would be very much less risk connected with building it, and for large ships the transit would be quicker; while, taking into account the interest on the amount saved in building, the actual cost of maintenance would be less. After being built it would be easier to enlarge the lock canal than the sea-level canal. Moreover, what has been actually demonstrated in making and operating the great lock canal, the Soo, a more important artery of traffic than the great sea-level canal, the Suez, goes to support the opinion of the minority of the Consulting Board of Engineers and of the majority of the Isthmian Canal Commission as to the superior safety, feasibility, and desirability of building a lock canal at Panama.

The law now on our statute books seems to contemplate a lock canal. In my judgment a lock canal, as herein recommended, is advisable. If the Congress directs that a sea-level canal be constructed its direction will, of course, be carried out. Otherwise the canal will be built on substantially the plan for a lock canal outlined by the accompanying papers, such changes being made, of course, as may be found actually necessary, including possibly the change recommended by the Secretary of War as to the site of the dam on the Pacific side.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 19, 1906.*

## Private Power Comparison Backfires—TVA Is National Asset, Skybolt a Dud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, private power interests have once again attempted to launch a bitter attack on the Tennessee Valley Authority by making an ironic comparison of the TVA and the Skybolt development project.

Private power interests in national magazines have gone so far as to say that investment of tax dollars into the Skybolt project buy defense while tax money used to construct public powerplants and transmission lines is spent needlessly. How wrong indeed are the propagandists. Skybolt has been canceled as a dud, while TVA continues as a national asset.

The Nashville Tennessean has pointed out the complete folly of the statement contained in this advertising and has shown that the TVA has returned to the Treasury more than enough money to pay for the costly Skybolt program which was a miserable failure and which has been canceled by the present administration.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include this editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

PRIVATE POWER COMPARISON BACKFIRES—TVA IS NATIONAL ASSET, SKYBOLT A DUD

The private power interests have renewed their age-old attacks on public power, using their unlimited cash resources to manu-

facture phony charges and circulate uninformed criticism. As usual, the propaganda peddlers have singled out the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Year after year TVA continues to serve its customers, neither feeling the need nor having the funds to engage in propaganda warfare with rich private power. But this time the anti-public-power crusade has backfired, demonstrating the low level to which its promoters are willing to stoop.

In current issues of national magazines a full page color advertisement appears showing missiles on the wing of a bomber. The accompanying text reads:

"When Skybolt rides a bomber your tax dollars buy defense, but when your tax money is used to build more Federal Government-owned electrical plants and transmission lines it is spent needlessly."

This obviously was to have been the mighty opening gun in a winter offensive against public power. It also represents a little flag waving and a degree of false patriotism on the part of private power interests.

It is a wrench of logic to compare a resource development program with a missile project, but the tricksters employed by the wealthy power corporations didn't hesitate to invent a comparison, pitting the value of Skybolt against the value of TVA.

Therefore, let the real values speak for themselves.

Skybolt was a flop. Obviously it did not represent a good investment of tax dollars. The administration wisely canceled Skybolt after many unsuccessful tests, concluding that any future outlays of funds would be "spent needlessly."

The Government during two administrations already had poured $353 million into Skybolt.

It is ironic that since its beginning in 1933 TVA has returned to the Treasury of the Federal Government $348 million from power revenues and $42 million from nonpower revenues. This total of $390 million is enough to have paid for the now impractical Skybolt with $37 million left over for some worthwhile defense project.

This $390 million, incidentally, does not include payments of $190,500,000 TVA has paid in lieu of city, county, and State taxes during its lifetime.

Interesting too is the fact that the Skybolt development project calls for a thousand missiles for the Air Force and another 100 for Great Britain—at an estimated total cost of $2.5 billion.

Again ironic, since the effort to compare missiles and resource development has been made, is the fact that during the 30-year history of TVA appropriated funds for all valley projects—dams for navigation, dams for flood control, power itself, experimentation, fertilizer production and the rest—amounted to $2.5 billion, or precisely the amount estimated necessary to make Skybolt operational.

Even these figures ignore many other facts about TVA: Resource development creates a climate favorable to industry. This means more jobs and more productivity for the area affected. It brings about general growth and added revenue to State and local governments as well as to the Federal Government. In addition, atomic energy plants and other Federal defense agencies use electricity from TVA at a special reduced rate, saving taxpayers millions of dollars each year—$50 million last year alone.

If the power interests want to make comparisons they should take note that the savings the Federal Government has realized from this reduced rate during the last 9 years have amounted to enough money to have built the U.S. portion of the St. Lawrence Seaway, or more than all the funds spent thus far on Skybolt.

The reason private power interests launched these bitter and frequently uninformed blasts at TVA is because TVA rates force them to hold their own electric power prices down. Millions of electricity users elsewhere in the country are paying lower electric rates because of TVA's "yardstick" policy.

Surveys show that residential electric rates grow progressively higher as the distance from TVA increases.

Yet private power blithely asserts "when Skybolt rides a bomber, your tax dollars buy defense, but—."

The truth is that Skybolt was a skyburst and the private power interests, not realizing it, fell into their own pit of quicksand.

From the beginning, the people of the Tennessee Valley have seen through the gross huckstering and stupid misstatements of fact of the rich utility corporations. Now perhaps others will recognize the brainwashing tactics for what they are—hogwash.

## Oil Spokesman Shocked

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GRAHAM PURCELL
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, the tax proposals made last Thursday by the President in his message to the Congress were very broad and will require much serious study before action is taken. At first glance many of the programs seem sound and equitable.

However, the proposals effecting the petroleum industry seem to me to reflect a lack of understanding of the problems of this vital sector of our economy. The oil industry, so vital to our national security and our continued progress in living standards, has been declining for the past several years. The new tax proposals of the President would hasten this decline and severely hamper an industry which needs help and not another setback.

A statement issued last Thursday afternoon by Mr. Harold Decker, president of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, states the case of the oil industry and points out very well the disastrous effects the new tax proposals would have on the oil industry if they were adopted. Here is Mr. Decker's statement:

President Kennedy in his tax message to the Congress today has recommended changes in petroleum tax policy which would be a drastic setback to the economy and national security. His proposals would directly and severely depress the development of oil and gas resources.

The President's recommendations are shocking because the effect of the proposed changes on the Nation's largest resource industry would run contrary to his objective of stimulating capital investment and economic growth.

The recommendations are designed to impose an additional tax burden of $280 million on oil and gas development. Dollarwise, this is equivalent to reducing percentage depletion from 27½ to 17½ percent. Even worse from the standpoint of the national economy, this additional tax would come directly at the expense of the development of our petroleum resources.

It would reduce drilling activity by more than 5,000 wells per year, which would cost the Nation more than 500 million barrels of new oil reserves each year.

The President's proposal, if enacted into law, would threaten the self-sufficiency of our Nation in petroleum. The industry already is in a depressed condition. Exploration and development activity has declined steadily for 6 years. In 1962 exploratory drilling, the necessary forerunner to the discovery of new reserves, was more than 30 percent below the rate in 1956. So far this year, it has suffered a further decline. Only yesterday it was reported that domestic rotary rig activity is at a 19-year low.

In discussing the broad objectives of the tax philosophy of his administration before the New York Economic Club last December 14, President Kennedy made clear that the basic goal would be to stimulate the economy, and stated that "we can and must step up development of our national resources."

In light of the stated objectives of the President, it comes as a shock to us that he would propose and advocate adverse changes in the long-standing resource tax policy which the Congress wisely has maintained in recognition of the peculiarities of the petroleum industry, the hazardous risk in oil exploration, and the unusually large capital requirements of the petroleum producing industry, which exceed those of any other industry.

The recommended changes which the President has made would seriously aggravate the unhealthy conditions which the domestic oil producing industry is now experiencing. Both the political and business communities are advocating tax and fiscal policies designed to stimulate capital expenditures and economic expansion. These goals cannot be served by actions which would discourage the Nation's largest natural resource industry, expending about $5 billion annually for exploration and development, with roots in thousands of local communities in more than 30 oil and gas producing States.

The Independent Petroleum Association of America is confident that congressional studies will reconfirm, as previous ones have for more than three decades, both the necessity and propriety of existing petroleum tax provisions.

## Remarks of Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson at the Democratic National Committee Luncheon, January 19, 1963, Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to attend a recent luncheon of the Democratic National Committee and hear our distinguished Vice President make a stirring speech on the philosophy and role of the Democratic Party over the years. I urge my colleagues to read this wonderful expression of the belief and guidelines of politics as enunciated

by a man who adopted them as his way of life. It follows:

I have never ceased to be amazed by the dedication of the loyal Democratic Party workers who give so freely of their time and their energies to a cause. To me, this is one of the true strengths of a free people.

You have put aside your affairs and traveled hundreds, and even thousands, of miles to strengthen the party. And you have done so only because you believe in goals which are over and beyond your own, individual interests.

A democratic form of government can exist in the modern world only if people organize themselves to make a point of view effective. Without that organization, government becomes the exclusive province of a small group of officials who have succeeded by one means or another in capturing power. And government that is exclusive is exclusive of the people.

There is a cynical view which holds that politics is the art of organizing to seize power. In our country, I believe, it is the art of organizing to achieve goals that will serve the people.

You and I have chosen the Democratic Party, because we have faith in its dreams and aspirations. And, as we close out the books on the first 2 years of a Democratic administration, I feel we can conclude that our faith has been justified under the leadership of John F. Kennedy.

President Kennedy likes to trace our party's beginning back to 1791, when Thomas Jefferson and James Monroe went from Virginia to New England on what they called a botanizing excursion. The seeds they planted on that trip blossomed almost immediately, and the plant still bears fresh fruit every year in the form of new leaders, new ideas, new accomplishments, and new victories.

We are here as members of the world's third oldest party, and we were a going concern when the English Whigs and Tories were merely the political arm of a few established families.

I never tire of telling people why I think we have remained in good shape for so many years. There is a lesson in this great political success story, and the better we remember it the more effective we will be when we leave Washington and return to our homes and the voters, the real source of our party's strength.

Franklin Roosevelt once said that the Democratic Party would be the majority party as long as it belonged to the people. He went on to describe our party as one that believes "in the wisdom and efficacy of the great majority of the people, as distinguished from the judgment of a small minority."

Our party, Roosevelt said, also "believes that, as new conditions arise beyond the power of men and women to meet as individuals, it becomes the duty of the Government itself to find new remedies with which to meet them."

These are principles of constant change—as man's needs are constantly changing. But they are firmly rooted in stable and fruitful soil.

To begin with, we Democrats are not an exclusive party. If this country was founded as a haven where all who believe in liberty could come, live together in harmony, and try to make their lives better, then it follows that a party which hopes to lead the country must believe in these things, too.

So we Democrats have always been the one great national political party, made up of people from all sections, all classes, all races, all religions. From the outset, we have been the party that has met the immigrant at the dock and helped him to become a citizen—just as it reached out a helping hand to the sharecropper, the working man, the student, and the businessman.

But we knew that this was not enough. Jefferson said that the only healthy republic was one of educated citizens, each with a stake in his country's welfare. So we believe in educating each American to the utmost of his capacity. So we believe in the right of every American to have an equal chance to contribute his talent to our country.

Our foreign policy has been equally uncomplicated down through the years. We Democrats, of course, believe that in a world of aggressors our country can only remain free by remaining brave, by remaining strong. But we do not arm for conquest. We arm to maintain freedom and preserve peace.

But we also believe that "the best way to have a good neighbor is to be one." This is the basis our historic reciprocal trade policy, which encourages commerce among all the nations of the globe. It is the basis of our support of the United Nations in its painful quest for world order, and of our support of programs which help others to help themselves.

These principles, as you can see, are neither numerous nor hard to understand. But they have lasted, and our party has lasted with them.

When I entered politics, some 30-odd years ago, I found my natural home in the Democratic Party. It wasn't hard for me to join—I was born one.

I found it easy to remain in the Democratic Party because my deepest personal political principles were at home there.

I believe that it is the politican's first duty to hold his country together, to appeal to the forces that unite us, and to channel the forces that divide us into paths where a democratic solution is possible. It is our obligation to resolve issues—not to create them.

None of us will ever live to see our country perfect, just as we will never live to see ourselves perfect. But we can try—and if we leave the world a little better than we found it and if we die with a little more understanding than we had when we were born, we are doing all right. I have found that being a Democrat has helped me to try to do both.

Our work is made easier because during the past 2 years, we have had a man in the White House who has dedicated his life to advancing the cause of freedom and social justice in every corner of our land and in every corner of the globe.

John F. Kennedy has taken the principles of the Democratic Party and has applied them to solving the world's problems.

Because our administration believes in strength, freedom is stronger everywhere in the world. We have pulled the fangs of the Cuban rattlesnake—and made it clear there were no limits to our determination to defend our security.

By calling the bluff in Cuba, we made freedom in Berlin and southeast Asia that much surer. And, where a few short years ago the Communist world was solid and united, its major preoccupation today is a bitter internal quarrel between its two most powerful leaders.

Because we believe in collective security and in being a good neighbor, we have supported intelligent trade, the Alliance for Progress, the Peace Corps, and the United Nations.

Because we believe in solving problems, we are seeking to bring our economy to full capacity, so that every American capable of holding a job or a place in college attains those goals; so that the senior citizens among us need no longer feel the crippling financial effects of lingering illness, and so that our great metropolitan areas are made livable for the overwhelming majority of Americans who reside in them.

The Democratic Party has grown in recent years because the people know it is the best vehicle for carrying out their hopes for a better world. We have gained this confidence for three reasons.

First is our history, our principles, and our present program.

Second is our willingness to work long and hard for what we believe in. We know that human needs change, and we must plan for the future. But also we know that current needs must be solved. We are trusted because we have the eyes to see what must be done and the courage to do it.

Third is the kind of people our party attracts. I mean more than the tens of millions of voters—a vast majority, by the way—who consider themselves Democrats. I mean the kind of people—the hundreds in this room and the millions of people to whom we will carry the message when we leave here—who hold our party together.

So I would like to thank you again, in behalf of the President and myself, for what you did for us in 1960; for what you did last year; and for what you will do next year to help elect the Democratic candidates for President and Vice President—whoever they might be.

We will meet again next year to choose those candidates. If the Democratic Party holds true to the country, and if we hold true to our party, we will have doubly earned the victory that will be ours.

## Influence for Sale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, many people have been rightly concerned with the recent emasculation of the civil service system by the Democratic National Committee in the brazen pressure it put upon career Federal employees to buy $100 tickets to the committee sponsored vaudeville show. The following article by Robert Baskin in the Dallas Morning News has even more frightening implications wherein White House influence was peddled at $1,000 a clip. Is there no lengths to which the Kennedy administration refuses to go in playing politics and in building a political machine in the basest image of ward-heeling politics?

CLUB MAY HAVE TROUBLE MAKING GOOD ON PROMISES

(By Robert E. Baskin)

WASHINGTON.—The Presidential box at the National Theater in Washington contains seats for six persons.

What, then, might happen if some 32 Dallas residents—or, worse still, 500 people from across the country—demanded their right to exercise the privileges of the newly formed President's Club?

Membership in the President's Club cost $1,000 a member and members have been assured, by telephone but not in writing, of a number of special privileges not conferred on ordinary taxpaying citizens.

The right to sit in the President's box at various public functions is one of these.

But there are other prerogatives attached to membership in this exclusive club, which sets a record in Presidential effort to assist the financial condition of the Democratic Party.

Each member, for instance, receives a gold-plated membership card in the President's Club, good for 1 year—which means it is good until next year's party fundraising effort starts.

Members of the club, who held their first gathering last Friday at Washington's International Inn, with personal greetings from the President and Vice President and their wives, are also entitled to an invitation to at least one major White House social function during the year.

This, in itself, is going to be difficult to arrange. If carried out, some White House social events will be dominated by the $1,000 card holders, including a very sizable contingent of socially aspiring and well-heeled Texans.

This is not all of it.

Some of the elite crew have been advised that a so-called liaison office is being established at the White House just to handle problems that members of the President's Club have with the Federal Government.

One can readily see that the $1,000 membership in the club could be the biggest bargain ever conceived, particularly if a member has a problem in the field of Government controls.

Invitations to the $1,000 event carried none of these promises of special favor.

However, various officials in the Democratic National Committee followed up the printed invitations with phone calls which assured the recipients of special considerations involved, although these assurances varied somewhat from person to person.

Most Washington lobbyists, for example, were told nothing about the White House liaison office, since they would know this was a pretty ridiculous prospect. Some of the folks in the hinterlands got no word on the presidential box project.

But practically everyone was assured that he would be invited to a major White House social event during the year.

There is a lot of cynicism among the veteran Washington lobbyists who had to shell out the $1,000 for the elite dinner last Friday, at which the President and his wife tablehopped while the paying guests ate. They later sat down for dinner privately with Vice President and Mrs. Johnson.

"It represents a new low for the office of the Presidency," said one lobbyist who attended the $1,000 dinner.

## Youth and Unemployment in New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which was broadcast over WCBS-TV in New York City on January 11 and January 12.

The problems of a city the size of New York are many and varied. One of the most serious is that of unemployed and—at present—unemployable young people. A strong campaign and concerted effort must begin now to solve this problem if these young people are to be turned into useful citizens.

The editorial follows:

YOUTH AND UNEMPLOYMENT IN NEW YORK CITY

ANNOUNCER. The following program is an expression of opinion of WCBS–TV. Speaking for the station: Mr. Norman E. Walt Jr., vice president and general manager of WCBS-TV.

Mr. WALT. Good evening.

New York City is developing a new kind of unemployment problem that may seriously affect its economic life as well as the welfare and safety of its citizens.

Recently, the mayor's task force on youth reported that there are almost 77,000 young people in our city who are out of school and out of work, and that the number of unemployed youth is increasing steadily. Some eagerly seek work and a few manage to find occasional, part-time employment. But a large number of them have stopped looking for work altogether because they are convinced their search will be fruitless, and they are drifting on a tide of frustration and despair.

Who are these young people? A large percentage of them are Puerto Rican and Negro. But nearly all the young unemployed, regardless of their economic or racial backgrounds, are school dropouts.

Each of these young people represents a tragic human waste. But what happens to them as individuals also has consequences for the entire community.

The existence of large numbers of untrained, poorly educated young people is a major problem for our business and industry. Office and industry jobs increasingly demand a minimum of high school education or special training. Many offices and plants will be forced to relocate outside the city, if a sizable portion of the city's work force can't meet their job requirements.

These young unemployed also present a serious threat to those who are employed. Cheap labor in large supply inevitably depresses the labor market and affects everyone else's living standards. It encourages "sweat shops" and economic exploitation.

In fact, the existence of a mass of unemployed youth affects every resident of the city. Idleness and juvenile delinquency go hand in hand. Crime in our city streets has already caused many families to flee the city. If these young people are permitted to attain maturity without any improvement in their lives, even more people will leave the city to avoid the burden of coping with large-scale poverty, unemployment and crime. Every taxpayer should realize that an unemployed youth who is not helped today becomes a community burden tomorrow.

It is, therefore, in our interests—as taxpayers, as employers, as workers—to see that something is done for these young people. It is not simply a matter of finding jobs for them. These youngsters are caught in a vicious circle. There are few jobs for which they are qualified. They are not qualified because they dropped out of school. They dropped out of school because there is no motivation to continue. And they don't have the motivation to remain in school because they have seen from the experience of their parents, older brothers, sisters and friends that racial discrimination bars them from most job opportunities.

This truly is a vicious circle and it has to be broken at many points. As Mayor Wagner pointed out recently, we have to deal with the total environment of these youngsters—housing, family relations, education, and discrimination in hiring. There are any number of well-intentioned public and private agencies who are trying to do just this—the schools themselves, welfare agencies, youth services, employer and trade union groups. But none of them are as effective as they might be because each operates on its own, with little or no heed to the work of other agencies and frequently with duplication of effort. For example, there are school vocational courses which train youngsters for jobs which rarely exist, such as cabinetmaking, while there are no training opportunities at all in a number of fields where there are job opportunities. Again, for lack of coordination, various vocational schools are actually in competition with one another for available jobs.

What is needed is a team effort with a good quarterback.

During the past year, the city youth board made a good start toward creating this kind of effort when it sponsored the mayor's task force on youth and work. But this is only a start. There still is no citywide agency which coordinates all the various youth programs and services now in existence. There still is no single agency in the city responsible for gathering the kind of information which would provide schools with a clear picture of the changing job market, that would identify expanding industries and new skill requirements and thereby define the kinds of vocational programs the schools should emphasize. What the city needs is a single agency that would provide this information service and, at the same time, have the responsibility for planning overall city youth policy and seeing to it that all the youth services work together as a team. Without such an agency, much of the efforts to help young people in our city will miss their mark.

Channel 2 urges the mayor to give the youth board the authority and the financing to enable it to develop an overall plan of attack on youth unemployment and to see that the best use is made of present efforts. Channel 2 urges the mayor to take such steps now. The presence of large numbers of unemployed youth in the city is social dynamite. No problem has a more compelling claim on our attention and on our resources.

Thank you and goodnight.

## Mrs. Harper Sibley: A Matter of Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANK J. HORTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 21, 1963*

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, my home community of Rochester, N.Y., has as one of its residents one of the distinguished women of the world. She is Mrs. Harper Sibley.

Mrs. Sibley has gained distinction far and wide for her selfless activities. She has applied her talents and energies to a host of humanitarian projects. Not alone has been the benefit to mankind of Mrs. Sibley's contributions, for her service also has proved an inspiring example to other women.

On a recent visit to her home from one of her many globe encircling missions, Mrs. Sibley gave an interview to the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle. I take pleasure in submitting it at this time for insertion in the RECORD:

MRS. SIBLEY RETURNS—HOME FRONT WHIRL BEGINS

(By Lynne Watson)

Rochester's famous lady has been home for just 5 days after a 4-month trip to

Europe and the Near East, barely enough time for her to open the piles of mail in her office at her 400 East Avenue home.

In fact Mrs. Harper Sibley probably won't get all that mail read, for the churchwoman and lecturer is off again tonight—this time to New York for meetings on one of her favorite projects, the Japan International Christian University.

After New York, Mrs. Sibley goes to Oxford, Ohio, to speak to Western College for Women. In February she plans a trip to California to see "my two daughters, six grandchildren and five great-great-grandchildren there" as well as address a Rotary meeting in Los Angeles and a women's group in San Francisco.

Today's agenda is typical of the fast-moving former president of the United Council of Church Women. She'll introduce Andrew W. Cordier, dean of the Graduate School of International Affairs at Columbia University, to the City Club of the Chamber of Commerce, and speak that evening herself at the Century Club.

Mrs. Sibley thrives on this schedule which would exhaust many a man or woman younger than her 75 years.

"I believe there are infinite sources of energy in the universe," she said last night at her home. "It's a question of living in harmony with these spiritual resources."

As usual on her trips abroad, Mrs. Sibley combined her love of travel with a desire to check the progress of religion in other nations.

As an unofficial observer at the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council in Rome, she found this historic meeting "has moved so fast that of the eight volumes of schemata (agenda) for its reopening September 8, the second already has needed revising."

She had these comments on other subjects:

The Supreme Court decision outlawing the board of regents school prayer in this State: "It's too bad the regents wrote that prayer," she said. "But it really was a Government group entering into the picture. This doesn't mean religion is finished in our schools—there's just a little hysteria at the moment over the decision."

Israel: "Israel has had a great deal of help" from other countries in its drive for progress. "But I hate to see girls in military uniforms, it's bad enough the boys must do it."

Evangelists: "Certain people have been stirred to something very permanent" after hearing one of them. She welcomes the rebirth of religion that some observers feel is happening in America, but cautions that nuclear war alone shouldn't send people to God—"religion just from fear has no validity."

A nonbeliever in God can also live life to its utmost, "but he misses something," said the widow of the former president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

"Why live in the cellar and not see the sun?"

## The Administration's Tax Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous material, I wish to call the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives to some remarks in the January 24 issue of the Durand Gazette, Durand, Ill., under the column entitled "In This Column," written by the Editor and Publisher Mr. John van Sickle.

I think that these few lines very succinctly captured the thoughts of many thinking citizens with respect to the administration's tax proposals. The article follows:

IN THIS COLUMN

No matter what your politics happen to be, does it make sense to increase the Federal budget and propose tax cuts in almost the same breath?

Admittedly, I am no economist, but I know that if I don't put more money in the bank than I check out, that I am headed for trouble. Perhaps, a government can run its finances differently.

President Kennedy's theory is that a cut in income taxes will give people more money to spend, will create more consumer demand, and eventually enable the United States to balance its budget as improved business conditions will be reflected in higher tax collections even at lower rates.

But, to be realistic, if our Government continues to spend more than it takes in, will this not lead to inflation and depreciation of the value of the dollar still further?

Senator DIRKSEN says the budget proposals are incredible. Indeed they are. Even many of the Democrats are alarmed at the size of the budget.

Nor is the end in sight. With medicare given a chance of being adopted during this session of Congress, another increase in social security taxes lie just ahead.

Probably the thing that irks me the most is that I know there is so much waste in Federal spending. When a government is as large as ours, there is bound to be an immense amount of waste, but it breaks my heart to pay my income taxes and know that so much of what you and I have paid will literally be going down the drain.

## George H. Mead—The Mead Corp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, George H. Mead was not only a great industrialist, but he was a great American. Mr. Mead became the first president of the Mead Corp. when it was formed from the Mead Paper Co. in 1930. In 1942 he was elected chairman of the board. At the time of his recent passing at age 85, he was honorary chairman of the board.

Although the headquarters of this great corporation is in Dayton, Ohio, and Chillicothe, Ohio, is the "White Paper capital of the world," Mead was a leading pioneer in the development of the paper industry in the South.

Few people know the story of the paper industry in the South, and the important part it has played in developing the South's great new vigor and economic progress. Mead played a major role in this southern development. Today every school boy in the South knows the importance of tree farming.

Mr. Mead devoted much of his energy to the national welfare. He was one of the founders of the Business Advisory Council for the United States in 1933, and a member of the National Defense Mediation Board in 1941. He served on the Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the U.S. Government in 1947.

As a member of the National War Labor Board in 1942, he was closely associated with the "Assistant President of the United States," our own beloved James F. Byrnes. He greatly aided Mr. Byrnes in mobilizing the industry and manpower of this Nation for complete victory over the Axis Powers.

Mr. Mead maintained a residence at Aiken, S.C., and donated his property at Aiken to St. Thaddeus Episcopal Church in 1955 for the establishment of a school, Mead Hall, in memory of George H. Mead, Jr., who was the first marine officer killed at Guadalcanal, during World War II.

The following editorial from the Kingsport Times, Kingsport, Tenn., where one of the Mead plants is located, pays a very eloquent and deserved tribute to George H. Mead, industrialists, philanthropist, and American patriot:

A BUILDER OF AMERICA

In a day and age when the old-fashioned American businessman has become almost an object of suspicion to some people, or at least regarded as something out of date, it is good to remind ourselves that there is no class of people to whom this country owes more than this same businessman. There is no class of people who have contributed more to building the country and who have done more to bring into being the American way of life. While the socialists and demagogues and political opportunists slander the American businessman with dirty words, he has been the real builder of America.

We are reminded of this fact by the death of George Mead, honorary board chairman of the Mead Corp. George Mead was one of those industrial tycoons we hear so much about. In the course of a long and vigorous life he had the leading role in the building of a great industry that gave many thousands of Americans jobs and in so doing helped to create many happy and prosperous communities in this country.

George Mead was not the classical example of the poor American boy struggling up from the bottom. He was the classical example of the young man brought up in a good home, given a good education which included understanding of the responsibility of citizenship. He went to work to prove that he had learned that lesson and he proved his right to come to the top by the use of a good brain, a fine character and the use of the old-fashioned virtue of hard work and diligence.

Like other men of his stamp and caliber George Mead took time out for what is called public service. He took on government work and served on many advisory committees and agencies of the Federal Government under different Presidents. But the point we would like to make and a point we think really needs stressing in our time is that his greatest public service was the role he played in the development of American industry. This was every bit as much public service as his work with government agencies, and we submit that it had a greater impact, a greater effect on the country and came closer to the American people. America would not be America without this sort of public service.

We here in Kingsport know something of this fact. We know that much of the prosperity and happiness of our people comes from the growth of the Mead operation in this city. We know what a shattering effect it would have if the plant shut down for good. We know that the men who operate the plant here understand that the manufacture of paper is not the be-all and end-all of their work. It is a contribution to the growth of the community and the growth of the Nation. This is not a materialistic idea but a human idea.

We get a little tired of hearing demagogs speak of corporations as if they were some devilish invention of wicked men. We get a little irritated at hearing it implied that all businessmen are interested in is profit and have no concern for human values. That does not square with the facts. The history of this country gives it the lie.

Men like George Mead in their lives give the lie to such charges and insinuations. The growth of America has been the growth of American business. It is American business that creates the jobs for our millions of people and gives them the highest standard of living of any people on earth.

George Mead was a representative of the highest type of American businessman. We repeat, it is such men who are the true builders of America.

## Fifth Anniversary of International Tracking of Space Vehicles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news release from National Aeronautics and Space Administration:

FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF INTERNATIONAL TRACKING OF SPACE VEHICLES

The Government and people of the United States will express their thanks and appreciation to the peoples and governments of 16 countries at a ceremony marking the 5th anniversary of international tracking of space vehicles on January 31 at the Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Md.

Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, and James E. Webb, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, will participate in the program.

The Vice President, as Chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, will award scrolls of appreciation to the ambassadors of the countries which have cooperated with the United States in the establishment of the worldwide networks used in tracking manned and unmanned satellites.

Dr. Harry Goett, Director of the Goddard facility, will preside at the ceremonies and Astronaut Walter M. Schirra, Jr., of the Manned Spacecraft Center will be among the speakers.

The tracking station network was activated to track *Explorer I*, launched on January 31, 1958. This network included minitrack stations located primarily in the Western Hemisphere. Since that time, other networks—Deep Space, Manned Space Flight, and Baker-Nunn—have been added to form a worldwide tracking network and data acquisition system for satellites and space probes launched by the United States.

*Explorer I* carried the International Geophysical Year scientific experiment of Dr. James A. Van Allen and discovered the radiation belt around the earth. The satellite is still in orbit, although no longer transmitting information from space. A model of this first U.S. earth satellite will be displayed for the occasion, as well as other historic NASA satellites and launch vehicles.

A signal from this country's oldest transmitting satellite is expected to be received in the Goddard auditorium during the ceremonies. This is the 6-inch grapefruit-sized Vanguard I, launched March 17, 1958, whose transmissions led to calculations showing that the earth is pear shaped. Information received from Vanguard I via the tracking networks has also helped in locating points on earth to an accuracy not previously known and has provided data on the effects of solar pressure.

While the other speakers will talk of the scientific and political implications of such a worldwide cooperative effort, Astronaut Schirra, whose Sigma 7 spacecraft orbited the earth six times last October 3, will express his personal appreciation and that of his fellow astronauts for the manned space flight network which kept Astronauts John Glenn, Scott Carpenter, and himself in constant communication by voice and signal with men on the ground during their orbits around the earth.

Following the formal anniversary ceremonies, the Ambassadors and other guests will tour Goddard facilities and view the progress made in earth's contact with outer space. The Goddard tour will show how the limited communications which tracked Explorer I 5 years ago have expanded through the demands of the space age to an integrated network of teletype, telephone, and high-speed data circuits comprising 177,000 miles of communications with 27 oversea facilities in 19 different political jurisdictions.

The minitrack network has grown to a worldwide tracking and data acquisition system for unmanned satellites and space probes launched by the United States. Established primarily in the Western Hemisphere in 1958, minitrack today comprises five stations in the United States and eight abroad. These stations provide precision tracking, command and telemetry data to the Space Operations Control Center on such satellites as Vanguard, Explorer, as well as the Ariel and Alouette scientific satellites of the United Kingdom and Canada.

Spacecraft traveling to the moon and beyond are tracked by the Deep Space Instrumentation Facility (DSIF) network. Three permanent installations of powerful transmitters and sensitive receivers are located approximately 120 degrees apart around the earth at Goldstone, Calif.; Johannesburg, Republic of South Africa; and Woomera, Australia.

The manned space flight network was built for the specific requirements of Project Mercury, which demands constant and dependable communications by voice with the astronaut from launch to landing. This network is capable of faster data handling than minitrack and maintains immediacy of conversational contact with the capsule through eight ground stations abroad, eight ground stations in the United States plus U.S. ships at sea.

The fourth tracking network is optical rather than electronic and comprises a worldwide system of Baker-Nunn telescopic cameras. While used as backup for the radio tracking system, its primary function is to obtain information on atmospheric densities and exact earth dimensions. The network is operated by the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory under a NASA grant and functions in nine countries abroad.

Countries to receive scrolls of appreciation for their international efforts from Vice President JOHNSON are: the Argentine Republic, Australia, the United States of Brazil, Canada, the Republic of Chile, the Republic of Ecuador, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and northern Ireland, India, Iran, Japan, the United Mexican States, the Netherlands, the Federation of Nigeria, the Republic of Peru, the Republic of South Africa, and Spain.

## New Farm Policy Omits Mandates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the January 25, 1963, edition of the Albert Lea Tribune. I call attention to the views stated in this editorial because they are such an outstanding presentation of the opinions of many of the people in our agricultural areas and worthy of consideration by my colleagues.

NEW FARM POLICY OMITS MANDATES

With no little satisfaction, the Tribune notes that the Kennedy administration will abandon its get tough policy for farmers. We have long protested the "or else" approach to the problems of surplus farm produce. Newsmen now write from Washington that a special farm message may be submitted to the Congress in a few days that will emphasize voluntary compliance.

Mandatory controls were the basis of Democratic election campaign in 1960 and were basic to legislative proposals made to the Congress in 1961 and again last year. This rigid control approach has long been advocated by Dr. Willard Cochrane, formerly a teacher at the University of Minnesota. When former Governor Freeman became Secretary of Agriculture, he took Cochrane and Cochrane's ideas with him to Washington.

It seems worth noting that the news of the administration's about face on its farm approaches was given to news reporters by "an authoritative source." Secretary Freeman wasn't that source and only in the most lengthy dispatches does the Secretary's name appear at all and then only in connection with the dairy industry program—which even he admits is failing.

The best news is that no longer will a farmer be forced to do what his Government believes to be good for him or face economic ruin. As noted above, the administration—which is to say Secretary Freeman—had urged rigid controls on farmers in the Congress twice and twice the Congress voted not to extend the managed production concept.

The Congress, instead, adopted voluntary statutes. Results in the voluntary feed grain program are generally so satisfactory, the administration has apparently decided on its shift from mandatory to voluntary controls for feed grains, dairy and cotton programs.

Taxpayers will benefit from this shift of policy. The feed grains program will cost less, because the present voluntary program has markedly reduced surpluses. A dairy

program is expected to cost nearly $150 million less than today's figure. Cotton costs will offset some of these savings.

But the most important fact of all is that the gun has been removed from the farmer's head.

## Dr. Kelsey Describes New Drug Protections for the Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, there is no such thing as an absolutely safe drug—one which would not be harmful to some one, or to many people, under certain circumstances. That is why the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for nearly 25 years has required extensive pretesting of all new drugs before they can be placed on sale.

But the 1938 act nevertheless had many deficiencies. These loopholes were recognized by some of us long before the thalidomide incident last year stirred public concern to such a fever pitch that we were finally able to close the worst loopholes in the 1938 act applying to prescription drugs. My bill introduced originally in January 1961, H.R. 1235, to rewrite the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938, contained many of the provisions of the prescription drug provisions of the law we enacted last year along with provisions to close other loopholes in the act. Eliminating the provisions of H.R. 1235 on new drugs which are now law, I have now reintroduced substantially the same bill in this Congress, under the same number, H.R. 1235, to achieve the additional reforms needed in our 25-year-old consumer protection laws. These include stronger controls over over-the-counter drugs, over barbiturates, and over amphetimines, the pretesting for safety of all cosmetics, more stringent factory inspection requirements for all foods, drugs, and cosmetics, the required pretesting for safety and efficacy of therapeutic devices, and so on.

TIGHTER SUPERVISION OVER EXPERIMENTAL DRUGS

Under the Drug Control Act we passed last year, the public is now being given far greater protection in connection with the experimental use of new drugs before they go on sale. It is most fitting that Dr. Frances O. Kelsey, the one individual most directly responsible for preventing the sale in this country of the drug thalidomide, is now in charge of this work as the newly designated chief of the Investigational Drug Branch of the Food and Drug Administration.

Her assignment is an extremely difficult one because, as I noted earlier, there is no such thing as a completely safe drug under all circumstances. She must weigh the methods being used to test drugs before they can be used experimentally on humans. She is also in charge of the re-investigations of drugs previously approved for sale. One of the main achievements of the new law we passed last year, based on one of the cardinal points in H.R. 1235 as introduced originally in 1961, is in the form of new powers the Government now has to remove from public sale previously approved drugs which are later suspected of constituting an imminent hazard to public health. Previously, the Government had to prove such a drug was actually dangerous in use in order to revoke its earlier clearance and take it off the market.

"ON THE RECORD" INTERVIEW WITH DR. KESLEY

Public confidence in the protections accorded consumers under our drug laws will certainly rise as a result of the assignment of Dr. Kelsey to this important assignment, and also by the intelligent and forthright manner in which she has undertaken this challenging and awesome responsibility.

In that connection, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of my remarks an excellent article by an outstanding Washington correspondent, James Deakin, of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, about Dr. Kelsey's approach to her new assignment. This article is based on a joint interview conducted with Dr. Kelsey by representatives of the Detroit News, Newark News, and Washington Star, as well as the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. Many of the Members may have seen the copyrighted question-and-answer interview yesterday in the Sunday Washington Star. While both papers in which I have seen the interview used the question-and-answer text in full, each had its own analysis and summary of the information, and I am pleased to have the opportunity to bring Mr. Deakin's story to the attention of the Members.

Jim Deakin has followed the drug-control issue over a long period of time. He did an outstanding job of informing the people of St. Louis about the need for tighter food, drug and cosmetic legislation long before we had ever heard the word "thalidomide." I am grateful to him for the many stories he has written over the years about my concern in this field, and I herewith present his account of the joint interview with Dr. Kelsey along with the text of the reporters' questions and Dr. Kelsey's answers, as carried in Sunday's St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

TWELVE MORE DRUGS SUSPECTED OF CAUSING DEFORMITIES

(By James Deakin)

WASHINGTON, January 26.—The Government has asked for reports from the manufacturers of 12 drugs suspected of being possible causes of birth deformities, Dr. Frances O. Kelsey of the Food and Drug Administration said today.

Dr. Kelsey emphasized, however, that there is no proof at present that any of these drugs actually are harmful. If any proof had been found, she said, "something would have been done."

As an FDA medical officer, Dr. Kelsey last year prevented the sale of the drug thalidomide in the United States, by refusing to license it for commercial distribution. Thalidomide is believed to have caused birth deformities in thousands of European babies.

Dr. Kelsey talked with Post-Dispatch, Detroit News, Washington Star, and Newark News reporters in one of a series of copyrighted, on-the-record interviews with Government officials. She was appointed last month as Director of the FDA's new Investigational Drug Branch.

In reply to a question, she confirmed that the 12 drugs under investigation are in the popular and much-sold fields of tranquilizers, antihistamines and various cold remedies. Some of the antihistamines are taken by pregnant women as treatment for morning sickness.

Dr. Kelsey pointed out, however, that the drugs in question can be obtained only with a physician's prescription if they are recommended for use during pregnancy.

Two of the drugs on which reports are being sought, Dr. Kelsey said, are preludin and postafen, both of which are suspected of being possible causes of deformities in newborn babies.

Preludin, also known as phenmetrazine, is an appetite-curbing preparation. Postafen, an antihistamine preparation sometimes mixed with the vitamin pyridoxine, is a remedy for morning sickness.

The other drugs under investigation were not identified, but in a recent speech at a symposium on birth defects, Dr. Kelsey listed several others believed in medical circles to be possible causes of birth deformities. Among them were:

Glutethamide (doriden), a hynotic; chlorthalidone (hygroten), a diuretic; tolbutamide, an oral antidiabetic drug; thiazide-type diuretics; podophyllin, a cathartic; podophyllotoxin, a constituent of podophyllin; ancoloxin, an antihistamine used as a morning sickness remedy; the phenothiazine tranquilizer drugs; the nasal decongestants commonly present with antihistamines in various cold remedies, and tetracycline, an antibiotic.

In reply to a question, Dr. Kelsey said that some of these drugs have been on the market for 10 or 15 years.

The FDA, she said, has asked the manufacturers of these drugs to report any information they may have on adverse effects experienced by persons taking the drugs.

Asked whether new FDA regulations that will go into effect February 7 will prevent a repetition of the thalidomide incident, Dr. Kelsey said no one could give absolute assurance of the safety of a drug. She added, however, that many harmful drugs can be brought to light through careful clinical testing.

The new FDA branch headed by Dr. Kelsey will check on whether drugs have been tested adequately before the manufacturer applies for permission to put them on the market. This is the so-called investigational stage, in which drugs are tested on animals and human beings but not sold for general use.

Following is the transcript of the interview with Dr. Kelsey, copyright 1963 by the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the Detroit News, Newark News, and Washington Star:

"Question. Dr. Kelsey, you have been named to head the investigational drug branch of the Food and Drug Administration, and new regulations for your branch go into effect February 7. What protections will the public have now that it didn't have before?

"Dr. KELSEY. The FDA will be aware of every drug that is under investigation, being tested in humans. Previously, we were only required to be told that these tests were going on at the time the drug was submitted for clearance as a new drug. Consequently, many drugs might be tried on humans which we would not be aware of. We might not know a drug was being tested that had shown toxic effects.

"Now we will have some control over the types of investigations, the investigators that

will be used, the subjects that will be used, the types of tests, how much animal work should precede particular types of human testing, and so on.

"Question. Do these new regulations prevent a repetition of the thalidomide incident?

"Dr. KELSEY. I don't think one can give an absolute assurance of the safety of a drug. There are so many factors involved so many different adverse reactions that may only come to light in a few persons or a select group of the population, that may not show up until years of use.

"There are many, however, that with careful clinical testing can be brought to light, and physicians can be made aware of these, and weigh whether the drug should be used or not.

"Question. Are other new rules or regulations still needed to prevent the toxic effect of drugs?

"Dr. KELSEY. I think it is simply new knowledge that is needed, a further knowledge of how drugs act and how human subjects respond to them.

"Question. The last time I looked, Dr. Kelsey, this investigational drug branch consisted of yourself and two chemists. Under these new regulations, do you have sufficient authority and employees to do this big job?

"Dr. KELSEY. We are shorthanded now, and we are going to have a great many more drugs to handle under the new regulations, so I hope to get considerably more people.

"We already have perhaps 300 new drug applications a year. You realize that perhaps there will be maybe 10 investigational drugs to every new drug.

"Question. You mean that, on February 7, you will have only yourself and two other people to handle hundreds of drugs in the coming year?

"Dr. KELSEY. What we anticipate doing at first is to get assistance, so we will borrow, as it were, from the personnel in the existing new drug division. Meanwhile, we are having a very active recruitment program, and we are getting new medical officers in all the time.

"Question. Do you feel you have enough authority to do the job on other drugs that you apparently did on thalidomide?

"Dr. KELSEY. I think so, yes; I believe so.

"Question. Doctor, the American people look to you as a symbol of better protection in the drug field. Do you think they may be expecting you to do miracles that you can't perform?

"Dr. KELSEY. It depends on how realistic their hopes are. If they think that toxicity of drugs is going to be absolutely eliminated, they will be bound to be disappointed. The decision whether to allow a drug to be used, or to take one off the market, simply because a few side effects appear—these are going to be very difficult decisions, and some of them are bound to be wrong. We hope there won't be many, though.

"Question. You said recently that FDA had 12 drugs under investigation as possible causes of birth deformities. Are these drugs in the popular and much-sold field of tranquilizers, antihistamines, and various cold remedies?

"Dr. KELSEY. That is right. Now, some of these, we know, are based on rather sketchy reports, and there may be no valid reason to have concern about these drugs. On the other hand, we do have these reports and we have to examine them and then weigh the evidence. There have been two or three reports from Europe on antihistimines. There are, of course, dozens of antihistamines. Many are used in the treatment of morning sickness, and according to British reports, at least 30 percent of women take such a drug during early pregnancy.

"If you have a deformity among these mothers, is it a coincidence? Is it somehow related to the fact that she was nauseated during pregnancy? Did the drug somehow play a role? We just don't know.

"Question. Are a substantial number of these drugs on sale in the United States now?

"Dr. KELSEY. That is correct.

"Question. What is the FDA doing to find out whether any of these drugs are harmful?

"Dr. KELSEY. At the moment there is no proof that these particular drugs cause any harm.

"Question. Are you calling for reports from the manufacturers of these drugs now?

"Dr. KELSEY. That is right, yes. We are asking them.

"Question. What information are you asking now?

"Dr. KELSEY. In general, if the manufacturers have had any reports of adverse reactions.

"Question. Are they bound to give you that information?

"Dr. KELSEY. They will be legally bound to comply, beginning May 1 under the new law. At the present time they usually do this on a voluntary basis. We have been receiving reports.

"Question. Have you had good cooperation from them?

"Dr. KELSEY. Yes.

"Question. Are you reviewing the applications that they originally filed for these drugs?

"Dr. KELSEY. Well, we certainly are looking over them, yes. It may be a question of revising the labeling to indicate that the safety of these particular drugs has not been established in pregnancy. Remember, these are prescription items if recommended for use during pregnancy.

"Question. Antihistamines are also widely available without prescription?

"Dr. KELSEY. That is correct; yes.

"Question. Thus far, you have found no pattern of thalidomide scope with any of these drugs?

"Dr. KELSEY. That is right. If we had, something would have been done.

"Question. Italy has banned the sale of preludin, which is a drug suspected of causing birth deformities.

"Dr. KELSEY. Italy has put it back on the market again. We are going to follow this drug as well as any others where there are any reports that suggest that there might be an association between the drug and malformations of the fetus, but we have no basis at this time for taking the drug off the market.

"Question. Does the same situation apply to the drug postafen, which Sweden apparently is in the process of withdrawing because it is suspected of causing birth deformities?

"Dr. KELSEY. That is right. This is one of these mixtures of antihistamine and the vitamin pyridoxine, and we have similar ones in this country. We are requesting the manufacturer for details. This has not been removed from the market anywhere. It has been made a prescription item only in some countries.

"Question. But, as yet, you have no evidence of any excessive birth deformities?

"Dr. KELSEY. No, that is perfectly right, and these drugs have been used, oh, for 10, 15 years I would say.

"Question. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY has placed great emphasis on the difficulty in getting international coordination, when suspicions are raised about a drug in one country. It takes a long time for the information to filter across the Atlantic. Has there been any improvement in this coordination?

"Dr. KELSEY. We have a liaison officer with the State Department, but I don't think any system is adequate that we have now. We have certainly got to get improved communications. We are working on it, and I think already there is some evidence that it has improved. Being faced in a matter of 2 or 3 months with acquiring a great deal of information here, we have got to be able to handle that ourselves, and this is a problem. This is our No. 1 problem, I would say.

"Question. But as of now, you are relying essentially on newspapers to find out whether a drug is being or has been removed from the market, let's say, in Italy?

"Dr. KELSEY. I would think that, at the moment, is correct. My branch frequently gets a call from a newspaperman first, to be perfectly frank. It is usually followed very closely by some other information from, say, the State Department.

"After May 1 any American manufacturer who acquires information about an adverse effect of a drug is required to report that information to us. Some of these firms have direct contacts and associations with foreign manufacturers.

"Question. Since enovid is still under investigation by the FDA for suspected blood-clotting difficulties, are women using this drug for birth control taking a risk of injury or death?

"Dr. KELSEY. Well, I think this is a loaded question, because if I say 'No,' you will say, 'Why are you investigating it, then?' As you know, a group is coming to discuss it. A great many women have taken this drug, and some have developed thrombophlebitis. But many women developed it before the drug was introduced. It is a question of deciding. You have to weigh the theoretical—at this time—harm of this drug with the known value to your patient.

"Question. Do you think the new regulations will delay new drugs reaching the market?

"Dr. KELSEY. I think it will have the reverse effect. We will be able to point out deficiencies in the plan of testing, or in the toxicology, and so on. The manufacturers will be able to adjust their studies as they go along.

"Question. The very controversial cancer drug, krebiozen, has long been in use as an experimental drug, and never as a regular prescription drug. Is there any way its manufacturers can continue to use it without coming to you with their data?

"Dr. KELSEY. The situation here is quite complicated, since this drug comes under the Public Health Service as well as FDA. But to answer your question about submission of data, they would have to—in order to continue to investigate the drug.

"Question. If they do not comply, can you stop the investigational use?

"Dr. KELSEY. If we feel that the investigation is not being carried out in a manner which is safe, we can stop it, yes.

"Question. Dr. Kelsey, remembering the thalidomide incident, how are you and the pharmaceutical houses getting along now?

"Dr. KELSEY. Oh, fine, I would say. I hope."

## Commonsense in Advertising Copy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to the attention of my colleagues the commonsense contained in the following copy which appeared in an

advertisement by Warner & Swasey Co. in the U.S. News & World Report:

AS EVERY BANKRUPT KNOWS YOU CANNOT SPEND YOURSELF RICH

Did you enjoy your trip to Europe? You paid for one, in subsidies to steamship lines.

Are you glad to pay someone else's electricity bill? You do. You have to pay the billions for Federal power dams, but people near them enjoy cheaper electricity than you do.

If you are not in a depressed area you soon may be, with your savings being poured out to so-called depressed people.

Do you get enough benefit from the Federal roadbuilding program to pay your share of the billions it costs in taxes?

Billions to farmers is pleasant for the farmers, but has to be paid by all taxpayers, including you.

Veterans with nonservice disability may like the billions they cost, but that doesn't help the vast majority of taxpayers.

The billions pour out, the deficit grows, of course. Any child knows that when you waste money, when you spend more than you earn, you go broke. If you could spend yourself rich, every park-bench panhandler would be a millionaire.

## WAVZ Radio Editorial on Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago we received in this Chamber the President's tax message. It was a message which not only prescribed a tax reduction, but also a series of badly needed reforms in our tax structure. I am in full agreement with the President's proposals. I believe that the tax reforms are no less important for the Nation's economic growth and the expansion of business as are the proposals to reduce taxes. The two go together and Congress should act on them both.

Recently there came to my attention the text of a brief editorial broadcast over radio station WAVZ of New Haven, Conn., dealing with the subject of taxes. The editorial was broadcast by Mr. Daniel W. Kops, president of WAVZ, on Tuesday, January 15, and Wednesday, January 16, 1963, and was heard in many parts of the State of Connecticut. This editorial expresses my sentiments on the subject and I am pleased to commend it to the attention of my colleagues. It reads as follows:

EDITORIAL BROADCAST BY DANIEL W. KOPS

We take a great deal of pride in the leadership that the United States has given the rest of the world in the development of democracy and technological advances.

But there are times when it behooves us to abandon our complacency and take advantage of what we can learn from abroad. We have in mind at the moment the booming prosperity which has developed in Western Europe while our economy has rested near dead center.

We don't want to oversimplify the differences, but the one that stands out is taxes. The countries of Western Europe have found that a simple tax structure encourages business growth, which in turn raises the standard of living of the country generally.

On the other hand, we have perpetuated taxes so heavy that they have discouraged expansion of business and growth. We think that sentiment around the country has crystallized in favor of tax reduction. We agree with President Kennedy's proposal that reductions be coupled with tax reform. If instead, Congress enacts perfunctory changes in rate without real reform, it will be years before we have another chance.

We in Connecticut faced with the possibility of increased State taxes would have special reason to welcome a cut in individual tax rates. It is equally desirable to see changes in the corporate tax structure which would spark the economy. We look to our Congressmen for effective action in this field.

Thank you for your attention.

## Where Labor Unions Get Their Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, in view of recent events, J. Mack Swigert's article, which appeared in the January 21st issue of U.S. News & World Report, is particularly timely. Because this article, entitled, "Where Labor Unions Get Their Power," is authored by an authority on labor law, I believe its contents will be of interest to all Members and citizens and ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

WHERE LABOR UNIONS GET THEIR POWER

(By J. Mack Swigert, authority on labor law)

Today there is a widespread feeling that unions need further regulation. How is this to be achieved? The public must understand that this is not a simple problem. Union power has many roots. Here are the major ones.

1. PUBLIC SYMPATHY FOR UNIONS

One of the ultimate sources of union power is the public sympathy which arose in the early sweatshop days and which has perisited in a large group of the population even though the conditions which originally created sympathy no longer exist.

Public identification with the weakness of the individual worker in his relations with the large corporate employer seems to have created a David-against-Goliath sympathy. Many seem to forget that, if the union was originally David, for many workers it is now itself Goliath. Also, there is a certain class feeling in this country, a tacit admiration for Robin Hood, who robbed the rich to help the poor.

In addition, one must bear in mind that we are a nation of employes. Most adults are in business for themselves, but are employed by somebody else. Many employees, even when not union members, tend to feel that "unions are on our side" even though many union objectives are basically selfish and against the interest of the nonunion majority.

Basically, it has been this underlying public sympathy which has enabled the unions to obtain the legislation and special treatment from public officials and communication media which today is a direct source of their power.

This prounion sympathy has been particularly evident among intellectuals and members of the educational community. Because of this factor, many economics and industrial-relations textbooks and reference works tend to present facts and weigh arguments in favor of the union position. These intellectuals, also, when called upon to give advice to Government representatives or to serve as arbitrators or members of fact-finding panels, tend to lean in favor of the union position because of their sympathy for the union movement.

2. LABOR'S POLITICAL STRENGTH

Votes are the currency of politics. Because of the public sympathy referred to above, the formidable union machinery for getting out the vote and for collecting political-action funds, and also because the unions have many members who presumably share a common point of view, many politicians believe that the unions control a substantial number of votes. They believe that the unions, when aroused, can cause officeholders to be elected or defeated.

As politicians make laws and enforce them, this idea that unions can influence the direction of thousands or even millions of votes leads politicians who want to keep their jobs or advance in their profession to bend in the union direction when a union issue is before them.

Through COPE (AFL–CIO Committee on Political Education), the unions are now able to collect and expend enormous sums of money in the political arena. They have also had the support of the ADA (Americans for Democratic Action), and certain other groups of similar political bent.

The growing effectiveness of union political action on local, State, and National levels is an important source of union power.

3. FAVORABLE LAWS

(a) National Labor Relations Act: This Federal labor law protects employees in their right to form and support unions. The act creates a special status for unions and gives them special rights and privileges of great importance and enjoyed by no other economic group. Among these special rights are the following:

(1) A union designated by a bare majority of employees in an appropriate bargaining unit becomes the representative of all employees in the unit including those who are opposed to the union.

(2) Moreover, such union becomes the exclusive representative of such employees.

(3) The employer must bargain with the union so designated on all aspects of wages, hours, and working conditions.

(4) The subjects of collective bargaining are broadly defined in section 8(d) of the act a sencompassing wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment. Because of the generality of this phraseology, almost any conceivable subject is placed in the area of collective bargaining and consequent union interference with management decisions.

(5) The employer may not interfere in the internal affairs of the union in any way and may not terminate an employee or otherwise discriminate against him because of union activity.

(6) Excepting in States which legislate otherwise, the employer is permitted to sign a compulsory union-membership contract. Such a contract ordinarily requires all employees to join the union within 30 days and remain members thereof as a condition of further employment.

(7) Exclusive jurisdiction over the subjects covered by the act is vested in an administrative board—NLRB—which has ordinarily been dominated by members sympathetic with unions.

(b) Exemption from Sherman Act: Although unions may originally have been subject to the Sherman Act, the Supreme Court in later years has ruled that, because of the Clayton Act and the Norris-La Guardia Act,

unions cannot be regarded as legal monopolies or combinations in restraint of trade—even though they intentionally and maliciously put employers out of business—unless they are acting in conspiracy with an employer. This exemption from the antitrust restraint applicable to employers is an important source of union power.

(c) Practical exemption from Corrupt Practices Act: Through the Taft-Hartley Act, enacted in 1947, Congress attempted to put unions under restrictions of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act and thus limit the use of union funds in political campaigns.

In a subsequent test case, the UAW–CIO was found not guilty of violating the amended Corrupt Practices Act even though its telecaster, Guy Nunn, gave widespread publicity to union-backed candidates in the 1954 primary and general-election campaign, and even though his propaganda was paid for out of the union's general funds accumulated out of the dues of the members.

For all practical purposes, the failure of this test case seems to have freed unions from the restrictions of the act and has enabled them to amass large political war chests and to spend the money in such a way as to further the special interests of the union leadership. This has enhanced union power.

(d) Norris-La Guardia Act: Because of the Norris-La Guardia Act and similar legislation in many States, it has become very difficult to enjoin violations of contract or law by labor unions even when the injury resulting from the violations is irreparable. This protection is extended by legislation only to unions.

The Norris-La Guardia Act itself is particularly important because, for practical purposes, it closes the doors of Federal courts to employers seeking injunctive protection against illegal union conduct. In these situations, the Federal judge would ordinarily be the most effective remedy, because he not only has a special status of respect in the community, but is also appointed by the President for life and, therefore, is not subject to the usual political pressures.

Money damages are ordinarily not a very effective remedy for the employer, because they do not, as in the case of an injunction, stop the illegal conduct at the time it is going on. A damage suit is usually not tried until at least 6 months or a year after the event.

Secondly, unions follow the tactic of refusing to settle a strike until the damage suit is dismissed. Thus, it is dismissed before it ever comes on for trial, and, therefore, operates only in a remote way as a deterrent to illegal union conduct. Of course, there are special situations in which the damage remedy results in the collection of money from a law-violating union, but these situations are quite exceptional.

With respect to injunctions, the Norris-La Guardia Act applies a double standard not applicable to other individuals or economic groups, a double standard which substantially enhances union power with respect to employers, members, and the public at large.

#### 4. SPECIAL TREATMENT FROM COURTS

Largely because of public sympathy and effective political action, as indicated above, unions not only benefit from favorable legislation, but also are singled out for special and favorable treatment from courts, arbitrators, law officers, and other public officials.

Labor-violence cases, when presented in police court, are customarily continued until the strike is over and then dismissed. The reluctance of many courts to issue and to enforce injunctions against unions is well known to lawyers.

Police assigned to strike duty often look the other way when union violence occurs. Even the FBI is reluctant to intervene in labor disputes. Many States have statutes forbidding or limiting the use of State highway police in such disputes. A tendency to lean in the direction of the union when the question is a close one is observed throughout almost the entire hierarchy of public officials.

Favorable treatment of unions is particularly marked in the case of State and Federal administrative officials and employees who deal directly with labor problems.

State departments of labor, workmen's compensation commissions, unemployment commissions, industrial commissions, mediation boards and labor boards are almost uniformly staffed with union members or former union officials or persons otherwise closely associated with and sympathetic to the union movement. This is true even though these agencies are charged with the protection of all workers, including the great majority who are nonunion.

Similarly, the U.S. Department of Labor, the National Labor Relations Board, and, to a considerable extent, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, as well as other agencies dealing with labor problems, are staffed largely with union members or sympathizers.

Since the advent of the Kennedy administration, the National Labor Relations Board has openly moved in a direction very helpful to organized labor.

The unions now have a clear majority of union sympathizers on the Board.

During the past 2 years, under the leadership of the new chairman of the Board, numerous precedents have been overruled and discarded, and the labor law has been substantially changed without legislation.

In almost every instance, the change has favored organized labor against the employer or nonunion employees and has been retroactive. As a result of the Board's continuing rejection of precedents and retroactive overruling of interpretations of law previously established by Board decisions and relied on by employers and others in the industrial relations field, no employer can be sure today that any action taken by him which might prove harmful to a union will be sustained by the NLRB.

The tendency of this policy is toward a government of prounion men instead of a government of law. This uncertainty tends to discourage employers from attempting to resists union demand and activities and is, therefore, an important contemporary source of union power.

This tendency towards a government of men instead of law, favorable to unions, appears to extend all the way to the White House.

Recent presidential intervention in the steel strike and the west coast airframe-industry dispute benefited the union and weakened the employer. There has been no comparable executive action against unions and none seems likely or even possible.

This factor of favorable treatment from the courts, law officers and other public officials is a further important source of union power.

#### 5. FAVORABLE TREATMENT FROM PRESS

Generally, unions get favorable treatment from the national wire services, radio and TV. These are important sources of public opinion.

Most news writers belong to unions or are union oriented. It is natural for them to slant stories which might otherwise place the union in a bad light. Besides being protected by their friends in the large news-gathering and dissipating agencies, unions also obtain considerable publicity for their affirmative programs. This favorable treatment is an additional source of power.

#### 6. RIGHT TO STRIKE AND BOYCOTT

The right to strike is recognized and protected by the Taft-Hartley law and miscellaneous other legislation, including the Norris-LaGuardia Act. In the Taft-Hartley law, "strike" is defined as a "concerted stoppage of work" or a "concerted slowdown or other concerted interruption of operations by employees."

This legal right of employees to band together and withhold their services in concert from a particular employer is an obvious source of union power. The Sherman and Clayton acts, and general public policy against monopoly, deny other business entrepreneurs a right to band together for the purpose of influencing price or wilfully inflecting economic harm in this way.

Unions are also permitted to advocate and advertise consumer boycotts against employers with whom they have a controversy, even though the Taft-Hartley law and the Landrum-Griffin Act have substantially limited their previous right to engage in secondary boycotts.

Businessmen are generally not permitted to advocate in this way a public boycott of their competitors, suppliers or others with whom they have business relations.

As there is almost no limitation of the right to strike, the use of the strike weapon is often abused. The strike power is frequently used to force retention of surplus or excess personnel and in support of various forms of featherbedding. Strike power is also used to force union recognition without recourse to the election procedures provided by the NLRB.

Sometimes a small group, through use of the strike power, is able to shut down virtually an entire operation or industry. In Pittsburgh, for example, a strike by a union representing a small number of steel-mill railroad employees was able to shut down an entire steel mill.

#### 7. UNIONS' PICKET SYSTEM

The great and traditional source of union power is the picket line. This probably ranks along with compulsory bargaining, required by the National Labor Relations Act, as one of the two most immediate and potent sources of union power in this country today.

The picket system includes two types of picketing—peaceful and violet. Both can be highly effective. Peaceful picketing—even when only one man with a banner is present, is effective because the working population as a whole has come to recognize this symbol placed in front of a place of business as a quarantine signal. Millions of workingmen have been disciplined and educated by unions to believe that they are doing wrong when they walk past a fellow workman who is carrying an "on strike" banner or an "unfair" banner. Therefore, in many situations, the mere presence of a man with a banner in front of any employer's place of business brings great economic harm to the employer.

In situations where the peaceful picket line is ineffective, the violent picket line usually does the job. It creates physical injury, property damage and fear. Most people do not want trouble. They will not risk physical injury or property damage to continue business relationships with a besieged employer. Through keeping third persons from taking the jobs of strikers, the picket line enables the union to monopolize the jobs in the struck plant. It is a coercive power weapon employed by the union to bludgeon the employer into submission. In their economic relationships, employers possess no comparable weapon.

#### 8. TRADITION OF THREATS AND VIOLENCE

Closely associated with the picket system, but having an effect beyond the picket line, is the union tradition of threats and violence. The labor movement in this country has been characterized by many violent strikes. The more spectacular of these in recent years, such as Kohler, Perfect Circle,

Republic Aviation, Southern Railway, and Southern Bell Telephone, have received widespread publicity. Hundreds of lesser strikes, however, have been accompanied by widespread acts of violence and terrorism. Even in so-called "peaceful" strikes, petty coercions, such as nails in the driveway and verbal threats, are almost always present. Most people do not want trouble. Therefore, this well-known tradition of threats and violence helps the union leaders keep workers in line and is a source of union power.

Fear of some form of reprisal is a factor which helps union organizers sign up workers for union membership. It helps union leaders control union meetings and direct the votes of the members. The standing vote is very common in union meetings. In certain situations, a member may feel that he is risking personal injury by standing up and being counted against a proposition strongly urged by union leadership.

Fear of ostracism may exist even when there is no fear of actual physical injury. Most unions encourage class feeling. Members are encouraged to feel that they do wrong if they stand with the employer against fellow workers. The threat of ostracism is itself a potent weapon when directed against the ordinary man who just doesn't want any trouble.

In many instances, the union threat extends far beyond mere ostracism. Each year there are many strikes characterized by shooting, dynamiting, physical beatings, mass picketing, car rocking, window smashing, paint throwing, and other forms of injury to person and property.

9. LOYALTY OF UNION MEMBERS

Another important source of union power is the dedicated loyalty of many hard-core members. Almost every local has a hard-core of members who attend meetings regularly and who sincerely believe in the union movement. With many of these individuals unionism is almost a form of religion. They deeply believe that unions have advanced the workingman and that employers would exploit workers ruthlessly if it were not for the existence and continued vigilance of labor unions. These dedicated members are a very important source of strength in all unions.

10. COMPULSORY MEMBERSHIP

During recent years, unions have used strikes and the threat of strikes with great success in forcing compulsory-membership provisions and checkoff clauses into a high percentage of the contracts in the two-thirds of the States of the Union where such contracts are lawful.

Under these provisions, there is no longer even the pretense that a union is a voluntary association. With these clauses in the contract, workers must belong and pay their dues in order to hold a job in the plant. In effect, the union is given the power to tax usually reserved solely to the sovereign. Although the Taft-Hartley Act gives employees some protection against discharge at the request of the union for reasons other than nonpayment of dues, the existence of compulsory-membership contracts is a very important source of union power and control over both employees and employers. Also, unions benefit greatly and are strengthened by the fact that employers can be made to collect the dues for the union before the employee ever receives his pay.

11. UNLIMITED SIZE OF UNIONS

The fact that the law permits unions to function as "internationals" is a root of union power. The union which is certified as the exclusive bargaining representative in a particular plant is usually not the local but the international union, which may have its headquarters and center of control hundreds of miles from the particular plant.

Through the provisions of its international constitution, and its usual power to appoint receivers, displace officers and take over the assets of the local if considered necessary, international officials have great practical power over the local and its members.

Craft unions also have apprenticeship systems, and membership cards which attract and hold members. As a practical matter, many skilled men can't even get a job without one of these cards. The international receives its tax-free financial support from locals throughout the country and is able to build up huge strike funds and also large welfare funds, pension funds and the like. Through the granting or withholding of strike benefits, the international is able to control the course of the negotiations at the local level. Through using strike funds to pay employees to strike, the international often can cause small employers to give in to union demands.

As there is no limitation on size, international unions can also organize an industry vertically as well as horizontally—as in the case of the Steelworkers, who represent ore mines, boat crews, and other groups in all phases of the industry.

The true picture of modern collective bargaining, therefore, is not that of a group of employees banded together to bargain with their own boss. Instead, an organization representing hundreds of thousands of employees throughout the country bargains with an employer who may possibly have only a hundred people working for him.

The fact that the law permits union bargaining power to be centralized in huge international organizations, which exercise discipline and tight control of the union funds, the union locals, and the individual members, and which are run by an expense account aristocracy of professional union managers, is, of course, an important source of union power.

12. WEAKNESS OF EMPLOYERS

In any catalog of the sources of union power, this item cannot be overlooked. Some industries are so sensitive that the employers cannot take a strike of any duration and remain in business. In other industries, direct labor costs are such a small percentage of the total cost that it is not considered practical to stand up to the union. These factors enable unions to be very strong in such industries.

Sometimes employers do not have the financial strength to withstand union pressures. These employers cannot go to the brink, where most important labor issues are ultimately settled. They cannot risk a strike, so ultimately must submit to the union demands.

In other situations, however, the source of union power may lie to a considerable extent in the weakness of the employer himself. Many employers regard labor relations as a nuisance.

They want to get the negotiations over with as soon as possible. They have no stomach for a fight. They do not understand the ponderous and time-wasting machinery of collective bargaining. In some instances, employers are even physically afraid of the union.

Many employers are opportunists. To save a few cents on wages, they are willing to make concessions to the union which over the years may cost them a great deal more than an extra 2 cents or 3 cents in wages. Their philosophy is to settle today and take their chances on tomorrow. If they cannot pass the cost on in price, they may be able to save the difference by changes in operations.

In dealing with employers of this type, professional union leaders, rich with experience, know that if they stand their ground, the employer will give in. Union leaders regard such employers as weak. Just before Christmas, the President asked the Longshoremen's Union to postpone a shipping strike for another 90 days "in the national interest." The international vice president of the union refused, explaining: "They're very weak, we'll lick 'em fast."

The weakness of employers, no matter how justifiable its cause, is an added source of union power.

CONCLUSIONS

Like banyan trees, unions today draw strength from many roots.

Favorable legislation and favorable treatment from courts, law officers and other public officials, and from news media, are important sources of union power. So are the right to strike and boycott, the picket system and the tradition of threats and violence.

Compulsory membership and checkoff and the unlimited size permitted by law also buttress union power. The hard core of members, and the vulnerability, disunity and weakness of employers, contribute to the strength of these organization. In addition, there are the strong roots of public sympathy and effective political action.

Today, unions are big business—rich—taxfree—and run by a new class of well-paid professional union managers.

On the political front, unions, acting through their grand lodge, the AFL–CIO, constitute a national Tammany Hall, with political machinery which functions in their self-interest from coast to coast. The influence of these unpoliced organizations, which are capable of shutting down basic industries and destroying small business, is felt in all walks of life. At few points are unions responsible for anything, even to their own membership.

There is a growing feeling that the national interest now calls for additional restraint on union power. The Supreme Court recently suggested that Congress correct the Norris-LaGuardia Act to permit Federal courts to stop union strikes in breach of contract. Many believe that the antitrust laws should be amended to cover unions. Others believe that a more fruitful course would be to withdraw some of the special privileges conferred by existing laws, which were enacted to encourage the growth of unions when they were small and weak, and which seem out of place today. A basic review and revision of union privileges and immunities seems in order if the public interest is to be protected.

## Make Them Use the Front Door

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. NORBAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial by Mr. Verne McKinney in the Hillsboro (Oreg.) Argus on the subject of back-door spending:

MAKE THEM USE THE FRONT DOOR

One of the most rewarding New Year resolutions that the administration and Congress could jointly make would be the elimination of back-door spending.

Back-door spending is the expenditure of funds outside the regular appropriation process. It is a violation—at least in spirit—of the Constitution which holds that Federal money can only be spent when the Congress duly appropriates it.

This practice cannot be dismissed as inconsequential. In 1961 it amounted to just under $20 billion—divided among Federal programs for agriculture, airport, area redevelopment, foreign aids, highways, housing, school milk, and loans for veterans. As large as that sum was the money originally requested was even greater—$29 billion.

In 1962, happily, encouraging progress was made in curbing back-door spending. Through the combined and commendable efforts of the administration and the Congress the rearflow was reduced to $437 million. First the budget requests were slashed from the $29 billion sought in 1961 to $2½ billion for 1962. Then the Congress performed more surgery on that amount, reducing it to $437 million.

It is not enough merely to cut down on the total spent in this evasive manner. The back door should be securely locked and permanently sealed.

## Stephen B. Luce, 1827-1917: Founder of the Naval War College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, over a period of many years, especially since becoming a member of the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Naval Academy, it has been my privilege to study the records of many of our naval leaders who have made notable contributions to U.S. history.

Preeminent among them was Rear Adm. Stephen B. Luce, who entered the Naval Academy in 1841 and was the 173d graduate of that famed institution. It was, therefore, with the keenest interest that I read in the January 1962 issue of Shipmate, the monthly magazine of the Naval Academy Alumni Association, a most informative biographical account of this distinguished naval leader by Rear Adm. John D. Hayes, U.S. Navy, retired, of the class of 1924.

Admiral Luce's greatest contributions were in the field of education. He was the architect and first president of the Naval War College, and prepared the first book on "Seamanship" for use at the Naval Academy, where Luce Hall was named in his honor.

In order that the career and contributions of Admiral Luce may be better known, I quote the indicated character sketch as part of these remarks:

STEPHEN BLEECKER LUCE, 1827–1917

(By John D. Hayes)

Stephen B. Luce has been made the subject of this first of a series of character sketches because I believe him to be one of the greatest figures that our Navy has produced. Another and perhaps more controlling reason is that he forms the link between the two great periods of our naval history—that of the sail Navy in the days of wooden ships and iron men with its revolution during the Civil War and the steam and steel Navy which did not have its beginnings until 20 years after that war. He, almost alone, preserved and carried forward the spirit and tone of the old Navy through those barren 20 years and infused it into the modern Navy of today. He did so by insisting that men were as important as weapons and machines and by constantly pointing out that no matter how remote the possibility, the purpose of a navy is war and the duty of officers is to study it and to train their men for it.

Fate did not grant to Luce the fortune of a major command in war, the opportunity by which a place in history is usually gained in the military profession. Instead it destined him to serve, as a young but seasoned officer, through the greatest of American wars and to see firsthand, as an impressionable man, the purposes of a navy in war and the needs of the men who make it. He never afterward allowed himself or those who followed him to forget these two foundation stones of their profession. His enthusiasm and acumen through the next 50 years were to bring about a revolution in naval thought, education, and administration that has had its impact to this day, not only in our own Navy but through it to the navies of the world.

The contributions of Stephen B. Luce to his profession cannot well be measured in tangible terms. He taught the Navy to think of itself as a whole. He saw strategy as clearly as others see a weapon or a ship. He defined better than anyone has since the relations that should exist between a government and the officers of its armed services. Nevertheless his concrete accomplishments were many. They include the following:

1. He prepared the first textbook on "Seamanship." It was first published in 1863 and went through several editions before it was replaced by the present Knight's "Modern Seamanship" in 1900.

2. He was commandant of midshipmen in the Naval Academy's most dynamic years just after the Civil War while David D. Porter was superintendent.

3. He pioneered the concept of training for merchant marine officers and established the first Maritime Academy for the State of New York in 1875.

4. He started the naval training system which today prepares our recruits for life aboard ship.

5. He saved most of the sea chanties of the days of sail by his book of "Naval Songs," first published in 1883.

6. He wrote the first article published by the U.S. Naval Institute and was president of that institution for 11 years from 1887 to 1898.

7. He is best known for establishing the Naval War College in 1886. What is not so well known is that he spent the next 25 years saving it.

8. He gave Alfred T. Mahan his great opportunity by asking him to lecture at the new college and this evolved into Mahan's famous books on Sea Power. It is interesting to note that the title of the series of lectures given was not "The Influence of Sea Power on History" but "The Influence of Naval Power on the Growth of Nations."

9. Finally, Luce was the leader of a group of forward-looking officers who, after a 30-year fight, finally succeeded in properly organizing the Navy Department by the establishment of the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations.

LUCE'S CAREER

Luce was born in Albany, N.Y., in 1827 and entered the Navy in 1841. He spent only his last year as a midshipman at the Naval Academy. One of his early cruises was under the War of 1812 hero, Commodore James Biddle, in the 74-gun line-of-battleship *Columbus*, which made a voyage around the world and visited Japan several years before Perry. During the Civil War Luce served in the South Atlantic Blockading Squadron, first as a watch officer in the flagship *Wabash*, later in command of a monitor and finally in command of a blockading gunboat. In the latter he had a contact with General William T. Sherman, which he himself claimed started him in the study of the art of war.

Sherman in January 1865 was at Savannah, Ga., after his March to the Sea. It was Luce's job to cover the Army's initial movements by water on the march north. Almost 40 years later Luce, in a lecture at the War College, told the story of his meeting with Sherman. "On reporting to headquarters, General Sherman indicated in a few short pithy sentences and by the aid of a map his plan for the campaign from Savannah north. * * * And he added in the pleasant style of banter with which he was accustomed to talk to naval officers: 'You Navy fellows have been hammering away at Charleston for the past 3 years. * * * I will cut her communications and Charleston will fall into your hands like a ripe pear.' And that is just what actually came to pass."

Luce continued: "After hearing General Sherman's clear exposition of the military situation, the scales seemed to fall from my eyes. 'Here,' I said to myself, 'is a soldier who knows his business.' It dawned on me that there were certain fundamental principles underlying military operations, principles of general application whether the operations were on land or at sea."

The prime of Luce's life, from the ages of 40 to 60, was spent in the period when the U.S. Navy was at the nadir of its history. The eyes of the American people after the Civil War were turned inward to the development of their heartland and away from the seas and overseas which had been the prewar outlook. The Navy and the merchant marine were neglected, forgotten. Senior naval officers seemed content to reflect in the glories of Civil War days and even Luce's contemporaries chose to look backward rather than ahead. Luce's thoughts, however, were kept focused on the future, on war and on the potentialities of war's handmaiden, strategy. His happy enthusiasm was able to transmit this ardent and unselfish professionalism to the young men who were to create the Navy of the future—Sampson, Evans, Chadwick, Taylor, Sims, and Gleaves.

Although best known for his establishment of the Naval War College, Luce's greatest monument should be the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations. The organization he thereby brought to the Navy Department has survived two wars and is essentially the same today. Luce was assisted in this work by Mahan; Henry C. Taylor, third president of the War College; Bradley Fiske; William S. Sims; and Dudley W. Knox. On the civilian side were President Theodore Roosevelt, through Sims then his naval aide; Secretary of the Navy Meyer in President Taft's administration; and Congressman Richmond P. Hobson, 1889, who introduced the legislation. These civilians however were only agents. It was the line officers, sparked by Luce, who were the positive, dynamic driving force to reform. This was in contrast to the Army reorganizational improvement which was largely the work of Elihu Root, Secretary of War in Theodore Roosevelt's administration. It is in contrast to the situation today.

Luce's impact was not alone on the line officers. He made efforts to start a school of naval architecture at Massachusetts Institute of Technology a generation before it was finally established. He encouraged the study of naval engineering but was opposed to the amalgamation of the Engineer Corps with the line. The man who brought it about, George W. Melville, finally came to agree with Luce that it was a mistake. Luce introduced the word "logistics," created by Jomini, into naval terminology and from there

it has gone into the military language of the free world.

LUCE'S METHODS

Luce to a large extent accomplished what he did through persistent letter writing, mostly to people in influential positions both in government and outside, as his papers, now preserved by the Naval Historical Foundation in the Library of Congress, indicate. He was always prolific with his suggestions and persistent in his demands. He was not hesitant about giving advice to those in high places, a service not always appreciated.

It was with his writings, however, that he made his great imprint on naval thought. They were mainly in the form of periodical articles, many of them in the Proceedings of the U.S. Naval Institute. They covered many subjects in the fields of warfare, naval history and administration, military ethics, officer education and enlisted training. Thirty-six of them, written between 1874 and 1911, have been summarized in an article in Military Affairs, winter 1955, under the title of "The Writings of Stephen B. Luce." Many of the concepts expressed therein are as pertinent today as when Luce stated them. They have become so ingrained into our naval administrative system that we take them for granted. If they were known better in the abstract by naval officers, they might have been applied with some benefit to the present day Department of Defense whose organizational problems are strikingly similar to those of the Navy in Luce's day.

Luce also wrote for many of the general periodicals of his day such as the Galaxy, North American Review, Harpers, and Youth's Companion and for several encyclopedias. However, he never took the time to compose his thoughts into books, as Mahan did, and for this reason his writings remain unknown while Mahan's are gaining in popularity each year.

Luce's learning was outstanding even in a day when anti-intellectualism was less prevalent in the service than it is today and when officers were not ashamed to quote Shakespeare to each other. Researching the references in his articles is a liberal education in itself.

His familiarity with foreign languages enabled him to know firsthand the French military writing in the 19th century when it was at its best. Luce had a much better knowledge of the French Navy and French naval strategy than did Mahan.

His devotion to his profession kept Luce a poor man all his life, unable even to give a college education to his son. On active duty he always preferred posts of usefulness to posts of honor. He was blessed with good health and he lived to be 90. An active mind, never devoted to self, no doubt contributed to this long life.

The last act of his career was a hallmark of the man. Asked to address the War College in 1911 at the age of 84, he might have reminisced. Instead he chose to make a fighting speech. He was frankly worried because there was so much interest in the then new postgraduate school of engineering and still so little in the Naval War College.

"Your profession is the art of war and nature will be avenged if you violate one of its laws in undertaking to make a part greater than the whole."

LUCE'S CHARACTER

Luce's character is best described by his contemporaries.

Admiral Porter wrote of him in 1866 to Assistant Secretary of the Navy Fox: "He is a straightforward fellow and nature has not given him the soft manners possessed by some people who are all smiles to your face and abuse you behind your back."

John S. Barnes who served with Luce in the Wabash and at the Naval Academy but who resigned to pursue a successful legal and business career: "Stephen B. Luce, all through his distinguished career, was one of the most capable officers in our or any other Navy. Besides his professional accomplishments which were great, his scientific and literary knowledge, increased by constant study and reading, made him an ideal naval officer, fitted to fill any office with dignity and power within the scope of Government action. My intercourse with him, then and later, I regard as one of the most fortunate intimacies of my life."

Robley D. Evans: "That master of his trade."

Albert Gleaves: "To such as he, there is no successor."

---

## Remarks by Mayor Robert F. Wagner at the 31st Annual Dinner of the Citizens Budget Commission

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of Friday, January 11, 1963, the Citizens Budget Commission held its 31st annual dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City. The principal speaker on this occasion was His Honor Robert F. Wagner, mayor of the city of New York. Under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House I include Mayor Wagner's address on this occasion:

ADDRESS BY MAYOR WAGNER

I am pleased to join tonight in greeting and saluting the Citizens Budget Commission on the occasion of its 31st anniversary. I wish a happy and fruitful year and many more in the times ahead to this organization which I have long known, always respected—and have sometimes differed with. But CBC, I love you anyway.

Again, as in the past, I congratulate CBC on its president, a true friend of mine and a public-spirited citizen if ever I knew one, Bob Dowling. And CBC is full of the spirit of Bob Dowling.

I intend tonight to make what might be considered a major pronouncement on the fiscal affairs of New York City. I am glad to do this under the auspices of the Citizens Budget Commission.

I shall deal with our budgetary prospects for next year—in fiscal terms and in terms of some of the practical problems we face and the decisions we must make during the weeks and months immediately ahead. They are very difficult ones.

The question is sometimes asked: Why must the city approach each year's budget problem as though it were being faced for the first time and, why can't we engage in more long-range budgeting and budgetary planning. The answer is very simple. Unlike the Federal and State Governments, we in the city government do not have ultimate control over our fiscal affairs. We can and do schedule our expenditures but the State government, above all, has the ultimate power of decision over our revenues and sources of revenue. New York City proposes, but Albany disposes.

In the current year, our revenues are expected to reach record levels. Our tax receipts from real estate are expected to attain their highest peak in our city's history due, among other factors, to the city's steady and sometimes spectacular development—as on Sixth and Third Avenues in Manhattan, Riverdale in the Bronx, in the Borough Park area of Brooklyn, in half a dozen sprouting areas in Queens, and in almost every section of Staten Island.

But as I said, we have no real power of decision or control over these revenues. When I first took office in 1954, real estate taxes accounted for 47.7 percent of our total city revenues. Today they only account for 41.04 percent of our revenues. To increase this tax would require an amendment to the State constitution, which takes a minimum of 3 years to enact. All other tax levies are subject to State authorization and some of this authorization is given us on a short-term basis like the authorization given us last year to establish for 1 year a tax on vault space under the city's streets and sidewalks. Likewise, State aid for education and other purposes is given us on a year-to-year basis. We know what we ought to be able to get from the State, but we never know what we are actually going to get.

Under such circumstances, long-range fiscal planning is extremely difficult if not impossible. Nobody would be more pleased to see this condition remedied than myself.

This brings me to the situation we face for next year. The fact is that for next year we face a very sizable budgetary imbalance—so substantial in magnitude as to require major decisions and measures by both the State and the city governments to meet the situation.

I am really not telling you any deep secrets. Anybody with a sharp mind and a dull pencil can figure it out and he doesn't need a very long piece of paper either. The Citizens Budget Commission issued a statement not many days ago giving a range of anticipated budgetary imbalance. For reasons I shall cite, I do not yet have the exact official figure, but I can say that the imbalance for next year will certainly be above the lowest figure in the CBC projection—which was, as I recall, $117 million. How much higher it will be, I am not yet prepared to say, but it will be substantially more.

We are hard at work right now reviewing the budgets and the proposed programs of the various city departments and agencies. I am examining and reexamining, in budgetary terms, the programs we had planned to inaugurate or expand next year and to achieve further savings and economies which may be possible. Until all this process is completed, I can't say finally what our minimum budgetary needs are. I know only that they will be substantially greater than in the present fiscal year, if only by virtue of automatic and mandatory increase.

Nor, of course, can I make a prediction as to our revenues for next year. Thus, I can only guess at the amount of aid we are going to get from the State government. I have no idea what increase, if any, we might hope to get in school aid; and I must say that for the long overdue increase in per capita payments, the prospects do not appear very bright. I wrote to Governor Rockefeller on December 2d, asking for the rectification of the inequities in State-city fiscal relations. I have no idea at this point what additional revenues we may count on from Albany.

For some years now we have been fighting for the authorization of legalized off-track betting, which could, within a few years of enactment, provide $100 million a year for New York City and a like amount for the State treasury—from off-track betting in New York City alone. This year there appears to be a somewhat more favorable climate in Albany for this proposal, or at least for an authorization of a referendum on it. But that doesn't promise us much money to meet next year's expenses.

For many weeks now, ever since August, in fact, I have been giving intense consideration to this problem and have been making such studies and holding such consultations as could be helpful.

Last April I said I would commission a group of experts to review the tax and revenue sources of the city and to reassess them in the light of our impending needs. I, and members of my staff, held preliminary discussions with a number of tax and fiscal experts in the effort to organize such a study. In the end we abandoned it as a formal enterprise—simply because of the factors to which I have already referred. There were just too many variables for a useful study by experts. Instead, in addition to a number of informal meetings with experts, I held and am holding frequent meetings on this subject with the comptroller, the president, and the majority leader of the city council, and other elected public officials, and, of course, with the appropriate officials and experts in the city government. I have also been seeking and considering the views on this subject of outstanding community leaders. These meetings are continuing.

Against this background, let me tell you that upon the conclusion of these studies and discussions, and after some of the variables I referred to become a little more definite, sometime within the next month, I will make my recommendations on the measures which I feel to be needed, including new tax proposals, to meet the urgent needs of the people of this city.

What do we mean when we speak of the urgent needs of the people? I think that the vast array of the services which the city government provides and the vital importance of them are sometimes forgotten when people talk about budget and taxes.

When we talk about city government, we are talking about the police, for whose services $204 million are included in this year's budget which provides 25,000 police. This amount pays for the greatest per capita police protection of any large city in the country. As a result of this protection, New York—contrary to impressions given by some headlines—ranked, for the first 9 months of last year, well down among the second 10 of the major cities of the country for per capita cases of crimes of violence.

We are also talking about $104 million for the fire department, which is widely acknowledged to be providing one of the most efficient and effective firefighting services in the country.

We are talking about the $191 million budgeted for the hospitals department for the maintenance of 27 city hospitals—for the recent spectacular improvement in the level of medical care and treatment in those hospitals—improvements which were overdue and must continue.

We are also talking about the more than $600 million budgeted for our city's primary and secondary schools and for our free-tuition city university providing essential education, including vocational training, for over a million of our young people.

We are talking about the $31 million for our health department for a wide range of activities including funds for the care of infants and children, for the largest medical research program to be financed by any city in the world, the inspection and supervision of the availability of heat to millions of tenants, and for the unending and essential war against rats and vermin.

We are talking about the $9 million budgeted for the department of buildings to administer and enforce the building code—so essential for public safety.

We are talking about only $1,500,000, which the city government's money contribution to our great housing program, which makes possible—together with the funds and credit of the Federal and State Governments—the vast amount of low-income and middle-income housing now under construction and on the drafting boards. We have, by far, the greatest government housing program in the Nation. More governmentally aided low-income and middle-income housing has been built in New York City than in any other city or group of cities in the country.

Included in the $1,500,000 the city has budgeted for housing, is money for our area services program which is designed and has achieved spectacular success in halting deterioration in neighborhood conditions, both housing and social. There is a crying need for the extension of this program to many areas of this city which do not need urban renewal but do need the kind of interim program we have developed under the name of the area services program.

We are talking also of our youth services program centered not only in the youth board and the parks department and also in other agencies, amounting to $329 million. A part of this money has been used to bring juvenile gang wars under some sort of control. I had occasion today to pay my last sad tribute to a frontline fighter against youth gangs who gave his life to this undertaking. He was brutally beaten when he stopped an incipient rumble—I think they call them. He had stopped many in East Harlem where he worked. There hadn't been one in his area for a long time. I had met him. He was typical of the dedicated youth board workers who at modest pay are doing heroic and successful work in this field.

We are also, of course, speaking of welfare, for which $298 million is budgeted this year. What is not generally known is that only a small percentage of this goes for general welfare. The largest percentage and the overwhelming number of so-called welfare clients are needy children and the needy and disabled aged. These amount to 338,000, out of the total of 352,000 served by the welfare department.

Then there is also the $36 million for parks and playgrounds, and the $28 million for libraries and museums, and the $47 million for the department of water supply, gas, and electricity, and the $12 million for our piers and docks.

I have covered practically the entire budget, aside from such irreducibles as debt service, pensions, and the like. I have asked myself—I ask each of you tonight—Which of the services covered in the budget totals I have listed would you eliminate or stringently curtail?

Of course, the drive for savings through administrative efficiencies has been going on for some time and must continue to go on.

As a result of the recommendations of experts in the office of the city administrator and budget director, we have eliminated, over the past several years, thousands of jobs, and made other savings amounting to more than a hundred million dollars. I and the deputy mayor for administration and my budget director are now searching for additional ways to economize and to pull the belt tighter. This will not be the last you will hear of economy this year and next, I promise you.

It is a fact that our expense budget has increased by 68 percent since I have been mayor. But over the same period, the State budget just for State purposes has increased by 74 percent and the Federal budget, even exclusive of defense, has increased by 75 percent. We have been providing an increasing number of new but essential services, through the Police Department, the housing program, the area services program, the improvements in our city hospitals and nursing homes, the services for youth, the activities of the health research council, and the special aids for the aged, among many others.

Just as an example, there is such an item as payments to voluntary hospitals for the care of needy patients assigned to the hospitals by the city. In 1946, the city paid $3.25 per patient per day. Today, it is $30 per day.

Of course, there have been major increases in the cost of almost everything the city buys, and also in the salary and wage rates and scales.

We now have on our statute books a career and salary plan which provides for automatic increases. All this is necessary not only to help our employees meet the rising costs of living but also for the city to compete with outside business and the State and Federal Governments, and to attract to the city service capable professional workers.

There are at least two ways of looking at city government—from the viewpoint of the balance sheet or from the viewpoint of the essential services it provides for the people.

The projected balance sheet for next year shows that we face a heavy problem. The program sheet for next year shows that we must not only maintain present government services, but in some categories, we must expand them.

Thus we must continue to improve and expand our new program for traffic control. We must continue to improve and expand our police department. We must continue to improve our hospitals. We must step up our efforts to promote the cultural and artistic life of our city, to provide more vocational training facilities for the unskilled—especially the unskilled youth—and thus to diminish our waste of human resources. We must take new steps to promote and encourage business activities, to keep the businesses that we have and to attract new trade and enterprise to our city. Such programs and many others, I will not take the time to mention, are essential if we are to keep our city dynamic, to make the most of our human resources.

To do all this and more, budgetary provision will have to be made. If our revenues are to be increased to meet the need, that increase must come either from substantially increased payments from the State government or by added taxes, or by a combination of both. For reasons I have already stated, we can get no substantial increase in the amount of money received from our real estate taxes. We must look elsewhere.

As I said, I will make my recommendations as soon as I get all the facts and complete the discussions I am now in the process of holding. One thing is certain: we will solve this problem as we have solved others.

New York is a wonderful place, and New Yorkers are wonderful people. If New York weren't such a thriving, throbbing, dynamic city, it wouldn't be as attractive to all the people of the world. If it weren't so attractive, it wouldn't be so crowded. And if it weren't so crowded, it wouldn't be so interesting.

The decisions we must make on budget and taxes will require a concensus of all our citizens. There will need to be a great deal of public discussion. I know that the citizens budget commission will play its part in helping to lead an informed, responsible, and constructive public discussion of this matter. I promise you that I will do my part to help this along.

Now it is my special pleasure to make a surprise announcement and award. It is my privilege to pay a special tribute to the executive director of the citizens budget commission, Col. John M. Leavens. Mr. Leavens has been executive director of the CBC for the past 10 years. He has, at the staff level, provided a driving, tireless leadership, and has helped in a major way to make possible the fine contributions of the CBC to the cause of good government in this city and State. I am pleased to be able to present to you, John M. Leavens, the scroll of the city of New York as an expression of the appreciation of all the citizens of New York, for your fine work with the citizens budget commission.

## Calendar of Events at the National Gallery of Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following calendar of events at the National Gallery of Art:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART—CALENDAR OF EVENTS, JANUARY 1963

Gallery hours: Weekdays 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Sunday 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. Admission is free to the gallery and to all programs scheduled.

Permanent collection: Paintings and sculpture comprising the Mellon, Samuel H. Kress, Widener, and Chester Dale collections, with gifts from other donors, are located on the main floor. The Widener collection of decorative arts is on the ground floor.

Special exhibition: Mona Lisa by Leonardo da Vinci, lent by the French Government. From January 9.

Continuing exhibition: John Gadsby Chapman, a retrospective exhibition. Through January 13. Central gallery.

New publication: "The Mona Lisa," illustrated booklet, 16 pages, 7 by 10 inches, 50 cents postpaid.

Recent publications: "John Gadsby Chapman." Exhibition catalog 7½ by 10 inches, 32 pages with 20 illustrations. Introduction by William P. Campbell. Price $1 postpaid. "Treasures from the National Gallery of Art," edited by Huntington Cairns and John Walker, 11¼ by 15 inches, 85 color plates. Price $25 postpaid.

New reproductions: Color postcards. Seven new postcards of paintings: Annibale Carracci, "Landscape"; Innes, "The Lackawanna Valley"; Morisot, "In the Dining Room"; Renoir, "A Girl With a Watering Can"; Reynolds, "Lady Caroline Howard"; Steen, "The Dancing Couple"; Titian, "Saint John the Evangelist on Patmos." Five cents each postpaid.

Sunday lectures: A series of lectures on "Stylistic Origins" will begin on January 6 and will continue through February 10.

Holiday Lectour: On New Year's Day the gallery will be closed. A radio lecture device is installed in 30 exhibition galleries. Talks, running continuously, cover most of the periods of art represented by the collections. A visitor may rent a small receiving set for 25 cents to use in hearing these Lectour broadcasts.

Cafeteria: Open to the public Monday through Saturday 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. Sunday 4 p.m. to 7 p.m. Closed January 1.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 31 THROUGH SUNDAY, JANUARY 6

Painting of the week: Hals. "Balthasar Coymans" (Mellon collection), gallery 47, Wednesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Italian Schools of Painting: Early Florentine, rotunda, Wednesday through Saturday 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection, rotunda, Monday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Origins of the Classical Style." Guest speaker, Charles Morgan, professor of art history, Amherst College, Amherst; lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: National Gallery orchestra, Richard Bales, conductor; Marjorie Mitchell, pianist; East Garden Court, 8.

MONDAY, JANUARY 7 THROUGH SUNDAY, JANUARY 13

Painting of the week: Monet. "Banks of the Seine, Vétheuil" (Chester Dale collection), gallery 83, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Italian Schools of Painting: Late Florentine, rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour introduction to the collection: Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Origins of the Gothic Style." Guest speaker: Robert Branner, professor of art history, Columbia University, New York, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Claude Frank, pianist, east garden court, 8.

All concerts, with intermission talks by members of the National Gallery staff, are broadcast by station WGMS–AM (570) and FM (103.5).

MONDAY, JANUARY 14 THROUGH SUNDAY, JANUARY 20

Painting of the week: De Hooch. "A Dutch Courtyard" (Mellon collection), gallery 47, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; 47, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30."

Tour of the week: Italian Schools of Painting: Venetian, rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Sunday lecture Z ,u

Tour: Introduction to the collection, rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Oriental Influences in Early and aLte Medieval Art." Guest speaker Benjamin Rowland, professor of art history, Harvard University, Cambridge, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Luis Garcia-Renart, cellist; Marta Garcia-Renart,, pianist; east garden court, 8.

MONDAY, JANUARY 21 THROUGH SUNDAY, JANUARY 27

Painting of the week: Orazio Gentileschi. "St. Cecilia and an Angel" (Samuel H. Kress collection), gallery 49, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Italian Schools of Painting: Umbrian, rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection, rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Renaissance Experimenters." Speaker, Margaret Bouton, associate curator of education; National Gallery of Art, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: George Walker, pianist, east garden court, 8.

Inquiries concerning the Gallery's educational services should be addressed to the Educational Office, REpublic 7-4215, extension 272.

## Salute to the Ukrainian People on Ukrainian Independence Day, January 22, 1963

SPEECH
OF
### HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, during the last several centuries the long history of the Ukrainian people entered a period full of calamities and tragedies. Since the middle of the 17th century the Ukrainians have been subjected, except for a brief period from 1918 to 1920, to alien rulers in their homeland. After suffering under the autocratic czarist regime of Russia for some 250 years, they were freed from the chains of that regime by the Russian Revolution of 1917, and early in 1918 they proclaimed their national independence. Ukrainian leaders instituted a democratic form of government and proclaimed the Ukrainian Republic. During the next 2 years Ukrainians worked heroically to rebuild their war-torn country and to make it a safe haven for its people. Unfortunately they had neither the time nor the means to accomplish these difficult tasks because their foes were preparing to put an end to the new state. In 1920 the country was attacked, invaded and overrun by the Red army, which viciously put an end to the Ukrainian Republic. Soon the country was completely overrun and was made part of the Soviet Union, and so it remains to this day.

For nearly 43 years, the Ukrainians have suffered under Soviet totalitarianism. Some 42 million stout-hearted and patriotic Ukrainians have been unsuccessful in their continuing attempt to free themselves from Soviet tyranny because with their bare hands they have been facing the ferocious might of the entire Soviet Union. The freedom-loving people of Ukrainia have not, however, abandoned their struggle for independence. They have been carrying the fight for freedom on, and still carry on with all the means at their disposal, hoping and praying that their righteous cause will eventually win. On the 45th anniversary of their Independence Day I join millions of Americans in wishing the Ukrainian victims of Soviet treachery fortitude and power in their struggle against the forces of totalitarian tyranny.

## Tribute to Herbert H. Lehman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on January 15, Herbert H. Lehman, one of the great statesmen of our times, was honored by the women's division of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies. Senator Lehman, who has been elected to the highest offices New York State can bestow, is loved and respected as no politician has been since Franklin Delano Roosevelt. One of New York's great Governors and the voice of liberalism in the Senate during the 1950's, Senator Lehman's constant demonstration of courage and dedication is an everlasting inspiration. It is with great pleasure that I direct the attention of

my colleagues to the following remarks made by Mayor Robert F. Wagner, of New York, at the luncheon. The address follows:

REMARKS BY MAYOR ROBERT F. WAGNER, AT LUNCHEON OF WOMEN'S DIVISION, FEDERATION OF JEWISH PHILANTHROPIES

I would not, for anything, have missed this opportunity to join in paying today's heartfelt tribute to Herbert Lehman. Herbert Lehman needs no testimonials, but in honoring him, we honor not only a man but an era—not only an individual but a tradition—a tradition of greatness of which he has been of the main builders, and of which he remains today one of the last great exponents.

Herbert Lehman is, among many other things, a living proof that virtue, integrity, and nobility can pass through the weathered streets of public life, and through temptations and stresses of elective office, and of standing for public office, and can come through undimmed, untarnished, and unsullied. I believe that the answer lies in the strength with which these virtues are attached to the character and personality of the man. In Herbert Lehman they are cast in one piece. In him these characteristics, these virtues, are found almost unalloyed. Yet, contrary to the theory of cynics, this man is recognized in all the places of the earth and among his own friends and family as well—which is an even harder test—as a truly great man.

I knew of Governor Lehman before I knew him. Even before I knew him as a friend, he was pictured in our household as a symbol of rectitude and uncompromising integrity, and of unswerving devotion to the public good. We knew of his greatness of character even before we came to realize his greatness as a public officeholder.

I knew of him as a generous and passionate admirer of Al Smith and as a man who shared my father's ideals and principles, even though Herbert Lehman had arrived at his first places of public eminence by a road quite different than that traveled by my father.

It is worth noting that both my father and Governor Lehman's father came here from Germany, although his father preceded mine to this country by more than a full generation. Beginning in the late twenties, Governor Lehman's career in public office came to dovetail closely with that of my father. In the thirties, they worked together under the supreme leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt for the achievement of what is often called the Roosevelt revolution.

Then in the Indian summer of Herbert Lehman's career, after he had retired from the last of his great public offices, he returned to the grassroots of his political life—to the sidewalks of New York—to the great task, as he conceived it, of reforming the Democratic Party organization of New York, as a means of generating improvement in the political and governmental atmosphere of his native city.

It had been my privilege ever since the days I was a freshman assemblyman in Albany, my first public office, to look up to Governor Lehman as a symbol of all the political values I had learned to cherish. I followed his leadership while he was Governor. I was proud to have him speak for me and for the people of New York City in Washington while he was Senator, and finally in the end, I was immensely fortunate to have him not only as my friend but as my counselor and supporter.

He had long been called the conscience of American liberalism and so he became the embodiment of what was called here in New York City the reform movement. The impact of that movement on New York City may be debatable. I will not undertake today to give a full evaluation of Herbert Lehman's influence in the political or governmental life of this city. That would take a book. I hope sometime, when I have the time, to be able to contribute to the writing of such a book. But today I will only say that in my judgment this impact has been historic, and altogether constructive and salutary.

To see this great man, already full of all the honors that the people of New York City and State could give him—the most venerated man of his faith in all the country and in all the world—to see him go barnstorming along the sidewalks of the city, into every neighborhood and section, shaking hands, speaking from the backs of trucks and jerry-built platforms, speaking so earnestly and sincerely as only he can speak, to see him in this way, to see him at my right side over a period of so many arduous months, was a spectacle to be remembered beyond even the narrow frame of the political circumstances which brought about his involvement.

As I said, I will leave it to the historians to measure the full proportion of the impact of the New York City reform movement. But I would be ungrateful, if I did not observe that had Herbert Lehman chosen to retire and enjoy his honors and the leisure and rest that his years deserved, it is rather unlikely that I should be standing here today as mayor of this city.

Certainly not because of this, but for a wide range of reasons which are so obvious that I need not enumerate them here today, I have asked and secured Governor Lehman's tentative agreement to be here in New York City on March 28—which day and week I shall proclaim as Lehman Day and Lehman Week. And there shall occur on that day and during that week, I am sure, appropriate observances of the 85th birthday of this beloved and heroic man, this compassionate and generous man, this gentle, gracious, peace-loving and yet fighting man. All of us will join on that occasion in tribute not only to Herbert Lehman but to that beautiful, devoted, gracious and ever-zealous and protective wife and helpmate, who with Herbert Lehman have made up one of the finest man-and-wife teams I have ever known—Herbert and Edith Lehman.

And now let me conclude my tribute to Herbert Lehman with words which are deeply appropriate to him—words that come from that great book, the Talmud. That wise and inspired book says: "The best preacher is the heart; the best teacher is time; the best book is the world; the best friend is God."

Herbert Lehman has lived these sentiments.

## Cardiologists' Oversea Program Successful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, almost a year ago, my good friend Mr. Eddie Cantor, a great American and well-known entertainer, wrote me with respect to an oversea program involving the American College of Cardiology. This nonfund raising educational organization has set up a committee to provide postgraduate courses in cardiology for less privileged countries, and particularly to present the great recent advances in cardiology in America. This program was particularly conceived to bring good will for our country and to improve the scientific image of America overseas.

The first circuit course was conducted in the Philippines and then Formosa, and was received with great enthusiasm by the over 2,200 physicians who attended. The reports received by our State Department were most satisfactory. The traveling expenses of this first circuit course were met by a $10,000 education grant from the Eli Lilly & Co., International. The program was intense, but the interest of the local physicians made the effort worthwhile.

The American Specialists Division of the Department of State recommended that the college obtain invitations from other countries, and advised that the Department of Cultural Exchange hoped to provide funds to pay the travel expenses for future faculties. A second course was arranged, but despite the immeasurable success of the first journey, the State Department officially advised that while it considered the program a commendable one, it could not offer the financial assistance requested—the nominal sum of $9,000.

At this point Mr. Cantor asked that I contact the Department of State to request that additional consideration be given to this project. I was happy to do so, and as a result the proposal was approved. Its success is attested to by a letter to Mr. Cantor from Dr. Eliot Corday, chairman of the committee which arranged the courses. Mr. Cantor has graciously shared this highly interesting report with me, and I believe you will also find satisfying the immense good accomplished by a small sum by these dedicated representatives of their profession and country:

INSTITUTE FOR MEDICAL RESEARCH,
CEDARS OF LEBANON HOSPITAL,
*Los Angeles, Calif., December 31, 1962.*

Mr. EDDIE CANTOR,
*Beverly Hills, Calif.*

DEAR MR. CANTOR: I would appreciate it greatly if you would transmit the attached information to our Congressman, JAMES ROOSEVELT, and thank him for his help in this program.

In summary, we have now conducted 3 circuit courses in 6 countries, the first 1 to the Philippines and Formosa (a copy of this report is attached), the second to Lisbon and Madrid, and the third to Jerusalem and Istanbul (programs attached). All these programs were overwhelmingly successful. You will notice that the doctors served without remuneration, only their traveling expenses were paid. In many areas the per diem did not cover their living costs. They refused an honorarium because they wished this to be their contribution to our country, and for the benefit of mankind. They often suffered a great loss of income. President Kennedy's motto of "Ask not what my country can do for me, but what I can do for my country," would be most appropriate.

Each visiting faculty came back exhausted, but so enthused by the reception they received. Usually, the auditorium was too small. In Turkey a public address system had to be installed in an adjoining hall. The local committees were overwhelmed by the turnout. The U.S. Information Agency used each ceremonial event for press, television, and radio so that the people throughout the land could appreciate that American medi-

cine was supreme. It helped improve the scientific image of the United States. Senator FULBRIGHT and Congressman MORGAN were present at the Ambassador's reception in Madrid. I understand they commented on the effectiveness and low cost of this program, and considered it should be expanded.

The State Department has asked us to prepare to send similar groups to South America in the spring of 1963. Chancellor Murphy of UCLA who is an authority in medical affairs in South America has helped us with our plans. In addition, we have invitations from countries behind the Iron Curtain. Yugoslavia and Poland asked us to present courses there. Other requests have been received from Pakistan, Thailand, France, Greece, and the Australian Asian Heart Associaton. The State Department is checking on the authenticity of these invitations.

I am enclosing reports from the program chairmen of Lisbon, Jerusalem, and Madrid, and from the cultural attaché in Lisbon. I wish that you would transmit these along with the copies of the programs to Congressman ROOSEVELT. Programs were sent to all the doctors in Spain—35,000 copies. You can realize the immense good-will value that such distribution would have.

Again, Mr. Cantor, I hope that you will extend our best wishes to Congressman ROOSEVELT and thank him again for his assistance in making this program possible.

Wishing you the best of everything in the new year, and with kindest personal regards,

Sincerely,

ELOIT CORDAY, M.D.

---

MADRID, *December 4, 1962.*

ELIOT CORDAY, M.D.,
*Institute for Medical Research, Cedars of Lebanon Hospital, Los Angeles, Calif.*

DEAR ELIOT: The course was a great success. From 500 to 600 doctors attended it and many took part in the discussions. Everybody was really pleased not only because of the prestige of the American colleagues but because of their efficiency, sincerity, modesty, and good will.

We tried to make pleasant their stay here and I have the empression that they did appreciate it. We do keep a wonderful memory of these past days.

Please receive my congratulations for it and forward my gratefulness to the American College of Cardiology for its initiative in organizing such courses. I thought of you very often during those days.

With very kind regards to you and Mrs. Corday, I am,

Yours very truly,

C. JIMÉNEZ DÍAZ.

---

LISBON, PORTUGAL,
*December 3, 1962.*

Dr. ELIOT CORDAY, M.D.,
*Chairman, Postgraduate Program Overseas, American College of Cardiology, University of California School of Medicine, Los Angeles, Calif.*

DEAR ELIOT: The course in cardiovascular diseases you worked so hard to bring about was a huge success.

The members of the faculty were top grade, their subjects of the greatest interest, and they had a full house every time they spoke.

All of us that had the privilege of knowing these great men enjoyed meeting them and were stimulated by them.

To you as the prime instigator and principal organizer of this wonderful meeting go our most heartfelt thanks.

Kindest regards from

Yours ever,

Arsénio,
ARSÉNIO CORDEIRO.

THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
AMERICAN EMBASSY,
*Lisbon Portugal, December 10, 1962.*

ELIOT CORDAY, M.D.,
*Institute for Medical Research,*
*Cedars of Lebanon Hospital,*
*Los Angeles, Calif.*

DEAR DR. CORDAY: First, I should like to apologize for taking so long to send you a report of the distinguished cardiology team we were privileged to have with us for a few days at the end of November.

The seminar was held at the School of Medicine of the University of Lisbon and was very well organized by the Portuguese Cardiology Society headed by Dr. Arsenio Cordeiro. The seminar was well publicized through the local press, radio, and television and by the previous distribution of 1,500 programs (see attached copy) to leading physicians throughout the country. Attendance at the sessions was unusually high; 280 doctors and students received certificates for attendance at seven of the eight sessions. At one of the sessions on the last day Dr. John LaDue presented technical books by various team members to the University of Lisbon. This presentation was covered by the local press, including photographers. Parts of the opening session were also filmed for television transmission. On November 20, the American Ambassador offered the visiting team a reception at the Embassy residence for approximately 75 professional people.

Portuguese response to the seminar was extremely favorable; not only were local participants greatly impressed by the high category of the American team, but they also reacted positively to the consistently high level of the individual presentation. I attended the opening session and can honestly say that Dr. Dwight E. Harken's lecture on "The Past, Present, and Future of Cardiological Surgery" was the best organized and most absorbing talk I have ever witnessed. The fact that all sessions were conducted in English seems to have presented no impediment to general understanding of the material.

Members of the team expressed themselves as satisfied with both the results and with their reception by their Portuguese colleagues. They all agreed, however, that the program was an exhausting one which left very little time for rest and recuperation. I gather, however, that it was the intention of the American College of Cardiology that this visit be strictly a work session, as I can assure you it was.

Altogether this project was one of the most successful I have known and left an excellent impression upon both sponsors and participants. The Embassy feels particularly grateful that the team could have come to Portugal at a time when Portuguese-American relations need strengthening in every possible way. I am sure the Ambassador would wish to add his gratitude to mine and to wish these distinguished cardiologists all success in their future missions.

Sincerely,

ROD W. HORTON,
*Cultural Affairs Officer.*

---

## Ukrainian Independence Day

SPEECH
OF
## HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the 45th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine is an event that demands commemoration here in the House of Representatives, the oldest continuous free representative assembly on earth. So I consider it a privilege to join with our colleagues in paying tribute to the people of Ukraine, both here in the United States and in their captive homeland, and to their love of personal freedom and national independence which has survived centuries of persecution and oppression.

The people of Ukraine have a special claim to our understanding and support. Not only do they seek for themselves what we have found and firmly established here and what we proclaim to be an inalienable right of all peoples—that is, government by the consent of the governed—but we have also been the beneficiaries of the approximately 2 million people of Ukrainian ancestry who have brought to this country the spiritual qualities and the human values of an old and distinctive culture.

In the congressional district which I am privileged to represent, I have seen at first hand the importance of the contributions being made daily by our fellow citizens and neighbors of Ukrainian descent. Because of their friendship, I have obtained a closer, more personal appreciation of the dedication of Ukrainians everywhere to the goals of individual liberty and national self-determination.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of those of our colleagues who were not present at the opening of our session this noon to the fact that the prayer today was offered by the Very Reverend Walter Bukata, pastor of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Holy Ascension of my neighboring city of Newark. On my own behalf and that of my many constituents who know and admire Father Bukata, I am delighted to welcome him to the House of Representatives on this memorable occasion.

Mr. Speaker, Ukraine is the largest and one of the oldest of the captive nations of Eastern Europe. Yet, the period of her independence as a nation during the 20th century is the shortest, the 2 years between 1918 and 1920 during which Ukrainians fought for and won their freedom from Russian monarchists only to have it torn away by the Russian Communists. Thus it is that Ukrainians know, perhaps better than most, the evils of imperialist tyranny and despotism, whether of the tsarist variety or the Godless brutality of communism. To have refused to succumb, to have kept alive the dream of freedom and the light of independence in the face of almost permanent persecution, is worthy of our deepest admiration and gratitude.

Unfortunately, Ukraine is sometimes omitted from the lists of the so-called captive nations of Eastern Europe, possibly because this brave nation was forcibly incorporated into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Whatever the explanation, however, this must be considered one of the real ironies of modern history. For Ukrainians have not freely subordinated their consciousness of nationhood to the iron demands of the Soviet state. On the contrary, it was

only because of their undeniable claim to nationality and their determination to fight for it that Soviet Russia was led to concede the Ukrainian people the status of a republic with the false hope of independence it implied. The hypocrisy, of course, was compounded when Soviet Russia obtained a seat in the United Nations for its puppet government of Ukraine.

But make no mistake about it, the 40 million Ukrainians now living in captivity and their countrymen everywhere know all too well that Ukraine is not free or independent. Nor have they given up the struggle for what is theirs in justice, despite the difficulties, the dangers, and the discouragements. We salute them for their courage.

On this occasion, however, we should do more than salute a people's courage, more than indicate our understanding of their problems, more than pledge our support in general terms. We owe them action, effective action, even though we recognize the limits of our own national power. We cannot arbitrarily or singlehandedly change the face of the map or even raise the iron curtain, but there are concrete and positive steps we can take to advance the cause of freedom.

Among them, Mr. Speaker, we can establish the proposed Select Committee on the Captive Nations here in the House and thereby help equip the Congress to deal with developments in Eastern Europe more expeditiously and effectively. The hearings held last year on the captive nations by the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs indicates the real usefulness of such a group whose full-time attention could be devoted to this critically important subject. Consequently, I have today introduced agains legislation to create a Captive Nations Committee.

We can also act to strengthen the U.S. Information Agency and its Voice of America with regard to the quality, frequency, and scope of its programing behind the iron curtain.

We can broaden and increase exchange programs and other means of contact between the people of the captive nations and our own people.

We can do a better job of reminding the rest of the world as frequently as practicable that the United States, as a matter of fundamental principle, refuses to accept the status quo in Eastern Europe and continues to insist upon the right of every people to political liberty and national self-determination.

We can expose at every opportunity—especially in the forum of the United Nations—the ugly record of Soviet colonialism in Eastern Europe, a record of subjugation, discrimination, economic exploitation, and military domination, a record that deserves the official condemnation of that world body.

These and many other actions can be taken which would give to the Eastern European policy of our Government the emphasis this important area requires. In keeping with our own ideals and in justice to those who have suffered for freedom's sake, we can do no less.

## An Expensive Dock Settlement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DONALD RUMSFELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues, I have been deeply concerned in recent weeks about the losses which this Nation has and is still suffering as a result of strikes. In the few weeks since this Congress convened, we have seen several dramatic examples of abuses of the substantial economic power of the labor monopoly.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I submit an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of January 25, 1963, which raises some serious questions worthy of consideration by all Americans and which demand the attention of the Congress.

The editorial follows:

AN EXPENSIVE DOCK SETTLEMENT

The 31-day longshoremen's strike which tied up 600 ships and idled 100,000 men at ports up and down the U.S. Atlantic and gulf coasts is estimated to have cost more than $700 million in lost wages and business.

How much indirect loss was caused in shutdowns and layoffs in industries producing goods for overseas shipment will never be known.

But now that a settlement has been forced by a kind of compulsory mediation on the part of the Government, the cost of the imposed terms to the shipping industry and to users of shipping will be far from insignificant even compared with the costs of the strike.

The spokesman for the New York Shipping Association calls it a "very, very expensive" settlement. And a look at the terms bears him out.

In the first place, the most emotional issue in the dispute, reduction of work gangs in northern ports from 20 men to 17, had earlier been referred to the Department of Labor for a 2-year study. This is probably the best way to handle the matter. But it means that savings by mechanization with which the shipping companies could meet the cost of wage increases are denied them for at least 2 years.

Meanwhile, President Kennedy has referred wage issues in the dispute to a special board headed by Senator WAYNE MORSE, an experienced labor arbitrator but also a pronounced political liberal. The terms recommended by this board, backed by the prospect of a report to Congress if the shutdown continued, involve increased labor costs of 37-cents-an-hour by the end of a 2-year period.

This is, if anything, a shade nearer the 51-cent serious demand of the International Longshoremen's Association than to the 22-cent offer of the employers. It is enough to raise serious question whether the increase is "in the national interest" to which President Kennedy appealed when he appointed the special board.

One of the national interests, as the President and others repeatedly emphasize, is to compete effectively in international trade, so that earnings from exports may reduce the deficit in balance of payments which results from defense and aid costs. This is not served by permitting unchecked continuance of a wage spiral enforced by labor monopoly.

Further, will the example of what the dockworkers have gained by subjecting the Nation to their economic power encourage the New York Typographical Union to continue its strike against New York newspapers until one or more of those publications goes out of business? Or encourage the United Steelworkers to reopen their contract with demands that would have far-reaching and depressive effects?

## ROA's Minuteman, Dennis Chavez

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to present for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an interesting and significant article from the Officer, the publication of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States. It deals with the life and accomplishments of the late Senator Dennis Chavez of New Mexico. Senator Chavez was selected last fall to receive the honor of "Minuteman of 1963" by ROA. On November 17, 1962, Senator Chavez died, and the award will be accepted posthumously at the midwinter national conference banquet on March 1 by his widow. Senator Chavez led an interesting and colorful life and was a great and good friend of the military. The article herein reprinted was written expressly for the Officer by John J. Ford, legislative editor of the Army Times, and is an authority on Capitol Hill matters.

The article follows:

PROFILE OF AN AMERICAN—BORN IN ADOBE HUT, ROA'S MINUTEMAN ROSE TO BECOME POWERFUL LEADER

(By John J. Ford)

Born in an adobe home with a dirt floor, too poor even to go to high school and past 30 before he could afford to study law, Dennis Chavez rose to become chairman of the most powerful subcommittee in the U.S. Senate, the group that sets the annual appropriations for national defense. At the time of his death last November he was fourth senior Member of the U.S. Senate and had served as a Senator longer than any other man from New Mexico.

As a boy he was forced to leave school in the seventh grade to go to work and help suppor his family, driving a grocery wagon 12 hours a day for the princely salary of $2.75 a week. As a Senator he headed the unit that wrote awesomely expensive Defense bills, directing the spending of $40 billion or more annually. His first job had taught him the value of the dollar but in his last he never made the mistake of trying to put a price tag on defense. Chairman of the Defense Appropriations unit during 8 years when Congress was showing renewed interest in strategic planning and exerting a big influence on such planning through the money bills, he consistently fought for a stronger Defense Establishment. He was in the forefront of the fight for a larger Army and Marine Corps, minimum strengths for the Reserves, speedier development of Polaris, a nuclear carrier, more conventional airpower and development of the B–70.

The grocery wagon job was in Albuquerque 25 miles north of Los Chavez, in Valencia County, where Dennis was born on April 8, 1888, the son of David and Paz Sanchez Chavez. The name of his birthplace was not coincidental; his roots went deep in the soil of Valencia County. He was on land deeded to his direct ancestors by Phillip II of Spain in 1597. One of his progenitors was the first jefe politico (Governor) of the New Mexican territory when Mexico won its independence from Spain in 1821.

The roots were deep but the soil was dry. David Chavez struggled in vain to provide a living for his family on the parched earth of his forebears. When Dennis was 7 the family moved to Albuquerque where there were jobs and also schools. In Los Chavez there were no schools, no books, and only Spanish was spoken. Dennis later said he had become a Democrat because, "I saw that under the Republicans English-speaking communities had schools, Spanish-speaking communities had none."

TO WORK AT 13

But the family was still poor and at 13 Dennis, oldest of 8 children, had to go to work. He not only drove the delivery wagon, he cared for the horse and stable. He once said he spent his youth "playing valet to a horse at 6 o'clock in the morning." The hours were from 6 a.m. to 7 p.m. except on Saturday. On Saturday he worked till 11 p.m. On weekday evenings he studied in the local library, reading his great hero, Jefferson.

After 4 years the pay was up to $11 a week but 1 day the store owner told him to deliver food to men hired to break a strike. He refused and was fired. At 17, he had taken his stand on the side of the underdog. It was the only side he was comfortable on for the rest of his life.

Examples of this come up again and again in his career. He worked tirelessly for the Mexican people of his State, who had discrimination problems, and for the often neglected Indians of the West.

A little-known incident happened in connection with the Defense money bill, which regularly contains restrictions against buying food and clothing from foreign suppliers. In 1955, Chavez added to the restriction the buying of "spun silk yarn for cartridge cloth." A man who owned a small silk plant who had supplied the cartridge covers to the Navy testified he was being forced out of business because the Navy was buying the covers from Japan. He had some evidence the Japanese product did not wear as well as his own. He had a small business and no lobbyist or Senator to fight his cause; he was a little man being disregarded by the Federal Government. Chavez put in the rider to protect him and the jobs of the people who worked for him. Senator Chavez had never seen the man before the committee hearing and never saw him after that but the rider stayed in the bill despite pressure from the State Department and other sources. It is still in the Defense bill today.

TAKES SENATE JOB

The ex-wagon driver studied at night to become a qualified surveyor, worked as assistant engineer for the city of Albuquerque. A job as interpreter for Senator A. A. Jones in 1916 brought an offer of a clerkship in the U.S. Senate. Encouraged by his wife, whom he had married in 1911, he gave up a promising start in the contracting business to come to Washington and fulfill his long dream of studying law. At the tender age of 30, a married man with two children who had never seen the inside of a high school or a college, he entered Georgetown Law School.

Years later, any young man who served on Senator Chavez' staff was required to use his spare time bettering his education. Among ex-Chavez staffmen who got their higher education this way are a former lieutenant governor, a former district attorney, and a number of prominent lawyers and doctors.

With his law degree in 1920, Chavez started a notably successful law practice, though often defending clients who could not afford attorney fees. In 1923 he was elected to the State legislature where he introduced the first bill to provide free textbooks to the schoolchildren of New Mexico. In 1930 he was elected to the House of Representatives, unseating incumbent Republican Albert Simms.

Reelected in 1932, he tried unsuccessfully to defeat Republican Senator Bronson Cutting in 1934 in one of the more acromatic campaigns in New Mexico history. It was the only 1 of 13 major primary and general election campaigns he lost. When Cutting died in a plane crash in 1935, Chavez was appointed to the seat. He was elected to it in 1936 and reelected in 1940, 1946, and 1952. Early building a reputation as a fighter for the things he believed in, he fought some tough battles in the political arena, once complaining it was his fate "always to run against a million dollars."

PROUD OF HERITAGE

The only Senator of Spanish descent, he was intensely proud of his heritage. Once, when asked his nationality, he replied, "American since before Plymouth Rock." An aid once said Chavez was recognized by his colleagues as "one of the last great individualists in the Senate." Like the great individualists throughout the history of the Senate, he had courage. His fellow Senators much admired that courage in 1950, at the height of the McCarthyism era, when many in the Congress were afraid to speak out. Chavez rose on the Senate floor to denounce McCarthy's favorite witness, Louis Bundez, as a man who gave un-American, un-Christian dubious testimony under the shield and cloak of the Catholic church. Chavez, himself a Catholic, said the period might be remembered as a time "when we have quietly shackled the growth of men's minds."

Early in the years of the war he showed that foresight on defense matters that marked his later service. The Senate was debating the Army appropriation bill in 1940 at a time when air power was still little understood and attempts were being made to cut the funds for pilot training. Chavez argued, "I maintain that our national defense in the future will be * * * the airplane of the future. I am for anything that may be done for the making of better pilots and for bringing about of technical improvements in this field."

EQUAL PAY FOR NURSES

Senator Chavez often helped on defense matters in less conspicuous ways. Early in the war there was a terrible shortage of nurses in the Army. Looking into the problem Chavez learned the pay for nurse second lieutenants was below that of male officers of equal grade. He prodded the War Department into paying nurses the same as other officers and recruitment soon picked up.

He wanted a strong defense and he wanted Congress to take the lead in bringing it about. In 1959 his committee reported a bill providing a 200,000-man floor on the Marine Corps and minimum strengths of 300,000 and 400,000, respectively, for the Army Reserve and Army National Guard. He had also voted for an active Army of 900,000 but it had lost in committee. When some in Congress questioned whether Congress should be setting strength minimums or other details of military policy, Chavez said:

"The fundamental issue involved far exceeds in importance the question of what constitutes an adequate strength for the Marine Corps. What is in fact involved here is the constitutional role of the Congress in the formulation of national military policy. The Constitution places the ultimate responsibility for defense squarely on the shoulders of the Congress."

He then lectured his colleagues with precedents, dating back to the time when veterans of the Continental Congress served in Congress, of the legislature setting the size of the Armed Forces and such details as how many marines would be carried on specific naval vessels. He even brought up a case where Congress had specified the tensile strength of the steel to be used in construction of warships.

"In those occasional incidents where our most carefully considered judgments differ from that of the Executive," he concluded, "the Congress cannot in honor and good conscience absolve itself of the burden by supinely bowing to the Executive."

Senator Chavez had a clear understanding of the value of the Reserves. On July 13, 1959, he told the Senate:

"Over a period of years there have been progressive reductions in the strength of the Active Army. One of the factors compensating for this reduction has been the increasing effectiveness and readiness of the Army National Guard and Reserve.

"The Guard and the Reserve are the lowest cost military forces that we have. As an economical and effective alternative to large standing forces they should, at all times, be kept at the optimum levels comparable with the importance of their mission.

"Because no nation, however prosperous, can afford to maintain on active duty all of the personnel who might be needed in time of national emergency, it is imperative that there be a pool of trained manpower available at a moment's notice. The Guard and Reserve, if properly maintained at adequate strength levels, will be able to fulfill this requirement."

LONG, USEFUL LIFE

The respect that fellow Senators had for Senator Chavez' service on national defense matters was well expressed by Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON who said, "I believe the Members of the Senate and every liberty-loving American looks with a great deal of approval upon his efforts. The Senator from New Mexico has had a long and useful life of public service, and I think the Senate is honored to have him head this important subcommittee."

Senator Chavez was thought to have won a year and a half battle with cancer of the throat and was learning to talk again with a metal tube in his throat. He left the hospital last fall to campaign for his party's ticket in New Mexico. He contracted a virus which, coming after the long illness, led to a heart attack that took his life November 17, 1962.

Those who attended the funeral in Albuquerque noted that when the funeral procession moved through the poorer sections of the city the people lined the streets for miles to pay their last respects. They had lost a great friend and they knew it. They always do.

## Washington State Senate Opposes Japanese Halibut Fishing in Bering Sea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Washington State Senate unanimously passed

a memorial urging Federal action to cancel recent concessions of the International North Pacific Fisheries Treaty Commission to allow Japan to fish for halibut east of an existing treaty line.

This memorial was adopted 44 to 0 and charged that a halibut fishery conservation program was threatened by the concessions.

On February 5 a meeting of the International Commission is scheduled to be held in Tokyo to consider Japanese proposals for conservation. It seems to me the agreement to allow Japan to cross the line heretofore established by treaty is premature. Conservation arrangements should have been agreed to first.

Once this halibut resource was almost destroyed but through regulation and self-denial of our fishermen the catches have been increasing in the Bering Sea area. Now the question is, Will the Japanese make 30 years of such restraint and sacrifice in vain?

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, let me add that a joint House-Senate congressional committee has scheduled a hearing on February 14 and 15 in Seattle, Wash., to investigate as to whether the halibut Commission's action was justified.

## Plain Commonsense on So-Called Deficit Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by James Tobin which appeared in the January 19, 1963, issue of the New Republic. Mr. Tobin takes the commonsense approach and gives an accurate assessment of so-called deficit spending.

The article follows:

DEFICIT, DEFICIT, WHO'S GOT THE DEFICIT?

(By James Tobin [1])

Question: "Sir, on that point, what do you think of the President's tax cut proposal and his idea that it would spur revenues even though we would have what he calls a temporary deficit? Does this make sense to you?"

Answer: "My own background is that of a small businessman who has had to scratch right hard to keep his head above water at times. The arithmetic of this thing just doesn't work out. I coudn't in my business increase my expenses and reduce my revenues and stay alive. I don't think a government can do it without an eventual change in our form of government."—Interview with Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, Democrat of Virginia, Chairman of the House Committee on Rules.

For every buyer there must be a seller, and for every lender a borrower. One man's expenditure is another's receipt. My debts are your assets, my deficits your surplus. If all of us were consistently "neither borrower nor lender," as Polonius advised, no one would ever need to violate the revered wisdom of Mr. Micawber. But if the prudent among us insist on running and lending surpluses, some of the rest of us are willy-nilly going to borrow to finance budget deficits.

In the United States today one budget which is usually left holding a deficit is that of the Federal Government. When no one else borrows the surpluses of the thrifty, the Treasury ends up doing so. Since the role of debtor and borrower is thought to be particularly unbecoming to the Federal Government, the Nation feels frustrated and guilty.

Unhappily, crucial decisions of economic policy are too largely blind reactions to these feelings. The truisms that borrowing is the counterpart of lending, and deficits the counterpart of surpluses, are overlooked in popular and congressional discussions of Government budgets and taxes. Both guilt feelings and policy are based on serious misunderstanding of the origins of Federal budget deficits and surpluses.

American households and financial institutions consistently run financial surpluses. They have money to lend, beyond their own needs to borrow. Chart 1 shows the growth in their combined surpluses since the war; it also shows some tendency for these surpluses to rise in periods of recession and slack business activity. Of course, many private households have financial deficits. They pay out more than their incomes for food, clothing, cars, appliances, houses, taxes, etc. They draw on savings accounts, redeem savings bonds, sell securities, mortgage houses or incur installment debt. But deficit households are far outweighed by surplus households. As a group American households and nonprofit institutions have in recent years shown a net financial surplus averaging about $15 billion a year, that is, households are ready to lend, or put into equity investments, about $15 billion a year more than they are prepared to borrow. In addition, financial institutions regularly generate a lendable surplus, now of the order of $5 billion a year. For the most part these institutions, banks, savings and loan associations, insurance companies, pension funds, and the like, are simply intermediaries which borrow and relend the public's money. Their surpluses result from the fact that they earn more from their lending operations than they distribute or credit to their depositors, shareowners and policyholders.

Who is to use the $20 billion of surplus funds available from households and financial institutions? State and local governments as a group have been averaging $3 to $4 billion a year of net borrowing. Pressures of the expanding populations of children, adults, houses and automobiles, plus the difficulties of increasing tax revenues, force these governments to borrow in spite of strictures against government debt. Unincorporated businesses, including farms, absorb another $3 to $4 billion. To the rest of the world we can lend perhaps $2 billion a year. We cannot lend abroad, net, more than the surplus of our exports over our imports of goods and services, and some of that surplus we give away in foreign aid. We have to earn the lendable surplus in tough international competition. Recent experience shows clearly that when we try to lend and invest too much money abroad, we either have to borrow it back or else pay in gold.

These borrowers account for $8 to $10 billion. The remainder—some $10 to $12 billion—must be used either by nonfinancial corporate business or by the Federal Government. Only if corporations as a group take $10 to $12 billion of external funds, by borrowing or issuing new equities, can the Federal Government expect to break even. This is, moreover, an understatement of what is required to keep the Federal debt from rising. For the Federal Government itself provides annually $3 to $4 billion of new lending; and the Treasury would have to borrow to finance these Federal lending programs even if the Government absorbed no net funds from the economy. It is gross Federal borrowing which offends the fiscal conservative, whether or not the proceeds are used to acquire other financial assets.

The moral is inescapable, if startling. If you would like the Federal deficit to be smaller, the deficits of business must be bigger. And would you like the Federal Government to run a surplus and reduce its debt? Then business deficits must be big enough to absorb that surplus as well as the funds available from households and financial institutions.

That does not mean that business must be run at a loss, quite the contrary. Sometimes, it is true, unprofitable businesses are forced to borrow or to spend financial reserves just to stay afloat; this was a major reason for business deficits in the depths of the great depression. But normally it is businesses with good profits and good prospects which borrow or sell new shares of stock, in order to finance expansion and medornization. As the president of A.T. & T. can testify, heavy reliance on outside funds, far from being a distress symptom, is an index and instrument of growth in the profitability and worth of the corporation. Financial deficits incurred by business firms, or by households and governments, do not usually mean that they are living beyond their means and consuming their capital. Financial deficits are typically the means of accumulating nonfinancial assets, real property in the form of inventories, buildings and equipment.

When does business run big deficits? When do corporations draw heavily on the capital markets? The record is clear: When business is very good, when sales are pressing hard on capacity, when businessmen see further expansion ahead. Though corporations' internal funds, depreciation allowances, and plowed-back profits, are large during boom times, their investment programs are even larger.

Chart 2 shows the financial deficits or surpluses of corporate business and of the Federal Government since the war. Three facts stand out. First, the Federal Government has big deficits when corporations run surpluses or small deficits, and vice versa. Second, Government surpluses and business deficits reach their peaks in periods of economic expansion, when industrial capacity is heavily utilized: 1947–48, 1951–52, 1956–57. Third, the combined deficit of corporate business and the Federal Government is greater now than in the early postwar years; this is the counterpart of the upward trend in available surpluses as shown in chart 1.

Recession, idle capacity, unemployment, economic slack, these are the enemies of the balanced Government budget. When the economy is faltering, households have more surpluses available to lend, and business firms are less inclined to borrow them.

The Federal Government will not succeed in cutting its deficit by steps which depress the economy, perpetuate excess capacity, and deter business firms from using outside funds. Raising taxes and cutting expenses seem like obvious ways to balance the budget. But because of their effects on private spending, lending, and borrowing, they may have exactly the contrary result. Likewise, lowering taxes and raising Government expenditures may so stimulate private business activity and private borrowing that the Federal deficit is in the end actually reduced.

This may seem paradoxical, and perhaps it is. Why is it that the homely analogy be-

[1] James Tobin was a member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers from January, 1961, until last July, when he returned to Yale University. His article on "Growth Through Taxation" appeared in the New Republic of July 25, 1960.

tween family finance of Government finance, on which our decisive national attitudes toward Federal fiscal policy are so largely based, misleads us? If John Jones on Maple Street is spending $8,700 a year but taking in only $8,000, the remedy is clear. All Mr. Jones need do to balance the family budget is resolutely to live within his income, either spending some $700 less or working harder to increase his earnings. Jones can safely ignore the impact of either action on the incomes and expenditures of others and the possible ultimate feedback on his own job and income. The situation of John F. Kennedy on Pennsylvania Avenue, spending $87 billion a year against tax revenues of $80 billion is quite different. Suppose he spends $7 billion less, or tries through higher tax rates to boost Federal revenues by $7 billion. He cannot ignore the inevitable boomerang effect on Federal finances. These measures will lower the sales, payrolls and profits of business firms, whether they were selling aircraft to the Government or pleasure boats to taxpayers. These business firms will in turn spend less for new machinery; their employees and stockholders will spend less on vacation trips. This chain is not endless. But before it ends, it will shrink total spending and income in the economy by a multiple of the original $7 billion. The Federal tax base shrinks correspondingly. In the end the Federal deficit will be reduced by much less than $7 billion; perhaps it will even be increased.

Incidentally, many of the very critics who are most vocal in chiding the Government for fiscal sin advocate policies which would make fiscal virtue even more elusive. They want to keep private borrowing in check by tight credit policies and high interest rates. They want to increase corporations' internal flow of funds by bigger depreciation allowances and higher profit margins, making business still less dependent on external funds to finance investment, even in boom times. When these apostles of sound finance also tell the Government to shun external finance, have they done their arithmetic? If everyone is self-financing, who then will borrow the surpluses?

The Nation is paying a high price for the misapplied homely wisdom which guides Federal fiscal policy. The real toll is measured by unemployment, idle capacity, lost production, and sluggish economic growth. But fiscal conservatism is also self-defeating. It does not even achieve its own aim, the avoidance of Government deficits. Federal fiscal and monetary policies consciously and unashamedly designed to stimulate the economy would have sufficient justification in economic expansion itself. But they might well improve the Federal budget too, by inducing business to use the private surpluses that now have no destination other than a rising Federal debt.

## New York City: Educational Stepchild of New York State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, another example of the way an urban area is discriminated against by a rural Republican-dominated State government is the area of education. The amount of money that New York City pays into the coffers of the State treasury is astronomical, and yet we have the spectacle of the State returning $107 less per pupil in State aid to the city's schools than the average received by other school districts throughout the State.

The people of New York City are not blind to this fiscal discrimination and will exert their influence at the polls at the proper time. An example of the awareness of this problem is the following editorial which was broadcast by station WCBS–TV on January 10 and 11:

ANNOUNCER. The following program is an expression of opinion of WCBS–TV. Speaking for the station: Mr. Norman E. Walt, Jr., vice president and general manager of WCBS–TV.

Mr. WALT. Good evening.

New York City schools have been a chronic source of dissatisfaction for a long time. Twenty years ago, our schools were widely regarded as being among the best in the country. Since then they have steadily declined.

Just last month, the State education department issued a report on the city's school system which pointed out that we don't have enough teachers, our classrooms are overcrowded, there aren't enough textbooks, a lot of equipment is antiquated, and many of our school buildings are dingy and dilapidated. While this report was no great revelation to teachers, to parents or, for that matter, to the school children themselves, it was useful to the extent that it spelled out what can be done to remedy these deficiencies. But as responsible citizens who live in New York City, we must face up to the fact that whatever has to be done will cost money, a lot of money. According to an estimate made in a joint report by the Public Education Association and the United Federation of Teachers, the amount required will be close to $200 million more each year than we are paying now. We must also face up to the fact that there are only two ways to raise it—by increased city taxes and by increased State aid.

Where can New York City taxes be increased? There have been proposals to increase the tax on cab rides, on amusements, on overnight parking, and a proposal to extend the city's sales tax to beer. Channel 2 opposes these taxes because they hit hardest at those who are least able to pay.

However, there are other tax possibilities which channel 2 believes should be carefully studied. One possibility might be to add one-quarter of 1 percent to whatever rate the taxpayer is paying in State income tax. This is called a surtax and would yield approximately $60 million. Its advantage is that it is based fairly on income. Another tax possibility which could yield as much as $269 million would be to raise the legal tax limit on real estate 1½ percent—to bring it in line with tax ceilings elsewhere in the State. Or the city might consider taxing the profits from the port authority's nonaviation enterprises at Idlewild Airport as well as any port authority project which has already paid for itself. And finally, there is offtrack betting as a possible steady source of city income.

Now, what about increased State aid? At present, State aid to our city's schools is $107 less per pupil than the average received by other school districts throughout the State. Why do we receive less? Because the current State aid formula bases the amount any school district shall receive on the tax value of its real estate. This formula is based on the premise that the greater the value of a city's real estate, the greater the taxes it may impose, and, therefore, the greater its financial ability to support its schools. The State figures that New York City, with its high real estate values, doesn't need as much State aid for schools as other districts. The difficulty with this premise is that it fails to take into account the city's expenses in relation to its income. The fact is that our city spends a far greater proportion of its tax revenues for a far greater number of public services than do the less populous areas. For example, in order to provide adequate police protection, New York City must spend a greater proportion of its total income than that spent by upstate Yates County for the same public service, in fact, 4 times as much. And it must spend proportionately 8 times as much of its total income for its fire department, 10 times as much for sanitation and more than twice as much for welfare. New York City also has to provide services which may not figure at all in the rural county budget, such as air pollution, water pollution, museums and markets. As a result, New York City actually has less of its total income to spend on education than far smaller communities where the cost of other public services is not so great.

If New York City is ever to halt the steady decline of its schools, and to restore them to the high scholastic level they maintained 20 years ago, we must face up to the fact that sacrifices will have to be made. It is going to take money—a lot of money—$200 million more for our schools than we are paying now. The additional money can only be obtained in two ways: by increased city taxes and by increased State aid. But we can't increase city taxes without the approval of the State legislature and we can't get increased State aid until the legislature comes through with a school formula that no longer discriminates against New York City.

For years our rural-dominated State legislature assured us that it is giving New York City its fair share of aid for education. On this station last November 20, Republican majority leader of the senate, Walter J. Mahoney, assured our viewers that in the field of education, and I quote: "the legislature is appropriating millions of dollars each year in special aids, over and above the amount the city is entitled to under the statewide formula." But significantly, he failed to discuss the formula itself—a formula which doesn't provide the city with anywhere near its fair share of State funds.

Parents of children enrolled in New York City schools can no longer afford to be passive about this form of discrimination. Channel 2 is convinced that Governor Rockefeller and Mayor Wagner can—and ought—to take the problem of our schools once and for all out of the realm of politics. If these two men will work out a statesmanlike formula for new city taxation and increased State aid—before the issues get distorted in legislative infighting—they will have given the legislature much-needed leadership and they will have earned the gratitude of every citizen in New York City.

Thank you and good night.

ANNOUNCER. The preceding program was an editorial opinion of WCBS–TV by Norman E. Walt, Jr., vice president and general manager of WCBS–TV.

## Loans for Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a new bill in the 88th Congress—H.R. 1978—to increase the funds which the colleges and universities can get for

loans to students. The bill will double the amount which the institutions of higher learning will have available for loans to needy students. In the 87th Congress, Representative Bailey, of West Virginia, had a similar bill which did not reach the floor.

I hope that the Committee on Education and Labor will give immediate consideration to my bill or to any similar bill which may have been introduced. The universities and colleges are unable to meet the requests for loans which are made by needy students. The National Defense Education Act program, involving loans to needy students, is acceptable to and supported by all groups interested in higher education. It provides for the return of the public funds loaned, with interest. It contains special benefits for loans to students who are preparing to be teachers so that the teacher shortage can be overcome. The programs for education are vital to the welfare of our country. Many States and cities are cooperating in a splendid manner with education grants, but these sources cannot begin to adequately solve the problem. This Congress can be a tremendous help if the loan program can be doubled at once so that needy students can be helped immediately.

## National Revolutions and Russian Imperialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable confusion with respect to communism, Russian imperialism, and national revolution which we read and hear so much about in these changing times. National revolutions have been in conflict with the aims of Russian imperialism for more than a century. Today the Russian Communists call out for peaceful coexistence while at the same time they are plotting and working to destroy the national independence of all free nations.

A very significant analysis of the relationship of Russian imperialism, peaceful coexistence, and the aspirations of nations to be independent was made by Dr. Michael S. Pap, director of the Institute for Soviet and East European Studies, John Carroll University, Cleveland, on the occasion of the 45th anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian Democratic Republic. His analysis relates to the atmosphere which permeated the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk in 1918 and the attitude taken by the Russian Bolsheviks with regard to the newly independent nations which arose with the collapse of the Russian czarist empire. This analysis is a positive contribution toward clearing up the confusion which exists on the nature of imperial Russian communism. By leave obtained, I insert in the RECORD Dr. Pap's analysis on national revolutions and Russian imperialism:

The anniversary celebrated by the Ukrainians in the free world each January has a meaningful significance not only for the Ukrainians but for the people of the United States and the whole free world as well. It is obvious that when freedom is obliterated in one country, it indirectly affects all the other free peoples. At a time when Moscow tries to impress the world as the champion of anticolonialism, there is an urgent need to remind our people of the fate of nations forced to live under the brutal oppression of Communist Russian dictatorship.

Ukraine with a population of 45 million was the first victim of Soviet Russian aggression. It is the largest non-Russian nation within the Soviet Russian Empire. This entitles it to rank in Europe next to Russia, Germany, and France not only in terms of population, but also in terms of strategic geographic position and rich resources. Because of its resources, it had always been regarded as a coveted prize of aggressors—first the Mongols, then Moscovite czars, and finally the Russian Communists.

When, in 1917, the Russian autocratic government disintegrated, the Ukrainian people availed themselves of the opportunity to regain their own independence. A national government was formed which then issued decrees and promulgated laws, securing liberty and equality for all citizens of Ukraine. At the same time, the Russian Communist Party issued its declaration in favor of the right to self-determination.

It soon became apparent, however, that this Soviet declaration was only a clever Bolshevik maneuver to preserve the unity of the former Russian Empire. Simultaneously with the ostentatious proclamation of the right to self-rule, the Soviet Russian Government dispatched to the Ukrainian National Government a 48-hour ultimatum dated December 17, 1917, signed by Lenin and Stalin, demanding unconditional surrender and the acceptance of Soviet Russian domination over Ukraine. The reply by the Ukrainian Government of December 19, 1917, is regarded today as a historical and a classic document which clearly exhibits a unique comprehension of the potential Communist threat not only to the young Ukrainian Republic, but to the free peoples throughout the world. Ukrainians realized already in 1917 that between the czarist and the Bolshevik imperialism, there was little or no difference. Rejecting the Soviet ultimatum, Ukraine proclaimed her independence on January 22, 1918. A proclamation of the reunification of all Ukrainian territories in one single democratic state followed a year later on January 22, 1919. With these two significant acts, the Ukrainians demonstrated to the world that Moscow and Kiev represented two different cultures, two different nations, and two different mentalities. Kiev personified the democratic concept of government based on respect for human rights and the dignity of man, while Moscow represented not only totalitarianism but also a godless force of destruction.

The ensuing Russian-Ukrainian war of almost 4 years' duration (1917–21) is rather obscured, because at that time communism was not recognized as a danger to the free world. The Russian Communists were aided in their war against Ukrainians by a majority of the Russians who sacrificed democracy in order to preserve the unity of the Russian Empire. How well the Ukrainians understood the danger of Russian Bolshevism can best be described by quoting the Ukrainian Representative Liubinsky at the Brest-Litovsk Peace Conference in February 1918 when following Trotzky's declarations of Communist peaceful aims, he stated:

"The noisy declarations of the Bolsheviks regarding the complete freedom of the people of Russia is but the vulgar stuff of demagogy. The Government of the Bolsheviks, which has broken up the constituent assembly and which rests on the bayonets of hired red guards, will never elect to apply in Russia the very just principle of self-determination, for they know only too well that not only the Republic of the Ukraine but also the Don, the Caucasus, Siberia, and other regions do not regard them as their government, and that even the Russian people, themselves, will ultimately deny their right; only because they are afraid of the development of a national revolution do they declare here at the peace conference and within Russia, with a spirit of demagogy peculiar to themselves, the right of self-determination of the peoples. They themselves are struggling against the realization of this principle and are resorting not only to hired bands of red guards but also to meaner and even less legal methods."

Since the Bolshevik Russian occupation of the Ukraine, 10 million Ukrainians or more died in the defense of their independence. The Ukraine would have remained free had the Western nations paid heed to her warnings of the potential Communist menace and answered her desperate call for moral and military assistance. Without the Ukraine's strategic position and her immeasurable mineral resources, the Soviet Russian Government would have difficulties in initiating aggressive pressures toward the West. We, Americans, should find comfort in knowing that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is not all Russia, but a chain of captive nations yearning for an opportunity to break this chain of bondage and become masters of their destinies within their respective Republics. During and after World War II, the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, was actively engaged in fighting nazism and communism alike. Paradoxically, the Western Powers again were not interested in the emergence of this freedom force in Eastern Europe, and unwittingly helped the Kremlin pave its way to the heart of Europe and Asia. On the basis of our experience with the Communists, we should know by now that the only policy capable of shaking the foundation of the Soviet Russian slave empire is a policy motivated by the idea of individual and national liberty for all. It is this ideological weapon the Communists fear most. For this reason, the Ukrainians would wholeheartedly support the U.S. ideological reorientation which would include an open support for the Ukraine's as well as for other nations' right to liberty and independence. Such a policy would force the Kremlin into a defensive position and may prove to be the best deterrent to a nuclear war.

## Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of January 26, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT
(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER)

THE PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGES

The economic report and tax messages of this week, as well as the earlier state of the Union and budget messages are sick documents, as I see it. Realizing this, I have of-

fered my own general analyses in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following each message, respectively.

*Economic report*

"Governmentitis" is the sickness. Keynesianism, that is, modern socialism, is described in detail. The deficit specified as $11.9 billion likely will run up to $20 billion or more. The President's four reports to Congress under the Employment Act of 1946 were: (1) Economic conditions; (2) foreseeable; (3) economic expansion; and (4) program for carrying out policy. Both the original act and the President's report carry all the language necessary for total control of the U.S. economy by the Federal Government.

Items from the report:

(1) Unemployment is still too high. Unmentioned are these factors: (a) Everyone over 14 years of age having requested work but unemployed are carried on the roles; (b) in a free society of 185 million there will always be several million unemployed.

(2) Gross national product and growth should be greater. Implicit in such statements is the assumption of our President that there are certain mandatory growth amounts in a free society, that he knows them, and that the Government can and will change them by Federal mandate. Unmentioned and/or unrecognized is the stultifying effect of Government redtape, control, and burden now on our private economy. The President confuses Government's role with the voluntary actions of millions of citizens and the Chief Executive's role with that of the Almighty.

3. The 1961–62 historical analysis is inaccurate. He characterizes the social security program as antirecession legislation which it is not; public works pumppriming as healthy economic growth, public housing and urban renewal as aids to recovery which, with Federal aid and deficits, they are not. The bugetary policy shift is explained, into deficits, and we are told to disregard as fallacious current fears over inflation on the one hand and gold outflow on the other, both endangering the value of our currency. Deficits are defended as prelude to wealth.

The President defended again: (1) the need for Executive quickie tax cuts at his pleasure and, (2) quick and massive public works expenditures (the second Congress passed last year—but not the first) and outlined for all to see a blueprint for dictatorial power.

So I presented then and now, a constructive program, quite revolutionary to some, of: (1) Balanced budget; (2) surplus accumulation; (3) debt reduction; (4) tax reform as part of my legislative cures for our economic sickness.

*Tax message*

The tax message carried further earlier references in other statements concerning tax reform and reductions, but still dealt in generalities instead of being in legislative form: $13.6 billion total tax cut, $11 billion individual and $2.6 billion corporate, with $3.4 billion recovered by increased taxes in various areas.

These are some of the suggested areas: (1) Reduce current 20 to 91 percent bracket percentages to 18½ and 84½ this year—next year down to 14 to 65 percent, respectively; (2) reduce 52 percent corporate to 50 percent first year and further to 47 percent; (3) change capital gains both in time property held and percent rate resulting in slightly lower rates; (4) repeal $50 exclusion and 4 percent tax credit on stock dividends over $50; (5) tighter tax rules surrounding oil and mineral depletion; (6) speed up quarterly payments of corporations; (7) eliminate individual deductions under 5 percent of income not permitted (instead of present 10 percent or $1,000).

The tax message has been referred to the Ways and Means Committee. Hearings open to the public for several weeks will be held starting February 6 followed by executive sessions by the committee.

FUNDAMENTAL FACTORS

Basic factors to be remembered: (1) Tax cuts should be matched at least by Government spending cuts and not divorced; (2) deficits lead to debt, not the wealth as the President foresees; (3) contrary to the President's avowed belief, inflation and gold outflow are twin dangers we must not disregard. Currency devaluation is inherent and would sabotage our economy.

Specific tax factors to remember: (1) Corporate taxes are passed on in higher prices to consumers; (2) corporate taxes drop automatically this year to 47 percent—Congress is being asked to keep them up in order to cut them starting next January; (3) speedup in tax payment—stricter law, more regulations—are not incentives to investment as heralded; (4) 1 million are being taken off the tax roll; (5) individual deductions elimination will increase taxes for everyone by that amount; (6) medical expense and drugs less deductible is Federal coercion of people to support the President's medicare program; (7) less charitable deduction is more Federal coercion for Federal aid to replace charitable help, while foundations tax-free operations are overlooked; (8) double taxation is increased by removal of stock dividend and credit.

FLAT PERCENTAGE TAX

Tax reform as I see it, to be fair must move to the flat percentage tax, paid equally by all people. That is my proposal. Meanwhile, our hodge-podge is further scrambled, not fair, not equitable, not an incentive, while the monstrous sabotage of private enterprise—Federal deficit planning and control of our people—is perpetrated. In the President's language "Tax reform * * * will stimulate growth and steer income or investment into areas which better serve the national purpose." By whose judgment I now ask? I believe individuals are entitled to what they earn, not to have Federal planners take it in taxes and replan individual lives in a society conforming to the planners' ideas and concepts of what's best for people.

CURRENT EVENTS

Current events, via Presidential action and statement: (1) Bay of Pigs fiasco. What really happened? Lesson learned: Tragedy of managed and manipulated and censored news by White House mandate; (2) surveillance of Cuba by U–2 proudly acknowledged by our President is same Communist surveillance for which Democrat leaders denounced President Eisenhower; (3) President wants to extend trade with Poland and Yugoslavia, saying "Trade really is better in this case than aid," never thinking apparently that both are wrong, and that both must be terminated.

Elsewhere this week the United States is displaying brinkmanship on the edge of danger in encouraging: (1) Nuclear test ban without adequate inspection; (2) capitulation to labor demands in the dock strike via Federal mediation; (3) seeking of more Socialist advice (beyond Walter Heller, the President's Chief Economic Advisor), by soliciting Socialist Gunnar Myrdal's counsel, who admits big Government's spending leads to inflation and therefore we need price and investment control.

PREDICTIONS

Predictions department: Present United States course will lead to: (1) Devaluation of currency through inflation and reduction of gold backing; (2) price control; (3) increased wage control, more than at present; (4) full managed economy.

How does all this tie in and is it affected by the statement of Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense: "That it's inherent in that Government's right, if necessary, to lie to save itself when it's going up into a nuclear war. This seems to me basic—basic."

Let's hope our country wakes up in time.

Once again the Dallas Federal Building is in the news with the usual misunderstanding or misinterpretation, of what happened. The Democratic leadership has admitted that the building has been held up for political reasons. The record proves I have done everything that is ethical and possible to have this project included in the budget.

House committee appointments: The appointment of ED FOREMAN to the powerful Armed Services Committee in his first term shows recognition by the Republicans of the importance of the South and is a real tribute to ED's qualifications as a Member of Congress.

## Our National Anthem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, all Marylanders take great pride in the fact that Francis Scott Key wrote the immortal words to our national anthem at Fort McHenry in Baltimore. In recognition of this event, the Stars and Stripes fly over Fort McHenry 24 hours a day and there are only 2 other places in the world where this is permitted.

Next year, we will mark the 150th anniversary of the penning of the "Star Spangled Banner," and we in Maryland would like to have the rest of the Nation join with us in celebrating this historic event.

The Metropolitan Civic Association of Baltimore is taking the lead in arranging for appropriate activities in our own State. This organization has adopted a resolution calling upon the President to appoint a Special National Commission to arrange for a nationwide celebration marking this 150th anniversary.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have this resolution and a brief statement by the executive secretary of the Metropolitan Civic Association, Mr. Maurice Shochatt, printed at this point in the RECORD:

METROPOLITAN CIVIC ASSOCIATION,
*Baltimore, Md.*

The Metropolitan Civic Association, a group dedicated to Metropolitan Baltimore activities, has won recognition for its activities in the spheres of transportation, rehabilitation, beautification, and taxation.

As part of its activities, the organization presents annual achievement awards to outstanding citizens of Maryland. Recipients of such awards include Baltimore Police Commissioner Bernard J. Schmidt; Charles P. McCormick, chairman of the Baltimore Civic Center Commission; Francis X. Gallagher, people's counsel to the Public Service Commission of Maryland; Dr. George B. Brain, superintendent of the Baltimore public schools; Inspector Thomas J. Keyes, of the Baltimore Police Department; Joseph F. Caskey, director of the youth traffic section of the municipal court of Baltimore City; and Hyman A. Pressman, champion of citizens'

causes. The organization is headed by Warren J. Weinberger, president; Reuben Fedderman, senior vice president; and Maurice R. Shochatt, executive secretary.

Within recent date, the executive board of the Metropolitan Civic Association passed a special resolution, in conjunction with the 150th anniversary of the "Star-Spangled Banner" that is to be observed in 1964. The text is as follows:

"Whereas 1964 will mark the passage of 150 years since Francis Scott Key saw our flag flying over Fort McHenry 'in the dawn's early light' on September 14, 1814, and then penned the immortal "Star-Spangled Banner": Therefore be it

*Resolved,* That the President be requested to appoint a Special National Commission to begin formulating and arranging for a nationwide "Star-Spangled Banner" celebration in 1964 so that all citizens may point with pride to Francis Scott Key's unique contribution to the Nation, as exemplified by our national anthem and its 150th anniversary."

## America the Beautiful: Heritage or Honky-Tonk?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Kiplinger magazine for November 1962, carried a provocative article on "America the Beautiful: Heritage or Honky-Tonk?"

This article has been reprinted for wider distribution by the National Trust for Historic Preservaton, a nonprofit educational organization, chartered by an act of Congress, and privately supported by membership dues and contributions.

Overcommercialization does pose a serious threat to the beauty and dignity of many of our historic shrines. This is a natural development in keeping with the greater mobility of our citizens. More and more of them are attracted to the battlefiields and other historic spots each year and entrepreneurs are quick to capitalize on the availability of these customers.

Preserving our national heritage is of overriding importance, however, and it behooves thoughful citizens to work toward keeping a dignified balance in the development of all of these historic sites.

In bringing this article to the attention of my colleagues, it is my hope that the Congress will provide the necessary leadership in preserving our national monuments for the enjoyment of the many rather than for the private gain of the few.

I ask unanimous consent to have the following article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

AMERICA THE BEAUTIFUL: HERITAGE OR HONKY-TONK?

What are they really like today, the places your kids read about in school and which you hope to show them sometime as the finest representations of the American spirit? In case you haven't looked lately, a shock is in store. Marvels like Yellowstone Park and Gettysburg battlefield are infested, often within their borders and almost always around the edges by a spreading disease of our time—tourist blight.

It's more than a sickness of an era marked by mobility and leisure; the manufacture of tourist blight is also a lucrative business. Competition is keen among those who cater to and exploit the simplest expressions of public taste.

Now Coney Island is one thing. It serves a delightful purpose, afluter with pennants and sideshows and mistaken for nothing else but itself. So does Atlantic City, for those who like to walk the Boardwalk and Steel Pier, feeling content in company of loud signs, loud noises and throngs of people. But this is hardly the atmosphere to spread from one coast to another, hardly an appropriate symbol to find at the gateway to, or within, a national shrine.

Of course, everyone is entitled to his own taste and should pursue it freely. But the public landscape, which all of us must live with, deserves farsighted care. And our national monuments should be more than an opportunity for promoters to make a fast buck.

Perhaps the surge of the last decade to lay waste to large sections of the countryside owes its inspiration to the success of Disneyland. Walt Disney built a synthetic thing, ballyhooed it on television and proved that millions of families would come running. Enterprising hopefuls copied some of the Disney image, playing up to public interest in history, the American West, nature, patriotism and religion. In almost every part of the country—often adjacent to a national park or monument drawing millions of visitors—are places bearing such names as Fantasyland, Six Gun City and even Bibleland.

But they lack Disney's greatest promotional advantage, the handy access to network television, and have to compensate in other ways. They resort to mammoth roadside billboards unashamed representing their attractions as the "most outstanding," "foremost," "most historic," "most scenic" single spot in the State or Nation. They harass with their signs, they demand attention, they cajole through appeals to children and parents until the poor family can hardly pass the place by without a guilty conscience.

Some resort to the lowest form of attention-getters, the display of caged animals at souvenir stands, gas stations and other tourist places.

Is this really what the public deserves? Some of those who profit from blight say, "Yes, most people have poor taste and we give them what they want." Yet there is the pitiful example of the Civil War Centennial to show how little opportunity the public is accorded to express its taste freely.

Long before the centennial began, it was marked as a target of exploitation by all manner of commercial interests hoping to capitalize on the instincts of patriotism. Manufacturers of toys and gimcrack souvenirs advanced from one direction. Tourist operators attacked from another, establishing paid attractions close to the gateways of sacred battlefields.

When Allan Nevins, the distinguished historian, became chairman of the Commission in late 1961, he pledged that the sufferings and sacrifices of a century ago would not be memorialized with a carnival and that commercialism would be muted and disciplined. The hopeful objectives became to save a neglected battlefield, commission a symphony, raise a monument, get important books written. The scholar, very clearly, expresses a different concept than does the self-serving tourist promoter.

Dr. Nevins and others like him, the garden clubs, historical societies, the advocates of planning and zoning, endeavor to preserve and protect the characteristics that made them natural wonders and historic shrines in the first place.

What can you do to help, besides let your blood boil? We'll get to that later, but for now come abroad the calliope and tour the country for a look at blight on the landscape. The following are choice examples:

Gettysburg, Pa.: No matter how you approach this hallowed ground, the route is lined with signs leading to extraneous commercial attractions. On the west, the Chambersburg Road, which Lee followed en route to the fateful battle, there is an Indian village, complete with totem poles and tepees; it's labeled "authentic," although Indians have not been in this area since 1750, and never did use totem poles or tepees when they were here. On the north, the road from Harrisburg, near the place where Gen. Jubal Early's force smashed Union defenses the first day of battle, there is a Horse 'N' Buggy Museum, variously and modestly advertised as "America's largest" and the "world's largest" collection.

But to be near is not enought. The new Howard Johnson motel advertises happily that it is practically in the center of the battlefield inviding guests to experience the art of pleasant living only a few hundred yards from the field of Pickett's Charge and the scene of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. Then there is America's most beautiful land of make-believe, a place called Fantasyland, with monkeys and Mother Goose, right in the center of things facing General Meade's headquarters just below the National Cemetery. And Stuckey's garish red and yellow roadside emporium, accompanied by Texas Fire Chief, astride the line of Longstreet's daring and bloody attack of the second day, where you can purchase mementoes of the battlefield, including ceramic birds, dogs, horses, alligator bags, and ash trays with such inscriptions as "Gasoline and alcohol don't mix—but gasoline straight ain't bad."

Then there is another group of attractions at Gettysburg, the "inspirational and educational." One is the Hall of Presidents, an array of wax figures that constitute an "exciting and patriotic exhibit" and a must for every American. Next, the National Civil War Wax Museum, with more than 150 figures in stirring tableaux. If you find them not sufficiently stirring, proceed to the "newest and finest attraction," the Gettysburg Battlefield Diorama and Museum, which features sound effects of smoking rifles, burning wagons, and blazing cannon fire. There is also the granddaddy of them all, the Gettysburg National Museum, now pressed into proclaiming itself as "Home of the New Electric Map."

These places are determined to leave absolutely nothing to the visitor's imagination. The battlefield tour, provides moments of emotion-drenched history in stereophonic sound. You travel by bus and listen to the voices of Lincoln and Pickett, with cannons thrown in as chills run up and down your spine.

Lincoln, in his utterance that brave men consecrated these fields far above our poor power to add or detract, proved a poor prophet.

Natural Bridge, Va.: Thomas Jefferson would hardly recognize the towering limestone arch that he once owned. He treasured the great bridge, carved by rushing mountain streams over the centuries, and described it as "the most sublime of nature's works." He resisted suggestions for manmade changes and said the bridge should remain as nature left it.

Today the wide bridge, 215 feet above Cedar Creek, supports Route 11, the main road down the Shenandoah Valley. But the view is blocked by a wooden fence, as though protecting the inside of a baseball park. Jefferson would be required, before gaining admission, to pay his fee of $1.50. But there would be no extra charge if he elected to visit during the evening to see the soul stir-

ring performance of the "Drama of Creation," when the bridge is illuminated with colored lights and voice recordings evoke various religious images. And after coming through the entrance, he could also stop at the swimming pool, skating rink and an enormous souvenir counter vending a multitude of trinkets and doodads.

A recent addition at Natural Bridge is the antique car collection known as the "Museum of Motoring Memories"; this kind of companion piece is now widely found together with moneymaking commercial tourist attractions. Natural Bridge is perhaps the pacesetter for Route 11, a once-beautiful route, now adorned from Winchester to Roanoke with unrestrained advertisements for motels, commercial caverns, a place called Zoorama—it failed after a short, unhappy life, but the signs remain—and some ill-maintained State roadside rests.

The Great Smokies, N.C.: "The lowest form of tourist blight involves the exploitation of wild animals, and some of the most distressing examples are found in the highlands of western North Carolina. Michael Frome, in his book on the national forests, "Whose Woods These Are," passes lightly over moonshining as a menace of the mountains to describe the caged-bear routine, as follows:

Gracing the foreground of the historic gateway to Pisgah National Forest is a roadside souvenir and refreshment stand. Here you can buy a coke, hand it to a bear through the bars of his cage and watch him drink it. The purpose of his presence is to attract your interest and trade. Western North Carolina has a variety of such crude attractions. One is the reptile garden, which everyone who loves wild creatures should see, not because it is good, but to observe how the animals, assorted scraggly deer, a bear and snakes, are cared for. There are the Twin Yona—yona is Cherokee for bear—caged on the roadside in the Indian reservation between the National Forest and Great Smoky Mountains National Park. And like displays of wildlife before gift shops and gasoline stations in Maggie Valley.

How are these creatures captured? And how are they cared for? The author asked these questions of the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission, which endeavored, in reply, to place the full blame on the Cherokee Indians although bear-displaying souvenior stands invariably are operated by white Carolinians. After the book stirred a commotion, with the Governor receiving letters of protest from all sections of the country, officials of the wildlife commission conceded the bears are kept in deplorable, unsanitary and inhumane conditions but have so far failed to protect the animals from their roadside exploiters.

The Tennessee side of the Great Smokies provides hardly a better foreground setting for the most popular of America's national parks. The town of Gatlinburg, an obscure mountain crossroads until chosen as the site of park headquarters, offers all manners of neon-lit commercial diversions, plus a chairlift ride over the town and a Biblical garden with dioramas of the life of Christ. There are some fine craft shops, in the best Smokies tradition, but far more prominent are those inevitable trinket stands—where the price is cheap but the markup is high. "Sure, I'm in the craft business," said one souvenir dealer with a laugh. "Get some of my best merchandise over the mountain—in Jay-pan."

Lookout Mountain, Tenn.: From top to bottom, four commercial tourist attractions decorate the landscape of Lookout Mountain. But their influence does not end there. The city of Chattanooga, with signs of all sizes and shapes advertising attractions, motels, and restaurants, is a difficult maze to pass through unscarred. And for hundreds of miles around, barn tops, billboards and birdhouses exhort the motorist and his family to "See Rock City."

Many visitors actually find Rock City, atop Lookout Mountain, an attractive place, with sandstone formations and trails over suspension bridges, through tunnels and "fairyland caverns." Admission may be high priced at $2, 75 cents for children (plus extras for special displays), but 30 percent of the revenue is poured back into highway advertising. Then there is Ruby Falls, reached by elevator, located in a cave below the surface. This attraction considers itself "the most spectacular of the world's wonders," and if this slogan is not sufficient enticement, there is another: "Worthy of the Master's hand alone."

To go up and down the mountain, there is the incline railway, which spans "America's Most Amazing Mile." To visitors the cost of being "breathlessly suspended above the city" is $1 round trip, while to commuters it is 36 cents. At the base of Lookout the new Confederama, "the world's largest battlefield display of its kind," is guaranteed to tug at the heartstrings of every red-blooded son of Dixie.

If you persevere in ascending the mounain, and successfully penetrate this glowing ring of commercial superlatives, you will ultimately reach Point Park. Maintained by the Federal Government to commemorate the Civil War "Battle Above the Clouds," it overlooks the city of Chattanooga and the sweeping Moccasin Bend of the Tennessee River. And, without binoculars, there's not a billboard in sight.

Silver Springs, Fla. The jungle waters and swamp growth of the springs have been a tourist attraction ever since a paddle-wheel steamer carried passengers up the Oklawaha River a century ago. Today this is big business, even by booming Florida standards. The traditional 1-hour electrically operated boat trip is only the beginning. From there you are invited to the adjacent reptile farm, or "institute"; the Prince of Peace Memorial (depicting the life of Christ in diorama); the deer ranch, and, of course, the inevitable collection of antique automobiles. Each of these components charges a separate admission, and the average family is likely to spend $10 or more.

Big business requires big promotion, and Silver Springs is a master of the art. Billboards are located all over the State, tracking the visitor from the instant he crosses the line; what is more, boards change frequently to keep timely and topical. Doormats at motels are not inscribed with the usual word of "welcome," but with "See Silver Springs." Bathmats are apt to say the same. So are placemats at restaurant tables. Any child traveling with his family to a vacation in Florida who doesn't say, "I want to see Silver Springs, daddy," has clearly had his head buried in a commic book the entire way.

Customers leaving the springs are also enlisted in the campaign, voluntarily or otherwise. One autumn a Florida newspaper editor thought he would take a presidential poll by assigning a reporter to tally Republican and Democratic bumper strips. "Sorry, chief, neither party can win," his man advised after spending a day on the street. "It's 'See Silver Springs' way out front."

Ocala, Silver Springs' neighbor in central Florida, bears the heaviest saturation. Advertising assumes urgent, imperative qualities, with such expressions as "Don't Miss" and "You Must." This basically attractive town appears despoiled and mesmerized, with its beautiful live oaks and subtropical foliage on the verge of obliteration by the unending message of "See Silver Springs."

Curiously, almost adjacent to the Springs lies Ocala National Forest, where on pennants flutter a welcome reminder of Florida's natural glories; yet its recreation areas receive scant attention from tourist promoters in Ocala or the State government. Little wonder, perhaps, considering the overwhelming emphasis on real estate, industrial development, hotels, motels and manmade tourist attractions. Places like the Ocala National Forest and Everglades National Park are hard put by many pressures. Yet they are the pattern for the synthetic, like the tourist place in southern Florida that offers the convenience of a little bit of the Everglades in the heart of Miami.

Black Hills, S. Dak.: "Yes, it is amazing to see the long line of commercial attractions on the road out here," a prominent and responsible citizen of the Black Hills area told a visitor from the East last summer. "The number is growing each year, too. Of course, we receive many complaints from visitors that this sort of thing destroys the feeing for Rushmore. But it seems somebody is bent on trying a new gimmick on every piece of private land from Rapid City to Mount Rushmore."

The gimmicks are multifarious indeed. The 25-mile road to Rushmore is an obstacle course of commercial attractions, all seeking to divert a million visitors, heading for a famous shrine, into their little crannies. The Reptile Gardens leads the way with the largest number of signs. There are four separate self-professed natural phenomena: Gravity Hill, Gravity Spot, Dizzyland, U.S.A. (Mysteries of Gravity) and the Cosmos—the real nature's mystery area—then assorted caves and gold mines, and the usual Horseless Carriage Museum and Fairyland's Bewitched Village.

At one point the tragic contrast between the shrine and the commercial surroundings becomes most evident. A neat, small, green and white sign reads, "Mount Rushmore Memorial, 3 miles," but this can hardly be seen for the much larger, garish signs above and around it advertising mines, motels, caves, and bars.

There is a novel little stunt in the Black Hills not seen elsewhere, a seal of approval at the entrance to many of these places. This sign reads "Family Approved Attraction." Approved by Parents' magazine? The Automobile Club? No, nothing as objective as that. These tourist operators have their own organization, the Black Hills, Badlands, & Lakes Association, and simply approve each other.

The picture within the memorial grounds has its dim side, too. One would think the National Park Service would maintain the vantage points facing the four Presidential heads carved high on the granite mountain. But one of the best spots is operated by a commercial concessionaire as a kind of carnival.

The mammoth souvenir shop carries the feeblest assortment of native handicrafts made by the Sioux Indians. The emphasis is on merchandising such items as nylon flags of all nations, Japanese-made plates bearing pictures of President and Mrs. Kennedy and figurines of Jesus Christ.

Yellowstone National Park: The sorry truth is that Federal officials sometimes contribute to tourist blight, too. Despite the proud tradition and generally high standards of the National Park Service, the core of Yellowstone, the Nation's oldest and largest national park, has deteriorated into a scandalous slum, the consquence of poor commercial management over a period of years and of soft and sloppy administration by park officials.

Park people concede this privately, often with grim humor. "I heard my neighbor brushing his teeth this morning," says one visiting park man to another after spending a night at Canyon Village Motor Lodge, the first new overnight accommodation in the park in 30 years. "That's nothing," his friend replies. "I heard my neighbor think-

ing about brushing his teeth. When do we leave?"

In short, 512-room Canyon Village, intended as a model in commercially developed lodgings for the entire park system, has turned out to be a failure, faulty in design, faulty in construction, with poor heating, flimsy soundproofing and a multitude of other shortcomings. Rooms are horribly overpriced ($13.50 for two, $18.50 for four), and the entire setting is incongruous with the great park, landscaped largely with black asphalt and blinking lights over the cocktail lounge. The gift shop offers one of the worst assortments of trinkets in America, 8,000 separate items, principally cheap, but profitable, importations from the Far East, including imitation English Wedgewood, Spanish toreador figurines in several colors, bells of Sarna and bongo drums.

The tragic debacle of Yellowstone illustrates the power exercised by private concessionaires. The three firms at Yellowstone appear to have more authority than the park superintendent. The Yellowstone Park Co., which operates lodgings and restaurants, made profits over the years while its plant became outmoded, overused and ill maintained. Finally goaded into construction of Canyon Village, the company paid $5,500,000 for a project originally estimated at $3,500,000. In an effort to recoup its losses, the firm last summer cut the number of college boys and girls on its payroll, then cut the wages of those it hired, to the barest minimum of compliance with wage-hour laws.

Yet for all the failings of the concessionaires, it remains for the park staff to answer the many complaints. The principal ones last summer were poor housekeeping, antiquated facilities, poor service, poor food.

Avoid the blight of Yellowstone? It is possible to a certain extent. You can find decent, clean and modern cabin and motel-type accommodations at the Grand Tetons, or well-kept campgrounds in surrounding areas. Look only at the thermal wonders, the wildlife and the marvels of a vast wilderness, shutting your eyes to all else.

But this is exactly the trouble: thinking Americans have shut their eyes for to long while blight and mass vulgarization have swept over the landscape. The amusement parks, the souvenir stands, the roadside animals won't go away by themselves. But neither must they be accepted as being here forever.

The point isn't that such places are not interesting or entertaining or even, in some cases, in good taste. But, rather, do they belong where they are? What does Mother Goose have to do with the commemoration of a Civil War battlefield? What are commercial biblical dioramas doing in the Great Smokies?

IT'S NEVER TOO LATE

"Honky-tonk, cheap-facade joints in the mountain areas are a disgrace to the State," declared a recent editorial in the Greensboro, (N.C.) Daily News, which pointed out what should be done. "Agitation in the public prints will do something to tidy up these roadside monstrosities. A little local or community pride might jolt the owners into at least partial recognition that an attractive, neatly kept roadside establishment is the best advertisement in the world for business."

Look over your own community. Demonstrate pride in its appearance and your desire to protect its inherent values. Sure, there's money in the tourist industry, but beauty is a far better advertisement for any town than a billboard. Certainly accommodations and commercial attractions are entitled to directional signs, but unrestrainted coercive advertising of a captive audience is quite another thing.

Support the type of beautification work undertaken by the garden clubs, the true historic restoration urged by preservation groups, the strict zoning proposals. They will do far more to create a favorable image that visitors will remember, and that you can live with, than gimcrack atractions, high prices, and unrestrained signboards.

In going places with your family, be selective. Visit places of reputation and stature because they really interest you, not because of their repetitive advertising along the roadside. If you want to see animals, there are zoological gardens in major cities. For souvenirs, purchase craft items indigenous to the area, not some cheap trinket that will scarcely survive the trip home. Cultivate an appreciation of the best of America in your children.

When you're good and mad, write letters. To the President, about the tragedy of Gettysburg. To the Governor of the State where you feel any shrine is marred. To the Director of the National Park Service, about the shabbiness of Yellowstone or of national park souvenir counters. Letters to the editor of your daily newspaper are useful because other people see them, too. Tell about places you are not going back to visit a second time.

Such words will find their way around, and nothing will shake a tourist community more than realizing it may lose business. Perhaps nothing will do more to encourage it to enhance, instead of exploit, its endowment of history or natural wonders.

## Resolution To Create a Select Committee on Arms Control and Disarmament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing a resolution to create a Select Committee on Arms Control and Disarmament in the House of Representatives. I had originally proposed the creation of such a committee during the last session of Congress, and hope that it will not be possible to obtain prompt consideration of the legislation during the current Congress.

This resolution provides that the committee would be composed of 13 Members of the House of Representatives chosen for their special knowledge of foreign affairs, armed services, atomic energy, science, and astronautics. The committee would be authorized to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of proposals for arms control and disarmament including, but not limited to, first, efforts made by the United Nations in seeking the control and reduction of military forces and armament of all types; second, disarmament proposals developed by the United States and other governments as well as by private groups and individuals; third, methods by which the attitudes of the American people and their Government on the subject of disarmament and world peace may be communicated abroad; fourth, the relationship of armaments to the state of the world economy; fifth, the relationship of underlying international tension to the problems of disarmament; sixth, the dangers implicit in unilateral reduction of armaments; and seventh, methods of assuring that plans for reduction of armaments shall not endanger the security of the United States.

I realize that any proposal to create another standing committee would probably meet with some difficulty and with much reluctance on the part of many Members of the House. Therefore I ask that a select committee be set up to stimulate discussion and consideration of one of the most pressing issues of the day—that of arms control and disarmament.

Creation of such a committee would be desirable and necessary fist step to reduce the grave possibility of nuclear war, because it would emphasize the efforts being made by the United States in its current negotiations with the Soviet Union to end nuclear weapons tests. I think we have all been heartened by the recent exchanges between President Kennedy and Soviet Premier Khrushchev, and by the temporary halt in U.S. underground atomic tests, announced by the President the other day, which is another step in the direction of world peace. I fervently hope that the further discussions which are due to take place in New York this week will bring us even closer to an agreement on a nuclear test-ban treaty at the Geneva meetings next month. Establishment of such a committee would have a tremendous impact on world opinion, and would demonstrate for all to see that the Congress of the United States is completely in accord with the efforts of the President to reduce the possibility of thermonuclear war, which could destroy us all.

I certainly hope that this resolution will warrant the consideration and support of each and every Member of the House.

## Let's Keep the Record Straight—A Selected Chronology on Cuba and Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, year before last, on May 23, 1961, I placed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled, "A Selected Chronology on Cuba and Castro." The Library of Congress had prepared this for me, at my request, in order for me to keep the events taking place in Cuba in their proper sequence.

Since that time the Library of Congress has continued to keep this chronology up to date and I now wish to follow up my original action by placing the later continued story in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix on 5 consecutive days, beginning today.

I am doing this because of the renewed controversy over who did what and who did not do what they should have with regard to our U.S. policy toward Cuba. Our Attorney General, Robert Kennedy, has made it a point to come up with some fairly myopic remarks during the course of an interview by the U.S. News & World Report on January 28, 1963, published under the title of "Robert Kennedy Speaks His Mind."

I used the word "myopic" because I feel his viewpoint is rather nearsighted, to say the least, as far as the Cuban issue is concerned. Let me quote a portion of his remarks to indicate why I feel this way:

Question. Do you feel that the latest Cuban crisis was a lesson to the Russians?

Answer. I think it makes a great difference because that's the first time that the power position and determination and energy of the American people and their Government—all of this had been brought to bear.

Now I suppose we cannot really blame Robert Kennedy for wanting his brother's administration to stand out as the one which singlehandedly solved the Cuban issue. However, a review of the chronology I previously inserted will prove that former President Eisenhower took, and attempted to take some steps which would have shown the power position and determination and energy of the American people and their Government. Attempts have repeatedly been made by many of those around the President to blame the Cuban problems on the Eisenhower administration. I feel the American people are entitled to something more than that sort of demagogery. Space will not permit my quoting some of the actions taken by President Eisenhower, but again I commend the former chronology on Cuba to the Members and the public's attention.

While a candidate for the Presidency, then Senator Kennedy called the October 19, 1960, embargo on all exports to Cuba, with exception of medical supplies and various food products—placed by President Eisenhower—"a dramatic but almost empty gesture—a gesture which will have so little impact on Castro as to be almost meaningless." Yet President Kennedy on February 3, 1962, proclaimed an embargo on almost all U.S. trade with Cuba, with the exception "on humanitarian grounds" of the export to Cuba of certain foods and medicines. His feelings as President seem to be greatly different than his feelings as Candidate Kennedy.

Again, Candidate Kennedy on October 6, 1960, made a speech at a Democratic dinner in Cincinnati, Ohio. Exhibiting a detailed knowledge of Castro's attempts to carry his revolution through South America, Mr. Kennedy stated:

The American people want to know how this was permitted to happen—how the Iron Curtain could have advanced almost to our front yard. They want to know the truth—and I believe that they are entitled to the truth.

The American public for some time now has longed to know the truth about the failure of the Cuban invasion and our part in it. Statements made by Bobby Kennedy, and backed by the President cover only the small issue of whether we promised air cover or not. But a statement by Manuel Penabaz, a veteran of the Cuban invasion, does not back up this supposed "official report."

Former President Eisenhower, by no means a man who could ever be called a demagog, stated on December 22, 1962 that he believed the truth is a far better weapon in hte cold war against communism than managed news. He stated further that he has no reason to think the American people have not been told the truth on the Cuban situation, but he noted that he doesn't know all the facts. He stated further that he sees no reason why the administration should not now release a full and official version of what happened in the disastrous attempt to invade Cuba in April 1961. The Bay of Pigs invasion is now history, he said, and the official story should have been told long ago.

On April 24, 1961, Presidential Press Secretary Pierre Salinger declared in a statement to the press that President Kennedy "assumes sole responsibility for the U.S. role in the action against Cuba."

Yet on May 24, 1961, President Kennedy, in discussing the tractors-for-prisoners ransom demand of Castro, in which he declared the U.S. Government would not negotiate with Cuba to ransom the prisoners, stated:

these men were trained and armed for this invasion by the Eisenhower administration. The signal to let them go and the means to get them there were given by the Kennedy administration. The United States still has a responsibility for those lives.

Now, former President Eisenhower, on January 24, 1963 says no plan was drawn up during his administration for a U.S. air cover for a refugee invasion of Cuba. He added however that he had "no kick with the plan" for air cover for the invaders. "If that had been done," he added, "that might have made the difference, because once these forces were ashore, ready to take care of themselves, it might have been easy to get more reinforcements through from the island itself and, finally, to recognize a government there."

Is it any wonder that Members of Congress, the public, and the press would like a truly official report of what happened? The Congress, you will remember, took some pretty strong actions itself in passing resolutions and legislation aimed at solving the Cuban crisis. They took these actions because they were close to the American grassroots opinion. They knew the American public wanted something done, that it was tired of speeches and soothing words, promising action but taking none. Those who trouble to read the original chronology on Cuba and Castro and follow through my continued chronology, will refresh their memory on some of the events, as reported, on the Cuban situation. And perhaps the congressional investigations suggested and promised will make the official actions clear to the American public.

I believe we can depend upon the commonsense and good judgment of the American people to know and recognize partisan politics when they see it played. And if the administration truly desires a bipartisan foreign policy and the continued support and encouragement of the American public and the Republican Party, it should remember that we do not intend that former President Eisenhower should be labeled directly or indirectly as a weakling by any member of the Cabinet, regardless of relationship to the President. This man, whose name has always been synonymous with honor, bravery, and love of his country, does not hesitate to call for support of the President's foreign policy. And he is not afraid of the truth or an "official version" of what took place on the Cuban issue.

Let me say that neither the Kennedy administration nor the minority party nor the majority party are doing themselves, or the public, justice if this matter is allowed to fall and rest in the area of purely partisan politics. The public, who gave the President complete, enthusiastic, and unequivocal support at the time he announced the "quarantine" of Cuba could well lose its enthusiasm for further support of this administration if they are denied the truth, or given half-truths or distortions.

And that is why I am including, Mr. Speaker, with my remarks today, a second portion, covering the period between May 20, 1961, through September 13, 1961, of the "Selected Chronology on Cuba and Castro," and every day hereafter a continuation of the chronology for a total of 5 consecutive days.

We want to keep the record straight.

A SELECTED CHRONOLOGY ON CUBA AND CASTRO [1]

May 20, 1961: A committee of U.S. citizens, headed by Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Walter Reuther (president of the United Auto Workers), and Dr. Milton Eisenhower, is formed to raise the funds to provide the 500 tractors. "President Kennedy was reliably * * * reported to have personally asked three prominent private citizens * * * to organize the 'tractors-for-prisoners' exchange with Premier Fidel Castro of Cuba" (New York Times, May 24, 1961).

May 24, 1961: President Kennedy urges all Americans to contribute to the purchase of the 500 tractors.

June 2, 1961: Tractors for Freedom Committee informs Premier Castro that it is ready to send the 500 tractors in exchange for the 1,214 prisoners. The committee gives him until noon June 7 to accept the offer.

June 6, 1961: Premier Castro suggests that his prisoners be exchanged for "political prisoners" allegedly held in jail in the United States, Puerto Rico, Guatemala, Nicaragua, and Spain. He also demands that Mrs. Roosevelt or Dr. Eisenhower, two of the leaders of the Tractors for Freedom Committee, come to Havana for further negotiations.

June 7, 1961: Cuban Government nationalized education.

June 8, 1961: Tractors for Freedom Committee offers to send six agricultural experts to Havana to discuss details of the types of tractors to be sent in exchange for the prisoners. The committee also announces that it is prepared to send the first consignment of 100 tractors to Cuba by June 22.

---

[1] Based chiefly on excerpts from Deadline Data; reproduced with the permission of Deadline Data on World Affairs.

Premier Castro accepts the offer the next day.

June 14, 1961: Experts confer with Premier Castro. He now demands tractors valued at $28 million, the equivalent of 1,000 farm-type tractors or 500 heavy-duty construction tractors, and will exchange them for 1,167 prisoners instead of the 1,214 he had originally offered to trade. He explains that the difference is due to some fatalities, special trials he plans, and other reasons.

June 19, 1961: Tractors for Freedom Committee in Detroit cables reply to Premier Castro. They give him until noon June 23 to decide whether he will accept 500 farm-type light tractors in exchange for the 1,214 prisoners he originally offered to trade. If he refuses, the committee will return the funds it has collected to the contributors.

June 26, 1961: Adlai E. Stevenson, President Kennedy's special envoy to Latin America and U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., declares at the National Press Club in Washington that during his recent trip to Latin America, Cuban agents preceded or followed him for propaganda purposes.

June 28, 1961: Florida court orders seizure of 29 carloads of lard going to Cuba. "The seizure order was obtained by a Miami advertising firm to help satisfy a judgment of $429,000 against the Cuban Government tourist agency" (New York Herald Tribune, July 6, 1961).

July 4, 1961: U.S. authorities in Florida seize three Cuban planes which have landed in the United States after being stolen from Cuba by refugees. The planes are seized on court orders to satisfy claims against the Cuban Government.

July 21, 1961: U.S. Government announces that it will finance the passage of 20,000 refugees from Cuba to the United States, because the refugees cannot obtain dollars.

July 23, 1961: Cuban Government orders Pan American World Airways—the company chartered by the U.S. Government for the airlift—to limit its flights from Miami to Havana to two round trips a day.

July 24, 1961: U.S. commercial airliner—worth $3.5 million—en route from Miami to Tampa, Fla., is forced by an armed passenger to fly to Havana. The other passengers and the crew are returned to the United States the following day, but the plane is kept by the Cuban authorities.

July 26, 1961: Premier Castro, in a speech made at the 26th of July celebrations, declares that he will return the airliner if the United States returns "the 10 Cuban planes which it has stolen."

During a speech made at the celebration of the 8th anniversary of the 26th of July movement, Premier Castro announces that all Cuban political parties are eventually to be merged into the United Party of the Socialist Revolution. The celebrations are attended by Soviet Astronaut Maj. Yuri Gagarin.

July 27, 1961: U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk declares in Washington that the United States will not agree to the exchange. He declares that final authority for the return of Cuban planes to Cuba rests with the courts, and not with the U.S. Government, and that if it is entitled to do so, the Cuban Government may apply for "sovereign immunity" for the planes. Rusk points out that since mid-1959, 25 Cuban planes have been held in the United States. Some of these have been sold in pursuance of court orders.

July 29, 1961: Cuban note to the U.N. accuses the United States of preparing an "imminent military aggression" against Cuba, and of using the plane incident as an excuse for its plans. Foreign Minister Raul Roa announces that the Cuban Government has placed the U.S. plane under the jurisdiction of the U.N. Security Council. The U.S. State Department declares that the Cuban move in the U.N. is a "transparent tactic to divert attention from the actions of the Castro government in detaining" the plane.

August 2, 1961: Government announces the reorganizing of the country's labor unions under direct government control. Henceforth, there will be only one union for each industry, and all unions will be grouped under a Workers' Confederation.

August 3, 1961: Two U.S. citizens—a former convict and his son—fail in a plot to take a Boeing 707 jet airliner to Cuba from El Paso, Tex.

August 4, 1961: Cuban government again protests to the U.N. Security Council that the U.S. Government is preparing military aggression against Cuba, and is using plane incidents as an excuse.

August 5, 1961: Cuban Goverment declares that it will release the airliner if the United States releases a Cuban patrol boat brought to Florida by defectors a week ago.

Cuban Government orders the immediate replacement of all Cuban currency. All bills now in circulation must be traded in for new ones. No more than 200 new pesos will be given any one household. Any amount over this will be deposited in a "special account" and may be drawn upon in a week's time. Bank holdings are not affected. There is no revaluation involved in the move. Cuban borders are closed to all ships and planes through August 7, to prevent any Cuban money being brought in from abroad.

August 8, 1961: Premier Castro declares that Cubans will be allowed to draw up to 1,000 pesos in cash from their special accounts. Thereafter, they will be allowed to withdraw at the rate of 100 pesos a month. Total deposits of 10,000 pesos will be allowed, but any amount over 5,000 will be placed into savings accounts. Castro also declares that any amount over 10,000 pesos will be confiscated.

Minister of Industry Ernesto Guevara (during a 2-hour speech, at the Inter-American Economic Conference in Punta del Este, Uruguay), accuses the United States of attempting the assassination of Armed Forces Minister Raul Castro on July 26, and of attempting the invasion of Cuba on the same day. He also implies that the United States was implicated in the assassination of President Trujillo of the Dominican Republic, on May 30. Guevara ridicules President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress, and declares: "While Cuba is there, the United States is ready to give." He suggests that with a little push, Latin America will get the $30 billion in U.S. aid which Castro called for 2 years ago. Guevara declares that Cuba expects $450,000 in loans from Communist countries over the next 4 years. Cuba, he says, "pledges a guarantee that it will not export revolution" to other Latin American countries. Guevara also produces two U.S. "secret" documents, allegedly State Department reports. The first characterizes Venezuelan officials as "inept and indifferent"; the second indicates the South American countries which can be counted upon for anti-Cuban measures.

August 9, 1961: U.S. Pan American jet airliner, en route from Mexico City to Guatemala, is forced by an armed passenger—a French Algerian, reportedly, a psychopath—to fly to Havana. The other passengers, the crew, and the plane are allowed to leave for Miami the same day. The Cuban Government declares that it is releasing the plane out of deference to the Colombian Foreign Minister, Julio Cesar Turbay Ayala, one of the passengers, and because Cuba is opposed to air piracy. In Washington, before it is known that the plane is returning to the United States on the same day, the news of the incident causes various U.S. Congressmen to advocate the use of force to retrieve the plane.

On the same day, Cuba requests the U.N. to place on the agenda of its 1961 General Assembly—due to open in September—an item on "threats to peace and security" by U.S. "aggression" against Cuba.

August 10, 1961: President Kennedy declares in a news conference that the anger aroused by the hijacking of planes must not be allowed to overshadow the importance of the Inter-American Economic Conference, meeting in Uruguay which he calls "perhaps one of the most significant meetings in the history of the Western Hemisphere."

August 14, 1961: The 5,805-ton *Bahia de Nipe*, a Cuban merchant ship carrying sugar and tobacco to a Soviet Baltic port, was seized by the captain and 10 crew members and diverted to Norfolk, Va.

August 15, 1961: A patrol boat, valued at $50,000, which was brought to the United States on July 29, by Cuban defectors was returned to the Castro regime.

At the same time the Eastern Air Lines Electra hijacked on July 24 was returned to the United States by the Cuban Government.

August 21, 1961: President Kennedy declined to use the Cuban ship, *Bahia de Nipe*, as ransom for the families of the Cuban seamen who brought the ship here and have sought political asylum.

Earlier the Cuban Government formally asked for the return of the vessel and U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk asked a Federal court to release the ship.

August 24, 1961: In a special session of the U.N. General Assembly called to discuss the Bizerte dispute between France and Tunisia, the Cuban delegate challenged the validity of the treaty under which the United States maintains the Guantanamo Bay Naval Base.

U.S. Ambassador Stevenson called Cuba's charge "international lawlessness."

August 29, 1961: Premier Castro called on the Brazillian people to "take arms * * * and take to the mountains and jungles" to fight the military leaders who are trying to keep Joao Goulart from becoming president of Brazil after the resignation of President Janio Quadros.

August 31, 1961: The Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Latin America said it was satisfied that an encounter in Montevideo, Uruguay, between Maj. Ernesto "Che" Guevara and Richard Goodwin, President Kennedy's Special Assistant on Latin American Affairs, was a casual and unimportant meeting at a cocktail party.

The subcommittee met with Mr. Goodwin after Argentina's Foreign Minister Adolfo Mugica declared on August 22 that the conversation had been politically vital and had touched on a possible resumption of United States-Cuban relations.

September 7, 1961: A spokesman for the Democratic Revolutionary Front, a Cuban exile group, announced that the front will shortly merge with the Revolutionary Council. The new group will be called the Cuban Revolutionary Council and will be headed by Miro Cardona with Antonio de Varona as second in command.

The U.S. Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals freed the hijacked freighter *Bahia de Nipe* for return to Cuba but stayed its order for 5 days to permit an appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court.

September 9, 1961: Five of the prisoners captured after the unsuccessful invasion attempt last April were executed on charges of murder and torture committed before they left Cuba. Nine others were given 30-year jail sentences on similar charges.

September 10, 1961: Four thousand Cubans shouted antigovernment slogans in downtown Havana until they were dispersed by machinegun bullets. Seven were injured. The demonstration was touched off by cancellation of a Roman Catholic procession in honor of the Virgin of Charity, the patroness of Cuba.

September 13, 1961: A third request for an order blocking the immediate return of the freight *Bahia de Nipe* to Cuba was submitted to U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice Earl Warren by the United Fruit Co. which has claims against the freighter's cargo of sugar.

---

## G. Gernon Brown—A Tribute to One of the Nation's Outstanding Molders of Men and Developers of Character in the Youth of the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has lost one of its outstanding developers of character and molders of men in the unexpected death last week in New Orleans, of G. Gernon Brown, executive assistant director of the New Orleans Recreational Department and for more than two decades the football coach of the Jesuit High School in that city.

Gernon Brown was nationally known in the sports world and in the field of youth development.

Such All-American football players as Ki Mills, of Virginia Military Institute, and John Pettiborn, of Notre Dame, were developed by him.

To the big leagues in baseball he had sent "Tookie" Gilbert, Connie Ryan, Charlie Gilbert, "Fat" Dantoni, among others.

The affection held for him by the people of New Orleans is reflected in many tributes paid to him by press, radio, and television following his death.

Gernon Brown was my lifelong friend. We were boyhood companions and classmates from parochial school through our formative years at Jesuits in New Orleans during which time we were inseparable associates. It is not, however, because of this personal devotion to him that I pause to pay tribute to him today. It is because of the niche which he occupied in the community and the respect which he had earned as one of the most successful scholastic football coaches in the Nation.

I pay this tribute because I think it fitting and proper that something should be said at this time when an enduring recognition can be made of a man who has contributed so much to so many during his lifetime. Other communities undoubtedly have Gernon Browns in their midst. Other cities and other States have given birth to men of like statute who have never come into the national focus. I doubt, however, if there ever lived an individual who brought such eulogies from those among whom he lived and from those who knew him and profited by their association with him as did Gernon Brown.

His classmates borrowed from Shakespeare to say of him in the Blue Jay, the graduating classbook of 1920:

> He was a man, take him all in all,
> I shall not look upon his like again.

That was Gernon Brown.

How he kept that image in the years that followed is mirrored in what was written about him the day after he died.

Here is Charles L. "Pie" Dufour, columnist for the New Orleans States-Item and now an author of prominence with such books as "The Gentle Tiger," "The Night the War Was Lost," and "Nine Men in Grey," to his credit. It is an inspired tribute to the boy and to the man, written by one well qualified to write about his schoolmate and his friend. Dufour's column speaks eloquently for that segment who knew Gernon Brown as he lived and as he left his imprint on those who were privileged to have known him over a span of 30 years and more.

Here is "Pie" Dufour's tribute:

DEATH OF GERNON BROWN CREATES ANOTHER VOID IN NEW ORLEANS

(By Pie Dufour)

When a good man dies, there is a void in the world. Such a void has been created in New Orelans by the death yetserday of Gernon Brown.

Gernon—I use his first name, because we were friends for more than 45 years—was good in everything he did, everything he undertook.

As an individual, he was moral, ethical, honorable, a genuinely good man, cherished by friends and family.

Gernon Brown could have been a great actor. He was a great high school football and baseball coach. He could have been a great mathematician. He was a great math teacher.

But whatever he was, or could have been, he never failed to be a great human being. For here was a man with literally thousands of friends.

You'll read on the sports pages of his remarkable coaching career at Jesuit High, and in American Legion play and the records his teams compiled and the players he produced. But far beyond the records and the stars is Gernon Brown's influence for good on the boys he coached. Long after they, too, have forgotten what they did on the athletic field under Brown's tutelage, will remain the lessons in character that he instilled into them.

I was in the eighth grade at the old Jesuits on Baronne and Common when Gernon Brown was in first high. He was in the same class with EDDIE HÉBERT, U.S. Representative from the First Congressional District. Just 6 months ago, Gernon was voted the Jesuit alumni Man of the Year Award, presented annually by Congressman HÉBERT.

Recently Charlie Wicker wrote about the old Jesuit team on which Gernon Brown played, and he quoted EDDIE HÉBERT as saying that one year when the Blue Jays didn't have a coach, Gernon was player-coach. I challenged that in a conversation with Charlie, and he said that he had even checked it with Gernon, and that that was correct.

Well, that fact had escaped my memory entirely and just the other day, I wrote Congressman HÉBERT, chiding him on his memory playing tricks upon him. He came back in the same vein, insisting that he was right. I had intended calling Gernon Brown up to get the word from him. Just a few weeks earlier, HÉBERT had pointed out that Dan Levy, fullback on the old Blue Jay team in question had died within a few days of Dr. Joe Palermo, who once was a part-time Jesuit coach.

And now, a third member of those great Blue Jay days—the first of the great Jesuit teams—of 1919 and 1920, Gernon Brown, is gone.

As a fellow student of Gernon, I remember him as much for his histrionic ability as for his athletic prowess. He was really magnificent on the stage—a high school boy who could have stepped right onto the professional stage. I remember him as the jester in "In a Fool's Bauble," a play by whom, I know not, and he was great. But in his final year, 1920, Brown played the title role in Bulwer-Lytton's "Richelieu."

I've never forgotten Gernon's "Richelieu." I still hear him declaim: "Armand Duplessis, Duc de Richelieu dies not by the hand of man." Over the 43 years that have elapsed since Gernon played the famed cardinal of France—it was at the Lafayette Theater, now the Civic, I believe, but it could have been the old Tulane Theater—I would frequently greet him with that quote. I had good cause to remember, because I was a spear carrier in that production of "Richelieu," a companion warrior to Ellis Henican. We heard the play over and over in rehearsals, and grew quite familiar with other parts than our own. For, as I recall it, on the night of the play, we were so absorbed in Gernon's impressive performance that when the time came to do our military duty, we arrested the wrong character.

Had Gernon Brown gone on the stage, there is no doubt in my mind that he would have become one of the leading figures on the American stage. Instead, he went to Annapolis, but a broken leg as a plebe football player ended his naval career. He finished his education at Loyola.

A teaching post at Jesuit High, after graduation, led to his becoming an assistant coach under "Doc" Erskine. Judge Ike Carriere, then a young lawyer, taught and coached with Erskine part time. When he began to be too busy as a lawyer, he retired from this part-time coaching and teaching, and Brown took his place as a coach. When "Doc" Erskine went to Loyola as head coach, Gernon took over the Blue Jays. His more than two-decade performance was tremendous. For the last 10 years or so, Brown was the executive assistant director of NORD under $1-a-year-man Lester Lautenschlaeger.

Death came for him at his desk, yesterday. But wherever and whenever it had come, it would have found Gernon Brown ready. He was, in every finest sense of the word, a good man.

Here is Cro Duplantier, executive sports editor of the New Orleans States-Item whose facile pen describes the man and the memory he has left behind:

AS COACH SAID, HE'LL BE AROUND

(By Cro Duplantier)

Lester Lautenschlaeger, executive director of New Orleans Recreation Department, said G. Gernon Brown, New Orleans Recreation Department's assistant director, was completing a call made to set a luncheon date.

"I'll be over in 10 minutes," Gernon said and hung up.

That was the last that Lester heard from Gernon and about the last thing anyone heard. For about 10 minutes later Gernon Brown was dead.

But the ending perhaps is a bit prophetic for Gernon will be over, he'll be around again, perhaps not in 10 minutes but time and time again in the minds and hearts of the thousands of boys grown into men whose lives he touched.

For when he touched the touch left an imprint—the G. Gernon imprint—and the mark has stayed with most of his boys forever after.

Gernon's own family life is indication enough of his attitude toward young people. He fathered 10 children and raised 9 of them. A man who raises nine children has to love children, has to love young adulthoods, has to love people. And Gernon, for all his occasional gruffness, loved people.

We met Gernon the year he became a head coach. We were a boy of 11, he a vigorous, husky, impressive, assured man of 31.

If taking the jump from assistant to head man frightened him, there is no record of it. And that there need not have been any worry on his part was obvious immediately. He was a smash success from the start and to the finish.

His years were not only the years of the Jays' greatest successes, but also the years when the prep league was at a height never since attained.

There were fewer schools. The schools that did exist largely had been there for a long time and their rivalries were traditional ones. Gernon loved it. And the Jay fans loved him.

But for the rest of the league it was a period of aggravation. Beating Jesuit was the goal. And making Gernon eat humble pie was something that all strived for.

Failing that, the fans from rival institutions were forever finding excuses. They blamed their defeats on Jesuit luck. On the pregame prayers the Jays said before each contest, led quite frequently by boys of Protestant faiths. But they missed their mark. Gernon was the guy to blame.

He liked being a winner. He wanted his boys to like being winners. And he inculcated that idea into them. If you've got the equipment, the talent, you ought to use it, he figured. And Gernon and his kids did.

We've had a few differences with him over the years. But they were minor ones and and they lasted only briefly.

For he was that kind of guy.

You admired him because he was smart. You admired him because he knew his business. You admired him because he could handle himself well in a contest, before a crowd.

And you liked him because, for all his assurance, for all his gruffness, for all his talent, he was still warm, still anxious to please and, above all, because you felt that he liked you and you were important to him.

Gernon Brown was the kind of man who could have been a big success in any undertaking, for, with everything else there was a dynamism, a restlessness to go, go, go * * * and to get others on the move too.

He spent his life in work which certainly offers small financial rewards for the talents and energy that he put into it. But we suspect that he rarely gave thought to this, though there must have been occasions when that army of kids was growing when he could have used a bigger income.

He spent his life as he did, because his work was the kind of work he loved.

This perhaps could be the key to sum him up as completely as is possible in a couple of words. He chose his work because he loved it. Because he loved it he was a happy man. And a happy man is bound to have many friends, and bound, also to make a lasting impression on them.

"Coach," as most of us called him, and as he called most people in return—told Lester he'd be "over in about 10 minutes."

He's already here, he's here right now, all around this area of ours, the death notice notwithstanding.

He's here and will be as long as any of the boys he coached and guided are.

He was that kind of guy.

Harry Martinez, my old associate and dear friend and sports editor of the New Orleans States, was a sportswriter when Gernon Brown played his first football game for Jesuits. He points out the difficulty it will be to replace Gernon Brown in the New Orleans recreation department program:

DIFFICULT TO REPLACE BROWN

(By Harry Martinez)

Replacing Gernon Brown as assistant director of the vast New Orleans recreation department program is not going to be an easy task. In his position he carried out the work outlined by Director Lester Lautenschlaeger and the two worked hand in hand to build up New Orleans recreation department's activities so well that other cities used the local programs as a model for their own.

Brown's death is mourned by thousands, particularly among boys who came in contact with him in sports. As a coach and as a teacher he had a great influence over his athletes, in mapping out their lives and causing them to become worthy citizens.

His life was dedicated to teaching youth. As a coach for 20 years at Jesuit High School he not only turned out championship teams, but built character. He taught fair play and, win or lose, his boys always played like champions.

The long years he spent coaching high school boys made him an invaluable man to take the position with the New Orleans recreation department which he held until his death. He knew the recreation work from all phases and helped to build it to the point where New Orleans was regarded as having one of the finest recreation programs in the Nation.

In recognition of his long association with athletics and recreation work, Gernon Brown served on many boards both local and national for the improvement of high school sports. Only last Tuesday he returned to New Orleans from New York where he was elected vice president of the All-American Baseball Association.

As one who has followed Brown's activities from his high school playing days at Jesuit back in 1919, we can add nothing but praise for his devotion to the work of moulding the character of many who have made their mark in the business world.

Then there is Buddy Diliberto, most articulate sports columnist of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, who wrote:

FROM THE BENCH: THE PASSING OF GERNON BROWN

(By Buddy Diliberto)

The unexpected death of Gernon Brown Tuesday hangs heavy with all who knew the man, especially hundreds of former Jesuit High athletes.

In his latter years Brown distinguished himself as executive assistant director of the New Orleans Recreation Department but it was as a Jesuit coach that he was known best.

Brown was a coach in the tradition of Knute Rockne or Frank Leahy. His greatest attribute was the ability to make boys perform beyond their normal capabilities.

The manner in which he accomplished this varied but the result was usually the same—success.

Hal Breeding, one of Brown's former athletes, recalls a game against Warren Easton in the early 1940's in which Easton outweighed Jesuit about 20 pounds per man.

"Gernon told us a story and when he was finished there wasn't one of us who thought Easton was too big to beat," Breeding recalls.

The story was about a second-string basketball player who played for Jesuit years before.

"The kid weighed only 135 pounds and unbeknown to the coaches suffered from epilepsy," Brown told the team.

"One afternoon during practice the kid had an attack and five of the biggest athletes on the team couldn't hold him down.

"Remember, boys, it's the size of fight in the dog not the size of the dog."

Easton's weight advantage made no difference that afternoon.

THE YEAR BROWN GAVE UP SMOKING

Brown hated to lose. He once said, "When you lose once it's always easier to lose the next time."

Jesuit teams seldom lost during the Brown years but when they did he wanted every player to take the loss as seriously as he did.

In 1941, Doc Blanchard led St. Stanislaus to a victory over Jesuit at City Park Stadium.

Gernon herded the team into the bus after the game and there was hardly a dry pair of eyes.

Brown walked up and down the aisle studying each of his players until he came upon a boy who wasn't crying.

"What's the matter son, are you happy we lost?" Brown barked.

"No sir," the boy replied.

"Well, start crying real tears or turn in your uniform when we get back to school," Gernon bellowed.

In the fall of 1946 Jesuit needed to win the State football title to complete a sweep of championships unmatched in the history of Louisiana high school athletics. The Jays had already won State basketball and baseball crowns under Brown that year and the track championship under the late Eddie Toribio.

Brown was a chain smoker yet no sacrifice was too big if Gernon thought it would help achieve victory.

He gave up smoking for a year that season as a sacrifice and the Jays went on to complete the slam by winning State in football.

It was a nerve-racking ordeal for the man but he lived up to his promise. The picture of Toribio following Brown around him with mints and chewing gum as a substitute for cigarettes is still vivid in the minds of the players on the 1946 team.

MOLDER OF TRADITION, SPIRIT

Brown, shirttail hanging out and arms waving, delivered many pregame and halftime speeches that would have made a Rockne proud. And at other times just a sentence would do the job.

John Petibon recalls a game in 1946 in which Jesuit was a topheavy favorite and Brown was convinced his team wasn't ready to play a good football game.

"Our practices were sloppy the entire week and we were all waiting for Gernon to tear into us," Petibon recalls.

"But he didn't utter a harsh word. Then moments before we went onto the field he said, 'Okay, girls. Let's go take our whipping.'

"That one sentence burned us so much we went out and won 40 to 0."

One of Brown's favorite tricks to fire a team was to address a letter to the squad and sign the name of the opposing team.

The letters were usually the same. They had references to the Jesuit players being "girls, mollies, mama's boys, etc." And they never failed to bring the desired result.

With all due respect to the many wonderful priests and lay teachers through the years, I feel Gernon Brown did more than anyone to build the tradition and spirit of Jesuit High.

The New Orleans States-Item said this of Gernon Brown editorially:

G. GERNON BROWN

Because he devoted his life to the moral, mental and physical development of New Orleans' youth, the death of G. Gernon Brown Tuesday imposed a particular deprivation on this community.

Mr. Brown leaves the stamp of his character not only on the athletes and students of Jesuit High School, where he served as head coach for 21 years dating back to 1933 and as faculty member, but also on New Orleans' younger generation in general.

For he was, of further reaching consequence, executive assistant director of the New Orleans Recreation Department and had, since its inception, played a major role in growth of that agency.

He was a charter member of the New Orleans Junior Sports Association, predecessor of New Orleans Recreation Department, and an organizer of many activities that comprise the recreational department program.

Milestones of the career which he dedicated to development of youngsters lie on the local, State and national levels.

For unstinted devotion to the ideal of inspiring tomorrow's citizens, Mr. Brown, during his notable career, earned the gratitude of the community many times over.

Now comes Peter Finney, one of the better young writers on the staff of the New Orleans States-Item who knew Gernon Brown as a student and later covered him from the sports desk:

BLUE JAY SPIRIT MADE BY GERNON BROWN: A SUPER SALESMAN

(By Peter Finney)

In later years, Gernon Brown would throw back his head and roar when reminded of the standing joke on the 1944 Jesuit basketball team.

"Let's steal his book," Tookie Gilbert used to say, "and he'll have to call off practice."

So far as I know, Gernon Brown was the only man who actually coached from a book.

Thumbing through the pages in practice, he readily admitted his knowledge of the sport was limited to what Stanford's Everett Dean had set down between two red covers.

As time when on, however, and you were in a position to assess Gernon Brown—the coach—you realized the extraordinary talents which made him the brightest figure in the golden era of prep sports.

It is not difficult to conjure up an image of the master at work—on the sidelines at City Park Stadium, in the dugout at Muny Park, on the bench at Jesuit's old quonset-like gymnasium.

Hair in disarray, suit rumpled, and eyes blazing, he was an eloquent picture of a forceful personality leaving his stamp on all who played under him as well as on the league in which he competed.

All of the high school heroes he mass produced—from Jesse Danna to Putsy Caballero, from Clay Calhoun to John Petitbon, from Connie Ryan to Hugh Oser—will tell you the intangible thing known as Blue Jay spirit was "made by Gernon Brown."

To what did he owe his success?

"Give Gernon a piece of chalk and a blackboard," Eddie Toribio once told me, "and he'll sell anyone on anything."

Yesterday, with tragic suddenness, 61-year-old Gernon Brown joined one of his greatest pupils. And, as news of his fatal heart attack sank in, bits of conversations with the wizard of the preps came back to you in staccato fashion.

"I learned most of my football from Lester Lautenschlaeger and most of my baseball from Larry Gilbert and Mel Ott," he'd tell you.

But this did not explain (as Eddie Toribio had) his amazing success on Carrollton Avenue during a 20-year period which began in 1932—an era in which his Jesuit football teams won 6 city and 5 State championships, his baseball teams captured 11 city and State titles, and his basketball teams 3 city and 3 State crowns.

"Mr. Brown was a supersalesman all right," declared Ray Coates, tailback on the 1943 city and State kingpins and his coach's choice as the finest triple-threat back that ever passed his way.

"He had a way of getting the best out of everyone. He simply had the God-given talent of knowing how to handle different types of boys. Some had to be petted, some had to be pushed and he knew which ones.

"Another thing he mastered was the knack of never allowing a game to be lost at practice. He knew just when to ease up. This plus his stirring pep talks and his passion for perfection made him the great coach he was.

Following his retirement from the coaching ranks in 1953, Gernon was constantly badgered with questions on his Jesuit football teams. The persistent poser: Which was the best?

"The 1940 bunch with O. J. Key, Tony DiBartolo, Lenny Finley, Paul Limont, Cy Kirsch, and many more," Gernon would tell them. "I never saw such talent on one squad."

Then he'd quickly add: "But that 1946 crew with John Petitbon, Hugh Oser and Mire Thomas was another great one * * * No one came within two touchdowns of us."

The only question Gernon liked to answer unequivocably was: "Which team gave you the most satisfaction?"

"That crowd in 1943," was his quick reply.

Sweeping to the city and State championships, the lightweight Blue Jays upset Holy Cross, 18–14, and Byrd High, 25–7.

"Mister Brown never let us believe we had less than an even chance of winning," said Coates. "We came from behind in four of our games that year; in fact, we had to come from behind three times against Holy Cross."

For the Baton Rouge game, Coates took two left shoes to the State capital and had to borrow a pair from the Bulldog coach. He used them to run 100 yards with an intercepted pass.

Gernon called the halftime demonstration against Byrd "the greatest I ever saw."

"When I came into the dressing room, we were behind 7–6," he told me once. "I was all set for a real rah-rah sermon, but I never got to say a word.

"The squad was standing when I walked in and Coates said: 'Don't worry, coach, we'll beat hell out of these guys.' Then all of the other players began shouting. They sold me."

There was another time when Gernon worked magic without uttering a word.

"We won our first State football championship in 1933," he once recalled. "That year we played Morgan City for the South Louisiana title and the score was 0–0 in the fourth quarter.

"Eddie Toribio's knee gave way on him and I went out and carried him from the field * * * he was crying like a baby * * * it fired the team up so much we had the game's only touchdown 2 minutes later."

Gernon Brown was fired up too—by a speech to the graduating class in June, 1940.

"You are the first clas in the history of the school to graduate without seeing the football team defeat Warren Easton," said the principal.

Beginning that fall, Brown's football teams went on a rampage that brought his school four city and four State titles in the next 7 years—and four victories over the Eagles.

It also brought to mind the advice he received when he took over as football boss in 1932. Doc Erskine, his predecessor, told Gernon: "Don't get too het up about winning because you open yourself to too much disappointment.'

Commented George Gernon Brown with a wry grin: "That's one rule I was never able to follow."

Finally there is N. Charles Wicker, who came to known Gernon Brown as a young prep school reporter covering the high school athletic beat. Charlie Wicker's deep personal tribute reflects the personal emotions and feelings of those who were exposed to Gernon Brown in his days as football coach and executive assistant director of the New Orleans Recreation Department program in New Orleans:

WHAT'S WHAT

(By N. Charles Wicker)

New Orleans mourns the death of a great man, a wonderful father, a leader of youth and men, and a coach, whose record will never be matched, with the passing of G. Gernon Brown, executive assistant director of the New Orleans Recreation Department, and former Jesuit High School coach.

Gernon Brown excelled in everything he did. He was an outstanding teacher in the classroom, an unexcelled coach on the field, and truly our best friend.

Gernon is the second of our great coaches to pass away while serving as executive director of New Orleans Recreation Department.

A little more than 10 years ago Gernon Brown was forced to retire as head football coach because the priests at Jesuit didn't want him to die on the field.

Proving that he was not finished, he took over as head of the recreation department when Johnny Brechtel passed away, and served in that position since.

We began our newspaper career just a few years before Gernon Brown became head football coach at Jesuit in 1931. Many happy and joyful hours were spent with him in the Jesuit athletic office, at various meetings, in fact, everywhere we were together. He was a man that the Jesuits let run the show. Why? Because they knew Gernon Brown to be a great leader and a man who stood for what was right.

Gernon Brown served as captain and coach of the 1918 Jesuit football team. He coached dramatics, he was a great math teacher, and at the time of his death he was part-time teacher at Jesuit. Every morning before he went to his office in the city hall he taught classes.

He became head coach of the football team in 1931. Without any basketball knowledge he coached the basketball team and won championship honors.

Several of his proteges, all great coaches, the late Eddie Toribio, Lou Brownson, and the present Jesuit coach, Ken Tarzetti, got their start as assistants under Gernon.

Ray Coates, present assistant at Jesuit, is another of Gernon's boys.

Without a question of a doubt, Gernon Brown developed more high school athletes than any other man in the city of New Orleans.

In a matter of a few years he would have been connected with Jesuit 50 years. He devoted his life to Jesuit.

Just a few months ago he was given the Blue Jay of the Year Award presented to the alumni voted as top man by the old grads for work done for Jesuit. "It was long overdue," said Congressman F. EDWARD HÉBERT who presented the award, and who started the idea some years ago.

Gernon Brown and the late Johnny Brechtel, along with the Brown brothers, "Little" and "Big Fuz" of Istrouma were the backbone of the Louisiana High School Coaches Association when it was formed.

W. L. Colvin, former president of the Louisiana High School Athletic Association, and Grover C. Koffmann, former secretary-treasurer of the LHSAA, were both great admirers of Gernon Brown. But who wasn't?

Brown worked long and hard to raise a wonderful family, the eldest of whom is Dr. Gernon Brown, a very successful physician in our town.

He never shirked his responsibility. He gave endlessly of his time. After a full day at Jesuit High School and football practice, Gernon found time to serve as math instructor for the nurses at Charity Hospital.

Each year at this time on the morning of the New Orleans Athletic Club banquet honoring the outstanding athlete of the greater New Orleans area, we devote much of our space to the winner of the award. But we just couldn't let the opportunity pass without paying tribute to a true friend.

To his wife Kathryn, and to everyone of his children, his sisters, and his brother, in behalf of my family and my children who have all been very fond of Gernon, may we

extend our deepest and most heartfelt sympathy.

Gernon is the third Blue Jay of the same era to pass away with a heart attack in a period of 10 days of each other.

Yes, we must agree with Gernon Brown's classmates at Jesuits in 1920 in New Orleans that this was a man whose like we shall not see again.

## Mobile, Ala. Editor Cites Dangers in Political Reprisal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 17, 1963*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include an editorial from the Mobile, Ala., Register in which the editorial writer points out the danger to our Republic in the action of the Kennedy administration in holding up a needed and meritorious project, the Federal Building in Dallas, until the people of that great city elect a Representative to Congress acceptable to the President. The editorial speaks for itself, but it should remind the President, as I said on the floor a few days ago, such tactics are not good politics and the President should remember the American people will exercise their freedom to vote as they please and they will not be bought nor pressured by any political machine:

WHERE NOT TO USE POLITICAL SPOILS TACTICS

This being a free country, the people are free under the American system to vote for candidates of their choice.

In some instances, however, it has seemed that the people have been free to vote for candidates of their choice only at the peril of being politically penalized.

Right now, to cite a case in point, Dallas, Tex., is less than supremely happy because of a feeling that spoils politics tactics are being used to give it the cold shoulder on a Federal building project.

More specifically, they suspect in Dallas, that the cold shoulder is coming from Washington, D.C., because the Kennedy New Frontier is burnt up over the presence in Congress of a Republican House Member from Dallas, Representative BRUCE ALGER.

Mr. ALGER has been in Congress 6 years longer than the New Frontier has been in the White House, but the New Frontier is suspected of resorting to political reprisal because of his presence there.

The Republican Congressman himself has sharply criticized what he calls a "deliberate attempt of the Kennedy administration to penalize and punish one of the great metropolitan areas of the Nation because its people did not support the candidate of the President's choice for election to the House."

Mr. ALGER says (and these quotations are from his remarks in the House) that "such a bold and tyrannical attempt to force the election of favored candidates to the legislative branch cannot, must not, go unchallenged in this free society."

He has also called attention in Congress to newspaper comment in Dallas.

He called attention to this from the Dallas Morning News:

"On Dallas' failure again to get its Federal center, one can strongly suspect but not prove that—

"We are being punished because Dallas County voted against Mr. Kennedy by nearly 70,000 votes. Other Republican districts are getting their share of projects.

"Continued reelection of BRUCE ALGER, a Republican to Congress, mitigates against us.

"Dallas doesn't want the (Federal building) center if it doesn't deserve it and if it doesn't need it.

"Truth is, we do need it, it is worthy, it will save the Government money; and regardless of how the people of a free district vote freely for whom they please, the center should be authorized on merit—and merit alone—regardless of ALGER, Kennedy, or anybody else."

Even more pointed has been the comment of the Dallas Times Herald, in saying:

"The Federal Government is using political reprisal for an inexcusable hatchet job on one of its greatest American cities; namely, Dallas. Dallas County (which forms the congressional district represented by Mr. ALGER) is getting its punishment from the Democrat administration because it voted a Republican Congressman into office.

"There are no party labels pasted on taxes we send to Washington and we want none in return."

If the Kennedys are going to operate a political spoils system of blacklisting people who have not seen fit to vote New Frontier, more than one-half of all who cast votes in the 1960 presidential election are eligible to the blacklist, for President Kennedy received less than 50 percent of the nationwide popular vote.

But the Kennedys surely know that apart from the poltical smallness of such tactics, the idea of running the U.S. Government on that basis is utterly incredible.

Democrats and Republicans have an identical right under the American system to vote for candidates of their choice without reprisal or fear of reprisal from the White House.

The American system would become empty and meaningless if the American people were browbeaten into goosestepping to the polls to do only the bidding of the White House, whether Democrats or Republicans were in power.

Ballots cast in that manner and under those conditions would be cast by robots, not by voters.

### RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

### LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

### GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

### CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

### PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

### CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

## REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*
Abele, Homer E., *Ohio*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Anderson, John B., *Ill.*
Andrews, George W., *Ala.* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.* The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Auchincloss, James C., *N.J.* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Barry, Robert R., *N.Y.* 3019 Normanstone Drive
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Battin, James F., *Mont.* 217 Slade Run Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Becker, Frank J., *N.Y.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Beermann, Ralph F., *Nebr.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.* 1314 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*
Bonner, Herbert C., *N.C.* Calvert-Woodley
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio.* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn.*
Bromwell, James E., *Iowa*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brotzman, Donald G., *Colo.*
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio.* Alban Towers
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif.*
Broyhill, James T., *N.C.*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Bruce, Donald C., *Ind.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N.Y.*
Burke, James A., *Mass.*
Burkhalter, Everett G., *Calif.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah.*
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.* 1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N.J.*
Cameron, Ronald Brooks, *Calif.*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y.*
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y.* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif.*
Cleveland, James C., *N.H.*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.* 1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Corman, James C., *Calif.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, John W., *Ga.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Delaney, James J., *N.Y.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N.Y.*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio.* 800 4th St. SW.
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dole, Robert, *Kans.* 2816 N. Jefferson, Arlington, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y.* 1719 New House Office Building
Duncan, Robert B., *Oreg.*
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Edwards, Don, *Calif.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans.*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio.*
Findley, Paul, *Ill.*
Finnegan, Edward R., *Ill.*
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.* The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R.I.* 1235 New House Office Building
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Foreman, Ed, *Tex.*
Forrester, E. L. (Tic), *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N.C.* The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn.*
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N.J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn.*
Fuqua, Don, *Fla.*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.*
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla.*
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y.*
Gill, Thomas P., *Hawaii*
Glenn, Milton W., *N.J.* Capitol Park Apts., 800 4th St. SW.
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex.* 200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y.* 3842 Macomb St.
Goodling, George A., *Pa.*
Grabowski, Bernard F., *Conn.*
Grant, George M., *Ala.* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa.*
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y.*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla.*
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Hall, Durward G., *Mo.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y.*
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif.*
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*
Harding, Ralph R., *Idaho*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, William Henry *Wyo.*
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*
Harvey, James, *Mich.*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind.*
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio.* 1323 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N.Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*
Hemphill, Robert W., *S.C.*
Henderson, David N., *N.C.*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Horton, Frank J., *N.Y.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich.*
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa.* 2120 16 St.
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J.*
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.* 1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.* Albemarle House, 4501 Conn. Ave.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.* 5906 Harwick Rd.,
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y.* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N.Y.*
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.* 4807 Newport
King, Carleton J., *N.Y.*
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C.*
Kunkel, John C., *Pa.*
Kyl, John, *Iowa.*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*
Langen, Odin, *Minn.*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md.*
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio.*
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif.*
Lennon, Alton, *N.C.*
Lesinski, John, *Mich.*
Libonati, Roland V., *Ill.*
Lindsay, John V., *N.Y.*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*
Lloyd, Sherman P., *Utah*
Long, Clarence D., *Md.*
Long, Gillis W., *La.*

# Appendix

## Bonneville Power Administration Must Increase Its Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR**
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, January 17, the Congress received the President's proposed budget for fiscal 1964. Even though many of us anticipated that it would be larger than his requests for 1963, I don't think we were quite prepared for the fantastic figure of over $107 billion requested in new appropriations in this document. It is almost inconceivable that Congress could be asked to consider a budget of this magnitude, while at the same time being asked to consider rather sizable decreases in Federal taxes.

I, for one, firmly believe the level of personal and corporate income taxes is seriously hampering this Nation's rate of economical growth. The excessively steep progression of tax rates to a point approaching an almost confiscatory level very often has the effect of stifling initiative and inventiveness of our citizens.

However, I do feel that if a tax cut is forthcoming it must be accompanied with a concomitant serious reduction in the level of governmental expenditures or a conscientious effort on the part of Members of Congress to find additional ways to increase Federal revenues.

In my humble judgment, one outstanding and immediately obvious way to reduce Federal expenditures, while at the same time increasing Federal revenues, would be to establish a realistically increased electric power rate for the Bonneville Power Administration.

Mr. Speaker, the audit report by the Comptroller General of the United States on the financial statements of the Columbia River Power System and related activities for fiscal 1962, which was transmitted to Congress on December 11, 1962, clearly points out that that power system sustained a net loss—and I repeat, a net loss—of about $13.1 million in fiscal 1962. This is the fifth straight year Bonneville has sustained losses from the sale of power because of its unrealistically low rates. In 1961, the loss was $14.2 million; in 1960, it was $10.9 million; $6.6 million in 1959; and $2.9 million in 1958—for a total of about $47.5 million in 5 short years.

The Comptroller General also reported to Congress that the Bonneville Power Administration failed to meet its scheduled repayment of the capital investment in commercial power facilities by about $17.6 million in 1962. This compares with a failure to meet its scheduled repayment of $15.3 million in 1961, $11.6 million in 1960, $9.7 million in 1959—for a total of $54.2 million in 4 short years.

Mr. Speaker, in these trying times when the demands of our Federal commitments at home and abroad create ever-increasing pressures for greater spending, and the poor taxpayer is almost stumbling from his burden of excessive taxation, to allow Bonneville to continue this folly is intolerable. It is made even more intolerable because it does not have to be.

Mr. Charles Luce stated in the 1961 annual report o fthe Bonneville Power Administration that "future deficits are predicted for the next 4 or 5 years." It will be remembered by many of us who were in this House during the 2d session of the 87th Congress that this same Mr. Luce promised us that if the Hanford project resulted in additional losses that Bonneville's rates would also have to be increased.

In my opinion, fiscal responsibility and sound public financing will not permit further procrastination in our need to face up to the realities of the Bonneville rate structure.

Mr. Speaker, many of us have also heard spokesmen for the Bonneville Power Administration say that its rates cannot be reviewed and adjusted except at 5-year intervals, and the next review would not be until December 1964. However, the organic Bonneville Project Act states only that contracts shall contain provisions for equitable adjustments of rates at "appropriate intervals not less frequently than once in every 5 years." Let me remind my colleagues, that Mr. William A. Pearl, then Bonneville Power Administrator, told the House Committee on Appropriations in May 1957—and let me quote him:

> Periodically, in accordance with the Bonneville Act, we are to review our rate structure—that is, no less often than once every 5 years. Actually, we review it every year.

He said also:

> About 2 weeks ago we announced there would not be an increase in rates for the year beginning December 1957.

When Mr. Pearl was telling the House Appropriations Committee this, the next so-called 5-year review would not have been until December 1959.

In other words, even though the review required under existing contracts was still almost 2½ years in the future, the Administrator announced there would be no increase in the year beginning December 1957. This announcement would seem to indicate—at least by inference—that if he had felt it necessary to increase rates before 1959, he could have done so.

The Bonneville Act further states very clearly that rates may be modified "from time to time by the Administrator" subject to the confirmation and approval of the Federal Power Commission and subject to the terms of existing contracts. Furthermore, the act specifically requires that rates charged by Bonneville must be sufficient to cover the cost of producing and transmitting the electric energy, including the amortization of the capital investment in power facilities, over a reasonable period of years.

However, even assuming, for the sake of discussion, that the Bonneville Power Administration cannot increase rates under existing contracts until December 1964, I can find nothing in the Bonneville Act which would prohibit the Administrator from increasing rates under new contracts or under mutually agreed revisions of existing contracts which would be adequate to recover at least a portion of the losses and to repay a part of the investment until such time as a general rate increase might be applicable to all contracts. The act merely states that rate schedules may—and I emphasize may—provide for uniform rates but does not state that the rates must necessarily be uniform.

Mr. Speaker, because of the seriousness of allowing Bonneville to continue operating at such large deficits, I have sent a letter to Bonneville Administrator Charles Luce sincerely suggesting that he and his staff begin immediately to prepare for a realistic increase in Bonneville's power rates. Even though the overall increase may not be applicable to most of its customers until late next year, I think it is only fair to forewarn them at the earliest possible moment of the necessity for a forthcoming rate increase.

Under unanimous consent I insert a copy of my letter to Mr. Luce in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D.C., January 28, 1963.*

Hon. CHARLES F. LUCE,
*Administrator, Bonneville Power Administration, Portland, Oreg.*

DEAR MR. LUCE: I have recently read the audit report of the Comptroller General of the Columbia River Power System submitted to Congress in December. The report, as expected, shows the Bonneville Power Administration lost another $13.1 million in 1962 and failed to meet its scheduled repayment of the capital investment in commercial power by $17.6 million. As a member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and a taxpayer, I am deeply concerned about these losses.

This is the fifth straight year BPA has sustained losses from its sale of power: $14.2 million in 1961, $10.7 million in 1960, $6.6 million in 1959, and $2.9 million in 1958, for a total over the 5 years of $47.5 million.

Also, for the past 4 years, including 1962, BPA has failed to meet its scheduled repayment of the capital investment in commercial power to the extent of $54.2 million. To the 1962 deficiency, there must be added deficiencies of $15.3 million in 1961, $11.6 million in 1960, and $9.7 million in 1959.

Furthermore, it was brought out in the House Public Works Appropriations hear-

ings for 1962, that these stated losses are not a true reflection of the real losses to the U.S. Government.

The information you supplied for the record clearly showed that if Bonneville were paying interest at the more realistic rate of 4 percent instead of 2.5 percent, the losses for 1960, 1961, and 1962 would have been more than double the amount shown as losses in your reports.

In BPA's 1961 annual report you state, "future deficits are predicted for the next 4 or 5 years." You also observe that it will be most difficult to avoid a rate increase, if this trend is not reversed.

You have consistently stated or implied that BPA rates cannot be reviewed less than each 5 years, and the next review date would be toward the end of 1964. However, the Bonneville Project Act provides that contracts shall contain provisions for equitable adjustment of rates at "appropriate intervals not less frequently than once in every 5 years." The act further provides that rates may be modified "from time to time by the Administrator" subject to confirmation and approval by the Federal Power Commission. Finally, may I remind you, the act also specifically requires that the rates be sufficient to cover the cost of producing and transmitting the electric energy, including the amortization of the capital investment, over a reasonable period of time.

As I read this act, you cannot by contract preclude the Bonneville Power Administration from reviewing the rates charged thereunder at least every 5 years. This does not prohibit the Bonneville Power Administration from making more frequent rate reviews and, if necessary, rate adjustments as would be in accord with existing contracts.

In order to at least minimize the impact of losses temporarily, it seems to me that BPA should immediately review its rate schedule with a view to assuring that any future new contracts contain rates adequate to enable BPA to comply with the law. In the interest of fiscal responsibility by the Government—in the face of increasing Federal budget requests and the expressed desire by the administration to reduce taxes—I think it is urgently necessary to insure that any new customer taken on by BPA apparently is committed in existing contracts.

I can find nothing in the act to prohibit you from treating any new contracts under new rate schedules which would be adequate to recover losses and repay investments. The act states that rate schedules "may provide for uniform rates." It does not state that the rates must be uniform.

Mr. Luce, for these reasons, I sincerely suggest that you and your staff immediately begin to prepare evaluations of the BPA rate structure which will lead to appropriate increases necessary to comply with the law and today's economic facts of life. Remembering that your customers must also have sufficient leadtime to plan future needs, I would further suggest that they should be forewarned as soon as possible that a rate increase will have to be forthcoming in the not too distant future.

Sincerely,

JOHN P. SAYLOR,
*Member of Congress.*

Mr. Speaker, as a longtime member of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I realize full well the consequences and implications of a rate increase for the Bonneville Power Administration. However, as I said in my opening remarks, it is intolerable that Bonneville should be allowed to continue to operate at a serious deficit. The Government can and must strive to find every possible means of meeting its financial requirements while at the same time reducing the burdensome load on the average taxpayer.

In closing, I would like to compliment the Comptroller General and the Government Accounting Office for the quality of their audit report on the financial statements of the Bonneville Power Administration for fiscal 1962. I have been reading these GAO audit reports for several years now and I think that in general they are outstanding. I have been somewhat concerned, however, that they seem to have received so little attention here in Congress. We should all remember that the Government Accounting Office is an arm of the Congress—not the executive—and, therefore, is deserving of more consideration.

The suggestions from the Comptroller General and his staff for improving Government and very often for saving money are usually well founded and excellent. I sincerely hope that in the future every Member of Congress will pay more attention to these reports and suggestions.

## Walter Hall, of Galveston County: A Banker for the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Tuesday, January 29, 1963*

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Walter Hall, a leading Texas businessman who has risen to prominence both as a successful banker and civic battler for good government, was recently the subject of an excellent article in the Houston Post.

Walter Hall is known statewide in Texas for his courage in stepping forth against great odds to defend the people who helped him build his business—the people who start at the bottom of the ladder and work hard for a living. He has fought great odds, economically and politically, and always with growing strength and support from the people. He is a stanch Democrat.

The Houston Post quotes Walter Hall:

I didn't consider it going out on a limb to help these people get started. Some of the first loans in that area were no more than $100. And the same people who borrowed these small amounts are pretty well off today.

This is a statement from a banker who knows where the basic strength of a country, or a business, is to be found. He has never forgotten this fact in his life as a banker.

On the subject of government, the Post quotes Walter Hall:

It is my feeling that all citizens should take an informed interest and have some participation in politics. I believe good government is almost in direct ratio to the percentage of people engaging in it as voters and in political activities.

Walter Hall and I have worked shoulder to shoulder for more than a decade for better government for Texas and the Nation.

Mr. President, because Walter Hall is an outstanding example of an American businessman who has achieved success in a relatively small town, and because of his continuing courage in working for good government locally, statewide and nationally, I ask unanimous consent that the article captioned "Friend of the Little Man: Walter Hall, Banker, Doesn't Act the Part," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRIEND OF THE LITTLE MAN—WALTER HALL, BANKER, DOESN'T ACT THE PART

(By John Rainey)

DICKINSON.—Walter Hall has been a banker for 31 years.

For 31 years he has broken the so-called cardinal rules of banking, has become the image of a man most bankers refuse to be, and he's still solvent.

This has confused his financial and political opponents no end. They can't figure out how he manages to remain solvent.

"Some bankers laugh at me for making small loans of $50 and $60. Yet, I know when people need money in a country town they have no other place except a bank to go. Loan sharks have tried to move into the towns where my banks are, but they don't stay long," Hall says.

Hall is a liberal Democrat, in the national sense.

He is president of banks at League City, Dickinson, and Alvin. And plans are being readied for the fourth, at Webster.

Dickinson, League City, and Webster are in the heart of the NASA development. But before the space age came along the area was expanding rapidly.

Most of the loans in the Bayshore area—which helped it to grow, originated at the Citizens State Bank at Dickinson, Hall's first bank.

He bought controlling interest in the Alvin State Bank in 1953. Then along came the Chocolate Bayou plant of the Monsanto Chemical Co., swelling payrolls in wealth in the town this year.

He acquired control in the Dickinson bank during the midst of the depression, not an era of health for banks. Yet the Texas City petrochemical boom was mushrooming. He was in on the ground floor.

Doesn't sound much like luck, does it?

But most of the major windfalls in the area from which he has benefited were entirely unforeseen, he says.

Hall quit the Humble Oil & Refining Co. in 1931 to take a job as cashier in the League City bank, then owned by the Hutchings family of Galveston.

It was then called the Citizens State Bank. Hall got into the insurance business on the side and saved his profits to buy an interest in the bank. In 1932 the competing First National Bank at Dickinson closed.

The League City bank was then moved in 1935 to Dickinson. Hall gained controlling interest in 1943.

From 1933 to 1934 the expansion at the chemical plants was astronomical. In 1934 an oil field was discovered in Dickinson. In 1938 the League City field was uncovered.

In 1939 Camp Wallace was established in the La Marque-Hitchcock-Dickinson area. A blimp base was built at Hitchcock.

As he tells it: "The Camp Wallace and blimp projects filled every living unit in the area. And I had been making loans for additions to homes and for apartments.

"Our bank was the first in a 16-county area to make FHA title I loans. The other

banks were slow in getting into this new program.

"But then I didn't have the handicap of experience and outmoded ideas to tell me I shouldn't do it.

"In the same period, the people trying to develop the Bayshore area were considered wharf rats by many. I felt that the rapidly expanding population in Houston and along the coast would create a boom someday in the recreation business.

"I didn't consider it going out on a limb to help these people get started. Some of the first loans in that area were no more than $100. And the same people who borrowed these small amounts are pretty well off today.

"When I acquired control of the Alvin bank in 1953 the decision was based on the premise that oil in the area would cause other industry to grow. It did. But they were primarily of a diversified nature—rice farming, dairy, and beef cattle ranching. I had no idea that Monsanto would build at Chocolate Bayou.

"And that has been the story. I was in the right place at the right time."

The three banks now have combined assets of about $25 million.

Hall may have been in the right place at the right time; that is part accident. But the loan policies he has instituted are not accident.

At the Alvin bank for example, he raised the ratio of loans to deposits from the previous 10 to 25 percent to 50 percent. The rate of growth of assets was 7.2 percent annually, up until 1961. That year the rate was 19 percent.

He organized the League City State Bank in 1956. It has had an annual rate of growth of 12 percent. It now has over $6 million in assets.

He has been active in his banks but he considers himself a citizen first, a banker second. He has hired competent people to run the banks, given them authority and then turned 'em loose.

For Hall has been as active in politics as he has in business. His views on economics put him in the class of radical among most businessmen and definitely so among bankers.

He gave more than voice support for Don Yarborough for governor this year. He campaigned and supported Yarborough financially. But this is not new with Hall. He is a prime supporter of U.S. Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH. Hall is also close to Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON.

He gets around, though his ideas on State finances have not been given much attention.

Here they are: "I don't gripe about taxes. I realize that the economic world we live in makes them necessary. I do think that the State tax structure is unfair, though.

"Taxes should be levied relative to the capacity to pay. They should be levied fairly with the least disturbance to the economy and living conditions of the people.

"Also, economy in the mechanics of collection is important. One of the main defects of the sales tax is the heavy cost of collection and the difficulty of enforcing it fairly.

"In many States where it is levied too much of the tax collected never reaches the State treasury because of collection costs.

"The State corporation tax, which is in effect in 37 States, has the advantage of being easy to compute and collect. And, of course, it is based upon profits. It is, therefore, a tax that meets the requirements of the capacity to pay.

"A glaring example of a vicious tax that is not related to the capacity to pay is the State franchise tax. This is a tax on capital and long-term debt and will literally bankrupt a company that is just barely getting by before the tax.

"One thing in favor of the corporate tax on a State level is that much of the money so collected by the State amounts to a diversion of Federal taxes.

"Texas is at a distinct disadvantage in not using the State corporate tax to help finance expenses.

"Taxes are heavy and will continue to be so. For the people want more things from all the various governmental units. These cost money and there is only one place to get it, from the people. But taxes have to be in relation to the income of those paying them, otherwise they become confiscation.

"People, especially businessmen, can't understand why I should be so interested and also mixed up in this business of politics.

"I do not consider myself a politician at all. We approach all problems through some political unit, generally, I like to see the efforts of meeting changing problems made by applying reason and using the best information possible.

"All of us, the busy businessman included, should see that tax money is spent efficiently and for the things the taxpayers want it spent. That there may be some penalty risk by businessmen participating in politics as I do, I do not question. Some say there is, some say there is not. Personally, I do not know. But I do know a man is, or at least should be, a citizen first, and a banker, engineer, farmer, or whatever, second.

"I respect politicians because I realize we cannot have a democracy without them. While democracy may have its defects, it is so far superior to anything yet devised that to me there is no alternative.

"I have been called a liberal and I suppose by some measures I am. This is because I know that change is inevitable and that orderly change is the most desirable kind. I do not fear change and it wouldn't matter if I did because it would still be with us, and I would have to meet it.

"It is my feeling that all citizens should take an informed interest and have some participation in politics. I believe good government is almost in direct ratio to the percentage of people engaging in it as voters and in political activities.

"People scream about the Federal Government invading the States, taking away States rights. While I do not regard the Federal Government as some sort of enemy as do some folks, I do not think it is good, in a State with the basic wealth of Texas, to have development of these resources depend upon Federal financing.

"I think it is a poor trade to exchange some degree of State control for Federal dollars.

"Yet, we have seen, countless times, people who constantly criticize Federal taxes and expenditures go all out for the Federal aid to finance State projects. In some States this is necessary, it is not in Texas. And yet, there is nothing now to cause anyone to believe there is any basic change in sight."

Hall has one other favorite topic—soil and water conservation. He served as president of the San Jacinto River authority for 11 years, from 1943–54.

He became interested in water supplies because of the need in the area for fresh water, especially for industry.

"Water supply has been the ceiling on every civilization," he says. "The need is now, and it will increase in the future."

"It can be said, perhaps, with logic, that the people will see the need when they become sufficiently educated. This may be true, but I point out we have many well educated people now and only a few of them seem to be much concerned about all of the aspects of taxes and water development.

"While the educational process is going on, and I hope being improved, considerable damage is being done in the State through neglect of soil and water development.

"For instance, there goes down the rivers of Texas into the Gulf of Mexico enough of our soil each year to create 8,000 farms, 100 acres each, with soil 6 inches deep.

"The leaders must lead. But the fact that the masses are not greatly concerned over these problems is a reflection on the leaders."

Hall does not demand that others listen to his opinions, only that others be tolerant of them. His politics is not a company policy. For example, his own secretary is a Republican.

Those who differ with him rarely become bitter over the differences.

He likes to have ideas on problems come out in full play, regardless of their nature. He likes to philosophize and mix economics with his philosophy. He received his bachelor of arts degree from Rice University in 1928. His favorite subjects were economics, philosophy, and history.

He was born in 1907, the youngest of seven children.

His parents moved from Illinois to a farm northwest of Webster in 1898. The 1900 hurricane ruined their crops and home. The family moved to Houston where Hall attended Central High School.

He is still essentially a country boy at heart. He knows the people in his area, personally.

One of his friends sums him up this way: "He has listened to the small because he considers them important. But the listening has not made him small. If he has a banner, it is one of individualism. He carries it high. It is, though, the kind of higher individualism that grows out of looking for meanings in the human drama."

## The Romance of the Mona Lisa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, January 29, 1963*

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, in these days when we are all so much pleased and interested in the display of the Mona Lisa at the National Gallery of Art, it is particularly interesting to note what the newspapers of our country are saying with respect to this matter. I think the editorial headed "The Romance of the Mona Lisa," which recently appeared in the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel sums the matter up very well and I am pleased to include it herewith.

Under unanimous consent I insert the article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE ROMANCE OF THE MONA LISA

It is indeed a heartwarming contrast that against a background of so much that is negative and ominous in international relations there should fortuitously be such a positive and ennobling expression of international relationship which is currently being graphically enacted in our own country—indeed in our National Capital.

The fruition of this salutary romantic and artistic international gesture became a reality when Leonardo da Vinci's incomparable masterpiece, the Mona Lisa, went on public view at the National Gallery of Art in Washington today. On loan from the French Government, it will also be shown in the Metropolitan Museum in New York City before being returned to the grand gallery in the Louvre.

The Mona Lisa, of course, is not the oldest portrait in the world, and there could be some division of expert artistic opinion as to whether it is the greatest. But it is a veritable miracle in international esteem. Mona stands for madam, and Lisa, her given name. Relatively speaking, it is a small portrait, just 30 inches high and 21 inches wide.

Lisa was the third wife a Florentine patrician, Francesco di Zanobi del Giocondo. She was about 25 years old when she sat for da Vinci, then in his early fifties. Incidentally, Giocondo was an ordinary rich man such as one encounters often and everywhere. He was neither overly handsome nor ill featured, and while he was preoccupied with his affairs, he nevertheless was still devoted to culture. He was 20 years older than Lisa, who to him was the ornament of his home. But legend has it that he really understood less of the consummate beauty and charm of his madonna than he did the quality of a new breed of beef cattle.

Lisa was a Neapolitan and a scion of an ancient family. Disaster struck her family, for her once rich father had been ruined by the French invasion in 1495. She was said to have married, not for love, but out of filial obedience. Her marriage disappointed many passionate, obstinate and desperate suitors. But none could speak ill of her. A biographer of Leonardo describes her as: "calm, modest, pious, charitable to children, a good manager, a faithful wife, and very tender with her stepdaughter, Dianora."

This then was the Lisa who remarkably sat to Leonardo for the better part of 3 or 4 years. That they both enjoyed the platonic seances is evident. Leonardo always had mimes, musicians and poets at his studio to keep the Madonna amused. A bitter note of tragedy intervened when one of her children died during her sittings.

It was most distinctive of the artist that he is historically reputed to have been, that Leonardo was never satisfied that the portrait was complete. He took it with him when he went to France in 1516 and sold it to the King, Francis I (Giocondo never got his hands on his wife's historic likeness), for 4,000 golden ducats. Nevertheless Leonardo kept the Mona Lisa on a whitewashed wall in his mansion at Chateau de Clous until the day he died.

The loan of the enigmatic Mona Lisa to the Washington National Gallery by the French Government represents alike a master stroke of diplomacy and international friendship. Significantly, Le Monde, the highly influential Paris newspaper, already has suggested that the French might "hope in return for the loan of artistic works which will arouse a lively interest." Noted international art connoiseurs have for centuries paid profound tribute to da Vinci's artistry in the Mona Lisa. The following by Walter Pater is typical: "Hers is the head upon which all the ends of the world are come. It is beauty wrought from within the flesh, the deposit, little cell by little cell, of strange thoughts and fantastic reveries, and exquisite passions."

## Let Us Be Better Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Tuesday, January 29, 1963*

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have just received a copy of a speech recently delivered by Mr. Harry Ostrov, grand master of Free and Accepted Masons of the State of New York, which was recently delivered at the Garden City Hotel, Garden City, Long Island.

Mr. President, in my judgment this address is worthy of the consideration of all thinking Americans. It is a call and a challenge to all of us to fill our responsibilities as citizens under a free government. As Mr. Ostrov points out, the citizens of America have never before been faced by the challenges that confront us throughout the world today. He concludes:

If we pride ourselves on being Americans, let us be better Americans. Let us work for the day when there will be peace on this troubled earth, when every man shall be free, when all of us can follow the dictates of our conscience, when all of us can work together for a better world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of this stirring address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS GIVEN BEFORE THE MASONS OF LONG ISLAND AT THE GARDEN CITY HOTEL, GARDEN CITY

We have started this day in a very auspicious manner. We have arisen and directed our footsteps to our houses of prayer and there, as the first act of the day, have paid our obeisance to our Almighty Father who is in Heaven; and then we gathered here to break bread together, and to share each other's fellowship, with the thought in mind that we will leave this place a little bit stronger than when we arrived, for we will be leaving with the good wishes of our brethren in our hearts. Would that we could start every day in this fashion, for then we would be ever mindful of the responsibilities which are ours, both as Masons and as Americans. We would then be able to gather the courage that we need to face the problems of our day; and problems, my brethren, we have.

From the very beginning of our Nation's history we have had problems. We have been confronted with one crisis after another, and we have survived as a nation primarily because of these crises; for each of them presented a challenge to us, and as we met the challenge day by day we became stronger in our convictions, strengthened in our purpose, and we developed a character which is known as the American; and we today inherit the steadfastness, the zeal, the courage, and the dedication of those who founded this Nation. In the forefront of those who established this country were members of our craft. Many of the signers of the Declaration of Independence were Masons; and also many of Washington's generals. Down through history, wherever our country needed men of courage and conviction and trustworthiness, it often developed that they were members of our craft. They had a job to do for their young Nation; we have a job to do for the Nation that has grown out of their efforts.

The one fault I would find with Americans, if it can be called a fault, is that they take too much for granted. We know that ours is a great fraternity and a great country, but we sometimes forget that this Nation was not born out of wishful thinking, nor was our fraternity. This Nation resulted from the sacrifice of many dedicated men who were willing to offer their wealth, their position, their sacred honor, in order to establish here on this continent a new nation conceived as it is in liberty, and firmly based on the principle that we are all God's children; and that there should be equality of opportunity for every man, for every citizen, to develop his highest best, not for any selfish reason of his own, but that he may thereby be better enabled to contribute greatly to the success and prosperity of his Nation, this beloved land of ours, and of all mankind. Freemasonry, my brethren, has ever been in the forefront of every movement for democracy and for freedom, and come what may we will always be in the vanguard of the battle for the dignity of the human soul.

We face a particular crisis today. We have met a challenge straightforwardly, unequivocally; we have accepted the challenge that was laid at our doorstep and we are now willing to negotiate and, if need be, to fight for the preservation for our way of life. It may not be easy, but nothing that is worthwhile, my brethern, comes easily. This is a time when Americans must stand united behind the leaders of our Nation, and support them with calm dignity. The worst thing that we can do is to panic. The best is to preserve our calm, maintain our faith in these institutions which we cherish so dearly, and, with the help of Almighty God and the dedicated efforts of all Americans, we shall be vindicated in establishing the principles for which this country has ever stood. I am proud this morning to be an American.

With this realization, I think that we should do this a little bit more often. Confession is good for the soul, and it would be well for us to stand up every once in awhile and speak about the things we believe in, and the things for which we stand, rather than devote our time, and such talents as we may have, to decry those things which we do not like.

Let us be positive. Do you believe in Masonry? Work for it. Do you believe in America? Fight for it. Do you believe that there is one Almighty Parent in heaven, which makes us all members of the human family? Brethren, if you believe in that ideal, fight for it. In no other way can these precious liberties, and these wonderful privileges, be maintained and preserved for the generations that come after us.

I attended a cornerstone laying in Philmont recently, a quiet little village upstate. There we heard much about the history of the times that preceded the laying of that cornerstone. But histories, my brethren, are unimportant excepting what we may learn from the lessons of the past. The history that is important is the history that we make today. We make it by the things we do today, by the things we think today, and by the manner in which we live our lives. Every moment of today is the history of tomorrow, and you who sit before me now, are writing history. What kind of history will it be? Will it be the kind of history that you will be proud to have your children read? Will it be the kind of history on which future generations will look back and say, "There were men of courage." It must be that kind of history, and to the making of that history I enlist every member of our fraternity, and I would enlist every American, for we have the opportunity now of showing the world that Americans are not just a country of preachers. Americans are not just a group of people who mouth their sayings without meaning them. We can prove to the world that Americans, and especially Master Masons, believe in their preachings, practice their preachments, and are ready to fight to see that this preaching is put into practice and that these faiths that we espouse will prosper and go on to greater glory. Never, in the history of America, have the citizens been given such a challenge. Never has the proper response to that challenge been so important. This morning, my brethren, let us dedicate our-

selves to the thought that if we are going to be Masons, let us be better Masons. If we pride ourselves on being Americans, let us be better Americans. Let us work for the day when there will be peace on this troubled earth, when every man shall be free, when all of us can follow the dictates of our conscience, when all of us can work together for a better world.

May I read to you, in conclusion, the prayer that was uttered at one of our services this morning, and in which I ask you all to join. "Bless our country, that it may even be a stronghold of peace, and its advocate in the council of nations. May contentment reign within its borders, health and happiness within its homes. Strengthen the bonds of friendship and fellowship among all the inhabitants of our land; plant virtue in every soul; and may the love of Thy Name hallow every home, and every heart. Praised be Thou, O Lord, giver of peace."

## Ohio's Favorite Son

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 29, 1963*

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in the 6 months since his appointment as Secretary of Health, Eduation, and Welfare, Secretary Anthony J. Celebrezze has proven himself a tireless worker dedicated to the successful administration of his far-reaching Department. More recently, Secretary Celebrezze rendered extra service in his cordial meetings with Premier Amintore Fanfani, of Italy, serving to strengthen the ties between our nations.

The State of Ohio is proud of its favorite son, who has distinguished himself and continues to bring great honors to Ohio.

On Saturday, January 26, at the dinner meeting of the Ohio Society of Washington at the Lawyers Club, Secretary Celebrezze delivered the following inspiring address:

REMARKS BY ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Since I am a lawyer by trade and since all of us here are from Ohio, it occurred to me that you would indulge me in a stipulation or two about our State.

Without making too fine a legal point of it, I think that in these circumstances we can stipulate that Ohio is a great State—and that all Ohioans are great people.

As a matter of fact, I suppose on this occasion I could probably stipulate that Ohio is the greatest of all States. But that would be bragging, and since—among our many other virtues—we are naturally modest, we'll simply stipulate that we're a great group of people from a great State, leaving the superlatives to someone else. There are, after all, only so many superlatives, and those that New York and Texas haven't cornered, Alaska and California have—or will.

So acknowledging our natural modesty, we will simply confine ourselves to the facts. We will merely note that Ohio was the pioneer State in one of the most brilliant chapters in American history—the development of the Northwest Territory—and that it has been a leader ever since.

We'll merely note that Ohio is blessed with rich soil, abundant water, healthful climate, and all other characteristics of a fine piece of real estate and that its people are industrious, imaginative, honest, forthright, progressive, conservative, and otherwise—by any standard—quite without fault.

I could, of course, go on. But having stipulated these self-evident facts, I am sure none of us wants to dwell overlong on the past or even on the present. The past is static—at least to the extent that it doesn't get rewritten. And there's not much any of us can do about the present—it, too, is in the process of freezing into the past.

But the future. That's where the great game is—always ahead of us. The seed not yet planted, the machine not yet invented, the song not yet sung—these are the things that lead us on.

Now, don't misunderstand me. I don't underrate the past. It is not only important, it is imperative that we understand and interpret the past. It is imperative that we grasp the significance of the present. We must know the past and appreciate the present if we are to command—and not be commanded by—the future.

But granted the most penetrating analysis of the past, the most sensitive appreciation of the present—granted all that, and the future is still an uncertain business.

What will the world be like—10, 20, 30 years from now? What will America be like? What will Ohio be like?

No one, of course, can know with certainty. But we do know that what each of us does or does not do tomorrow may—and in all probability will—have some bearing on the shape of things to come.

The other evening I was in Cleveland helping to celebrate the 70th birthday anniversary of a great and wonderful friend—Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver. And I quoted some of Rabbi Silver's own words from an address he had given several years ago.

"We have long been admonished by our sages not to observe the wind too closely lest we fail to sow, nor to regard the clouds with too much concern lest we fail to reap."

I like those words—let us not observe the wind too closely lest we fail to sow or regard the clouds with too much concern lest we fail to reap.

Somehow these words remind me of the traveler who stopped to ask the way of a local citizen. You all know the story of how the local citizen, after deep thought and a number of false starts, finally gave up and said to the traveler: "You can't get there from here."

We are seeking our way to the 21st century. It is just over the horizon, but how do we get there from here? Or more precisely, how do we go about making the world of the 21st century the kind of world we want it to be?

From some of the things you read, you sometimes get the notion that there's no way to get to the 21st century from here and that anyone who tries to figure it out ought to have his head—and even his motives—examined.

I expect that somehow we'll make it, but I thing we can stipulate that it's going to take some doing. We're going to have to do a lot of sowing, wind or no wind, and a lot of reaping, clouds or no clouds.

It takes a lot of work to keep a nation like this humming. But work is no problem. We seem to like work, and I am sure we will continue to like it.

The point is that it isn't enough in this day and age—if indeed it ever was—merely to get "A" for effort. The really difficult part is making our efforts, as individuals and as a nation, count. And that means developing and using all our resources.

Up to now, I haven't mentioned my dominant concerns, and I don't intend to burden you with them this evening. But since we are making some stipulations, I think we must stipulate that progress in the fields of health, education, and welfare are essential to our progress as a nation.

And we have made progress in all these fields. We are spending more money for medical research than any nation on earth, we have provided more education for more people than any nation in history, and we are spending billions of dollars a year to see that no one is destitute.

In short, we have gone to considerable trouble to deal with those problems which are of manifest public concern. The question is, Are we really taking advantage of our opportunities in these fields?

I suggest that merely alleviating human problems is a costly investment. I suggest that this approach belongs to a less enlightened, less resourceful age.

The youth loitering on the street corner, out of school, out of work—is he merely a problem, or does he represent an opportunity?

The once-clean river, laden by waste and debris—is this merely a problem, or does cleaning it up represent an opportunity for progress?

The mentally ill, living out their lives in custodial institutions because known methods of treatment are not available to them—are they merely problems, or do they represent opportunities for constructive action?

In a less enlightened, less resourceful age, the most we could hope to do in dealing with problems of health, education, and welfare was to try to relieve the symptoms.

But times have changed. We now know that it is possible, through timely and constructive action, to prevent many of the problems that have beset humanity throughout the ages.

It seems to me the better part of prudence that we steadily move in that direction—in the direction not only of dealing with problems after they have arisen but in the direction of preventing them from occurring in the first place.

There is nothing, it seems to me, quite so important to our progress and well-being as a nation as increasing the vitality of our educational system. I think you will agree that this becomes more and more evident as we advance further and further into the age of technology.

Consider merely one product of technology—automation. Consider the problems it poses for our educational system—and the opportunities it offers for increased productivity and the manifold benefits that go with it. But we must look upon automation as an opportunity for all—rather than a problem for many—if its true value is to be realized.

Well, I said I wouldn't burden you this evening with these concerns. If I haven't kept my promise, I apologize. But in all candor, I think we must stipulate that the work of the great State of Ohio is not yet done.

I think we must stipulate that Ohio, in common with all the other States, must not rest on past achievements but must keep moving forward—toward the 21st century.

There is bound to be a way to get there from here—if we will but find it.

## Adlai Stevenson and the Cuban Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GALE W. McGEE
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Tuesday, January 29, 1963*

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, this morning's edition of the Washington

Post carried a very interesting and informative editorial concerning a situation illustrative of the less effective side of American journalism. The editorial refers to the role played by U.N. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson during the Cuban crisis and subsequent revelations of his actions by a national magazine.

History has wasted no time vindicating Ambassador Stevenson, and I hope that this incident, painful as it has been to Mr. Stevenson, has taught us that eavesdropping and supposition are not suitable substitutes for factual reporting and analysis based on the facts of diplomatic life.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUTABLE MUNICH

"We're eyeball to eyeball, and I think the other fellow just blinked." So began the celebrated Saturday Evening Post account of the Cuban crisis as written by Stewart Alsop and Charles Bartlett. Near the end, this passage occurs: "Only Adlai Stevenson, who flew down from New York on Saturday, dissented from the Excomm consensus. There is disagreement in retrospect about what Stevenson really wanted. 'Adlai wanted a Munich,' says a nonadmiring official who learned of his proposal. 'He wanted to trade the Turkish, Italian and British missile bases for the Cuban bases'."

Last week a curious footnote was written to the melancholy controversy over Mr. Stevenson. President Kennedy confirmed at his news conference that the missile bases in Turkey, Italy and Great Britain are being phased out in favor of Polaris, "a much more modern weapon." Mr. Kennedy concluded by remarking, "I think we are going to be in a stronger position."

In other words, what would have been a Munich in September became a matter of modernization in January. Surely this ought to serve as a sobering lesson to those who persist in evincing a retrospective rectitude about what may or may not have gone on in the secret councils of state during a moment of supreme crisis. Mr. Kennedy would have been derelict if he had not considered the missiles bases as part of the diplomatic equation, especially since their removal does not, on the President's testimony, lessen western security. Events have brought Mr. Stevenson and his critics eyeball to eyeball, and it looks suspiciously as if history has just winked.

## Quincy Soldier Cited in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, January 29, 1963*

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Members of the U.S. Congress an award given to a brave young man who lives in my district. Pfc. Kenneth B. Eaves of 282 Wilson Avenue, Quincy, Mass., graduated from high school in 1961. He is a former newspaper boy and is a typical young American who is courageously doing his duty in order that peace may be established in the world. In this far-off place Kenneth Eaves is engaged in combat just as deadly and as dangerous as any battlefield in World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict. It is fitting that we should recognize the great sacrifices being made by these brave young Americans. Their devotion to duty, to God, and country has never been excelled.

I enclose a news story that appeared Thursday, January 24, 1963, in the Quincy Patriot Ledger that reads as follows:

QUINCY SOLDIER CITED FOR VIETNAM HEROISM

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM.—A 20-year-old helicopter gunner from Quincy, Mass., was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross today by U.S. Army Chief of Staff Gen. Earle G. Wheeler for heroism in a battle January 2.

WAS WOUNDED

Pfc. Kenneth B. Eaves of 282 Wilson Avenue, Wollaston, was shot down twice and slightly wounded in the leg in five missions during the 12-hour battle of Ap Bac.

He was 1 of 12 American soldiers awarded medals today.

Three Americans died and Vietnamese Government Forces suffered heavy losses in the battle with Viet Cong rebels about 40 miles south of Saigon.

Eaves, a machinegunner on a U.S. Army troop-carrying helicopter, has been stationed in this embattled country for 9 months.

On one mission, though covered with oil from a burst pipeline, he continued to fire his machinegun until his helicopter crashed. He survived the crash and waded across 100 yards of knee-deep mud to reach a rescue helicopter.

The gunner, his Distinguished Flying Cross dangling from his shirt, said after the ceremony: "I will stay in the Army and I hope to join the Special Forces."

FORMER NEWSBOY

Eaves, a 1961 graduate of North Quincy High School, has been in South Vietnam since last April. From junior high school until his sophomore year at North Quincy he was a Patriot Ledger carrier boy.

Five Distinguished Flying Crosses, six Bronze Medals and one Air Medal were awarded. Seven went to helicopter pilots and crewmembers and the other five were to military advisers.

"This is a dirty, nasty, little war," General Wheeler said in the ceremony at Soc Trang, a major American helicopter base 100 miles southwest of Saigon. Referring to the Normandy invasion of France, he said:

"You know you can get killed here just as easy as you would landing on Omaha Beach."

It was a "lonesome war," he added.

But he said although some might consider the Vietnam war a strange war in a strange country, no American should feel alien in any country fighting for freedom.

## Address by Hon. Anthony J. Celebrezze Before the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Tuesday, January 29, 1963*

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, on January 19 the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, was honored to have as their main speaker our great Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Anthony J. Celebrezze. The speech given by my personal friend Secretary Celebrezze set forth as well as anything I have read regarding our national objectives in the fields of health, education, and welfare.

I ask unanimous consent that this speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS[1] BY ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Madam President, distinguished colleagues. Seldom do I have the opportunity to speak before an audience whose major concerns, both personal and professional, are so deeply meshed with my own and so broadly extended over the field of government.

We are, each of us, in one way or another, trustees of the public welfare. Together we share the task of administering to the needs of the American people, and together we share the tremendous responsibility of safeguarding the future of democratic institutions both here and around the world.

It is fitting, at the beginning of this new year—at the beginning of this new legislative session—that we should pause to redefine our common goals and to examine some of the issues surrounding them.

Abraham Lincoln once observed that, "If we could first see where we are and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do and how to do it."

President Kennedy, on Monday, provided such an overview on the state of the Union.

Today, I would like to make some further observations concerning our national objectives in the fields of health, education, and welfare.

These objectives and the means of meeting them have often been the subject of vigorous public debate.

I am not dismayed by this attention. It reflects the fact that the programs of our Department touch directly, most intimately, the interests and concerns of the individual citizens of our Nation. Their spirited reaction to our programs and proposals is not something to be deplored. It is a very healthy sign of American democracy in action.

It is through such debate that we are able to reconcile differing points of view and produce a consensus that serves as a basis for action.

It is this that propels our Nation forward. When we fail to reach a consensus on matters of urgent public need, as in education, for example, then we are in trouble. For unless our Nation can move forward, not only we Americans but free peoples everywhere are imperiled.

How to resolve the differences that divide and tend to immobilize us, how to keep this Nation moving along on all fronts, is the function of government, the function of politics, the function of responsible citizenship. It is your job and mine.

It requires the free flow of ideas. It requires honest effort at accommodation among the special interests that are bound to exist in a pluralistic society such as ours. It requires broad perspective and broad understanding of all these interests.

I am most concerned that we should understand each other, you and I and the pub-

[1] Before the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., Grand Ballroom, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C., Saturday, Jan. 19, 1963, 12:30 p.m., e.s.t.

lic at large, on the fundamental issues concerning our objectives in health, education, and welfare.

Let us see ourselves first in the broadest possible perspective before we attempt to resolve the finite issues that appear to divide us. There is much that we are agreed upon, and from this vantage point I am certain that we can move to even closer understandings and to more productive leadership for the Nation as a whole.

In a global and historic perspective we know these things:

That we are a nation of 185 million people in a world of 3 billion, one-third of whom live under the yoke of communism;

That we share grave responsibility for leadership of the free world;

That we are a people of diverse national origins and races, with differing religious and political beliefs, who have made a common commitment to defend the freedom of man and to support the rule of law.

We are also a compassionate people, a people of good conscience, whose concern for the well-being of others is a fundamental and active component of our democratic way of life.

In the history of the world, ours is a unique experiment in democracy. It is true that we have fulfilled many of the great expectations of our Founding Fathers. We have survived the bitter tests of civil strife and economic hardship—of world conflict and militantly challenging ideologies. Our people have prospered. Our national stature has grown.

But the time of testing is not yet over. We are not preordained either to succeed or to fail. Our destiny will be determined by our actions, by our response to the needs and the aspirations of mankind today and tomorrow, here and around the globe.

During the last 20 years, since the end of World War II, the world has been undergoing a remarkable change in human attitudes.

This social and political change which we are experiencing is still too close for objective evaluation. That will be a task for future historians. But we can perceive its general outlines in the changing social, political, and economic structure of Western democratic states.

The change was heralded by Franklin D. Roosevelt when he added "freedom from want" to the essential rights of man. It was echoed by Winston Churchill when he proclaimed our era "the century of the common man." One of its first major international expressions was the Marshall plan, a truly historic gesture of man's concern for his fellow man which infused the nations of Western Europe with new life and new hope.

The concept of the Atlantic Community, the growth of the European Common Market, the Truman doctrine, the decolonization of Asia and Africa, the Alliance for Progress in our own hemisphere, all these are manifestations of the interdependence of free nations and of the rising hopes and expectations of free peoples for a new kind of society, for creation of what President Kennedy has called "a new world of law, where the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved."

This is the promise of democracy. Whether this new world of law ultimately comes into being will depend to a considerable extent on us, on our own continued strength, on our ability to achieve social and economic progress in our own land. We must continue to demonstrate that a free society is a viable society in which the rights of man are guaranteed, in which the common good is sought by common consent, in which civilization can grow and prosper.

This is the larger picture. But it is in this context that I would like you to consider this administration's objectives in health, education, and welfare. For we can no longer view the needs of our society or the obligations of our Government without an awareness of our place in the family of man.

Deterrents to progress in our land are no different from those in any other. Disease and poverty, ignorance and idleness all bear the same form and wear the same face. We are pledged to overcome them. Not all of them today, or tomorrow, or even perhaps in this generation. But we are pledged to make a fresh start. And we have made a fresh start.

We have begun by reaffirming our faith in the individual, in the 185 million men, women, and children who make up our national family. Our goal is to increase their personal freedom, to enlarge their capacity to build a good life for themselves and their families.

We believe that this can best be done by preventing the conditions that lead to dependency, to loss of personal freedom. Or, if we are too late, we would seek to restore their independence, to help them to help themselves.

In every field of social action, in health, in education, in welfare, these approaches are applicable. And they make sense.

Our social security system provides basic economic independence for retired or disabled workers, their widows, and surviving children. This does not intrude upon individual freedom and dignity. It makes them possible.

Our proposal to extend this insurance system to meet the basic health needs of the aged is another preventive measure, bearing no relation to socialized medicine. It would help protect the economic independence of older people by allowing them to insure themselves against some of the crippling costs of illness by prepaying part of these costs during their working years.

In the field of education we are facing a national crisis of alarming proportions. The growth of our economy is stunted on the one hand by the large and still growing number of educationally handicapped people, more than 8 million functional illiterates, 1 million school dropouts each year, and hundreds of thousands of men and women whose skills are becoming obsolete in today's highly developed industrial society. On the other hand we are experiencing a severe shortage of highly skilled manpower, particularly in the scientific and technical fields.

Thus, important national objectives are threatened by inadequacies in our educational system. Federal aid is clearly indicated, but of necessity can be only a small part of the total $30 billion invested annually in this country for education from all sources. Accordingly, the Federal contribution to education must be used to the maximum possible advantage of our schools.

Primarily, as President Kennedy pointed out in his budget message, Federal aid must "provide a major impetus to the solution of a selected number of critical educational problems."

The President has proposed that the Office of Education be strengthened and that the National Science Foundation play an increasing role in supporting the education of scientists and engineers. Other phases of the program, to quote the President, are designed "to obtain improved quality in all levels and types of education * * * to help break crucial bottlenecks in the capacity of our educational system by providing funds for building expansion * * * to increase opportunities for individuals to obtain education and training by broadening and facilitating access to colleges and universities and by providing an expanded range of technical, vocational, and professional training opportunities for teachers and students."

This is not too ambitious a program for America. Every phase of it is geared to stimulate State and local activity in overcoming an immediate and urgent national need.

And every phase of the porgram, in one way or another, has this objective: To prevent the tragic waste of stunted intellectual development in individual human lives and to assure that the Nation has the skills and brainpower it will need for the long haul in the years to come.

This program stands on its merits.

In the field of health, the principle of preventive and protective Federal action in concert with the States and local communities has long been practiced with success. The record of the Public Health Service is one of progressive triumphs over the agents of death, human suffering, and disease.

These efforts will be continued and strengthened and hopefully expanded to include national programs to prevent the appalling waste of human lives resulting from mental retardation, from drug addiction, from accidents, and other causes.

Our public health needs today are further complicated by manmade hazards in the environment, by the pollution of our waterways and the contamination of our atmosphere from industrial wastes, automobile exhaust, and the very same chemicals that serve to protect us.

During the last Congress we sought and received authority to strengthen our nationwide program of water pollution control, a major legislative achievement. We believe that effective air pollution control will require a major joint effort of nationwide scope.

We are also concerned about our manpower needs in the health fields. Today's shortages of doctors and dentists, nurses and public health specialists will not be overcome because we are already too late to do much about them. Tomorrow's shortages we can prevent by preparing for tomorrow's needs. This will require a huge national effort to expand our medical teaching facilities, to increase enrollments in medical schools by at least 50 percent and in dental schools by 100 percent.

These are our major objectives in health, education, and welfare. I believe they are sound objectives. They are all aimed at guarding and conserving our human resources, protecting the health and well-being of the individual citizens of this Nation and promoting its general welfare.

They are forthright, practical, and responsible approaches to difficult social and economic problems that must be solved.

The tasks we face today are not the same as those of yesterday. They require new approaches, new tools, and the testing of new ideas. Only by remaining flexible in our thinking and in our attitudes can we meet the challenges of change.

And change we must, for the status quo is neither safe nor desirable. We are by nature an open society, a dynamic society, that is responsive to the needs of its people and protective of their human rights. Other nations are looking to us, and we shall not disappoint them.

Among our goals, as you are well aware, is the provision of equal rights and opportunities for women.

We have not yet provided a fully satisfactory answer to Susan Anthony's question: "Are women persons?" In spite of the progress we have made in securing for women their basic rights, there remain shameful inequalities and prejudices that prevent the full partnership of women in our democracy.

The establishment by the President of his Commission on the Status of Women is a frank acknowledgment that much more can and needs to be done to assure that women in our society are part of "the whole body of the people." The Federal Government has assumed its leadership responsibility in this

area by translating intent into action. Our department has consistently supported a nondiscrimination policy in employment and promotions and will continue to do so.

But we do not need to be convinced of the huge contributions that women can make to the advancement of the Nation's welfare. We know how great it has been and can be.

We rely, perhaps more than any other Federal agency, on the efforts of women to further our programs of social improvement through voluntary and professional activity at national, State, and local levels.

We also rely on your leadership.

In the important unfinished business of achieving social progress in our land, this year and in the years to come, may we continue to benefit from your leadership, your talents, and from the high sense of purpose and dedication that you bring to the conduct of public affairs.

## Quiet, but Effective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 29, 1963*

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, for the past 12 years the people of Indiana have been extremely fortunate to have the services of Mr. Robert Kellum as executive secretary of the Indiana Flood Control and Water Resources Commission.

During this period many important and progressive strides have been made in Indiana to conquer the annual threats of flood and develop the State's water resources for the betterment of the entire State.

No individual has played a more important role in the solving of these difficult and time-consuming problems than Mr. Kellum who has served with a quiet efficiency becoming of any public official.

The recent resignation of Mr. Kellum from his post leaves a vacancy that will be extremely difficult to fill.

In honor of the 12 years' work by Mr. Kellum the Indianapolis Star recently published an editorial which depicts with clarity and accuracy the service rendered to the State of Indiana by Mr. Kellum.

The editorial from the Indianapolis Star follows:

QUIET, BUT EFFECTIVE

Those who are associated with him for any period of time soon learn that Bob Kellum is a quiet-spoken man of great sincerity not given to exaggeration or overstatement.

His comment on resigning as executive secretary of the Indiana Flood Control and Water Resources Commission is typical. Kellum wrote after 12 years' service, "It does seem to me that the commission can take credit for a number of extremely important developments that will be of lasting benefit to the people of Indiana." That statement hardly tells the progress in this field during a tenure that spanned four governors and both political parties.

Flood control and the conservation of water resources have been solidly established as matters of prime importance in Indiana under Bob Kellum's able and patient leadership. The scope of this work ranges from relatively small projects to the huge Monroe Reservoir, and the ambitious program to check flooding on the upper Wabash. Local flood control programs have benefited from his quiet cooperation.

The Star is proud that such an outstanding citizen is part of its family. Hoosiers should applaud a public servant who can leave a responsible office knowing his accomplishments will, in fact, "touch every segment of the population in some way."

## In Retrospect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 29, 1963*

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, three Congressmen have the distinction of representing former Presidents of the United States.

Residents of the 19th District of Pennsylvania are delighted to have the most recently retired President as its No. 1 citizen.

The following editorial appearing in the Friday January 25, issue of the Patriot, Harrisburg, Pa., is eloquent testimony to the high regard in which he is held by one man. A great majority of people everywhere would subscribe to the statements which follow:

J.F.K.'S YEARS—HOW HAS IKE FARED?

(By David Lawrence)

This is the second-anniversary week for the Kennedy administration, and a lot has been written lately evaluating what has happened since the inauguration in 1961.

So maybe it is timely to examine retrospectively how Mr. Kennedy's predecessor has fared in the last 2 years, how Dwight Eisenhower has weathered the storm of contrasts to which he has been so often subjected since he left the White House.

For it seems that President Kennedy's speechwriters are politically expert enough to make sure that, when anything bad develops on the current scene—for instance, the early phases of the Cuban controversy—the public must be told that the whole thing originated under the Eisenhower administration anyhow.

Indeed, the other day, in defending America's prominent role in supporting the U.N. intervention in the Congo—which is growing in unpopularity—the official White House statement was careful to put the umbrella of virtue over the existing policy by intimating that it was the preceding administration which had initiated U.N. efforts to harmonize things in the Congo.

Except, however, for these occasional efforts to gloss over delicate situations that may not be popular with the people, the tendency of the Presidential speech writers now is to imply that the U.S. Government really began to function only after January 20, 1961.

Perhaps General Eisenhower, quietly sojourning at Gettysburg or Palm Springs, is given to reflective soliloquy. He must be happy to read that, after all, it apparently was all right for him to go to Augusta, Ga., to play golf or to be away from the White House on vacation and weekend trips. For the latest statistics from the White House confirm that, whether on official or unofficial travel, Mr. Kennedy, during his first 2 years in office, has been out of Washington more days than was his predecessor during the same period in office. It is quite clear that such statistics will be considered meaningless now, for it is being said that the President has to keep moving if the country is to keep moving.

As for big crises when the people's hair stood on end, the impression has been conveyed that this happened for the first time when the "quarantine" was imposed around Cuba last October. Yet the tensest moment in recent history occurred when President Eisenhower and the Congress took a firm stand to ward off any attacks on Quemoy and Matsu that might lead to an invasion of Formosa. Red China has been and is far more irresponsible than the Soviet Union.

There was tension, too, when American Marines landed in Lebanon in 1958 in a turbulent Middle East situation. But these events today seem as far away as the Korean war, which wound up under President Eisenhower's administration in 1953.

When it comes to domestic problems, Mr. Eisenhower can look back on his relations with Congress as satisfactory in the main, even though the Democrats were in control of both Houses for 6 out of his 8 years. He didn't pick fights with the Democratic leaders but tried instead to preserve harmony and thus get his programs adopted. He must today view the passing scene with extraordinary interest because, theoretically at least, Mr. Kennedy has a majority in both Houses but is troubled by the same Republican-Democratic coalition of nonradicals that helped Mr. Eisenhower.

Eight years is a long time for a man to occupy the White House and the business of the National Government is so heavy from day to day that it must have caused Mr. Eisenhower to arch his eyebrows when his political opponents spoke of him as a do-nothing President. Maybe he does have some qualms of regret that he didn't engage in such publicity operations as Mr. Kennedy's energetic staff have conducted so intensively. For lots of things that Mr. Eisenhower did quietly and without fanfare would have made good news stories or fascinating shows on TV.

Mr. Eisenhower is basically a military man. He has an orderly mind and, as President, he followed a system of organized staff work. He constantly delegated tasks to his subordinates. He didn't try to be his own Secretary of State. He listened to his Joint Chiefs of Staff on military matters, even though he had been commanding general of the largest Armed Force in the world in a major war. Anyone who says he didn't keep in touch with what was going on every hour of the day, whether he was at the White House or away, doesn't know the fidelity with which such a man dedicates himself to his job.

After 2 years out of office, Ike continues in his own way to be useful to his country. While he makes speeches and indulges in criticism on domestic policies, he never impugns the patriotic motives or conscientious purposes of his successor—and that's one measure of the meritorious behavior of any former President of the United States.

## More From Mohawk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 29, 1963*

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I think most Members of Congress would be in-

terested in the following editorial from the Watertown Daily Times. At a time when airlines are demanding continued subsidy assistance from the Federal Government, it seems in poor taste to offer better inducements to air travel to potential customers abroad than to those of us who use the facilities at home, and are frequently subjected to erratic performance.

I think it might be well for the CAB to take a good look at the proposal mentioned in the editorial of January 24:

MORE FROM MOHAWK

The accusation has been made, not infrequently, and perhaps justifiably that we pick on Mohawk airlines. We cannot let the latest missive from Mohawk move past us without at least a plaintive comment.

Mohawk has announced that, effective March 1, a foreign visitor to the United States may purchase for $99 an airline ticket good for unlimited travel on Mohawk routes for 30 days. How about that? And how about the loyal regular patrons of Mohawk—loyal, that is, through thick and thin—getting in on this? Does it seem too much to ask that for every foreign visitor's ticket sold one should be offered at the same price to a regular customer?

## The 1963 Feed Grain Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, January 29, 1963*

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, farmers will soon be making a decision as to whether or not to participate in the 1963 feed grain program. Since the feed grain program, in itself, is somewhat complicated and since there are important differences in the 1963 program, as compared to 1962, I was pleased to find in the February 1963 issue of Successful Farming magazine, an objective explanation. I believe the Members of the House of Representatives will find this analysis helpful in explaining to their constituents provisions of the 1963 feed grain program and I accordingly, under unanimous consent, include portions of the article with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

THE 1963 FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

(By Fred Bailey, Jr., and Bill Brantley)

"Figuring with a sharp pencil or a dull one," Secretary Freeman recently said, "farmers will be money ahead to sign up for this year's feed grain program." Before you rush into a contract, however, take time to figure it with your own pencil.

Some farmers will get bigger Government payments than last year. But others will collect less. And few if any will find it as profitable to divert "extra" acres. As finally settled on, here's the program—with sign-up beginning February 1 and ending March 22.

All or nothing. Be sure to realize from the outset that this year you must divert all the acres you agree to divert in order to be eligible for any payments or price support. It's a new rule for 1963. And if you receive partial payment, then fail to comply in full, you forfeit the money and must return it (possibly with interest; this hadn't been decided at press time).

A three-crop program. Corn, grain sorghum, and barley are combined into a single program in 1963. Barley was separate last year. Thus, under the new program, your farm's feed grain "base" will be the average 1959–60 acreage of the three grains. (If your 1963 barley crop is in the ground, you can still participate in the program by reducing your total feed grain acreage.)

To participate, you must divert at least 20 percent of your 1963 base acreage. But you can, as in past years, divert more. The maximum per farm is 40 percent of your base or 25 acres, whichever is larger. In no case, of course, can the total diversion exceed your base.

Participation in the program entitles you to—

1. Diversion payments: These are paid on the acres you divert and they vary according to the crop idled. Payments average 20 percent of county support rate (national averages: Corn—$1.25, grain sorghum—$2, barley—96 cents) times normal—1959–60—yield of acres diverted. On acres diverted over the minimum 20 percent, payment is 50 percent of the local support rate times normal production.

2. Direct payments: These are 18 cents a bushel for corn, 14 cents a bushel for barley, or 29 cents a hundred for grain sorghum. You'll get the appropriate rate times the normal yield on the acres you plant for harvest.

3. Price support loan or purchase agreement: The CCC loan for this year's crop is $1.07 a bushel for corn, $1.71 a hundred for grain sorghum, and 82 cents a bushel for barley. It's available on your total 1963 production. Last year it was limited to normal production.

Other program details: Oats and rye are not included in the 1963 program, so you can plant all of them you want and still get price support on them—whether or not you participate in the program for other crops. National average support price on oats is 65 cents a bushed, and on rye $1.07 a bushel.

There's special payment this year to encourage small growers (those with a base of 25 acres or less) to divert their entire base acreage under the program. They will be paid at 50 percent of the support price for their full diversion.

Malting barley is not exempt in this year's program. So if you grow it, you must participate in the 1963 feed grain program to be eligible for price support.

About soybeans: There's no cross compliance. That is, you don't have to participate in the feed grain program to get soybean support. But you may be required to maintain your farm's total soil conserving and idle acreage to qualify for soybean loan. This rule wasn't firm at press time, so check your ASCS office.

What to do with diverted acres? USDA says the land diverted must be put to a conserving use, and that it must be in addition to the average acreage of conserving and idle land on the farm for 1959–60.

Payments you receive for diverting acres under the 1963 wheat or feed grain programs are only one part of the bargain you enter into when you sign up. There also are some obligations, and some opportunities you shouldn't miss on the handling of diverted acres.

Remember—your contract with the Government is just that—a contract. And the payments it offers are conditioned on a big "if". If you live up to your side of the agreement. So be sure you know just what is required. Here are some reminders on the requirements.

1. You must maintain your farm's normal soil-conserving acreage. This means the average number of acres in noncrop use during 1959 and 1960 must be maintained. Generally speaking, whatever conserving use this land was put to during this 2-year base period is considered an acceptable use for 1963.

And the acres you get paid for diverting under either the wheat or feed grain programs must be in addition to the above soil-conserving base.

2. The diverted acres must be from land currently used for crop production or from land previously under a Government conservation contract.

3. The law further requires that producers must keep such diverted acreage free from erosion, insects, weeds, and rodents. Chances are you can comply with this requirement simply by having the land in a suitable grass or legume soil-conserving cover.

Close mowing of diverted acres keeps weeds from seeding and controls foxtail, ragweed, smartweed, and similar weeds. If bindweed is a problem, or noxious weeds such as Canada thistle, perennial sow thistle, and horse nettle, spot spraying with 2,4–D will kill them.

Nationally, the USDA lists dozens of acceptable conservation uses for diverted acres. But a word of warning: By no means are all of these considered acceptable in all counties. Best bet is to check with your county ASCS office.

4. An other rule you should know about prohibits bringing new cropland into production, unless you make an equal reduction in present cropland. Otherwise, you will be subject to an acre-for-acre reduction in your diversion payments.

5. Except for specially permitted crops, diverted acres cannot be harvested or grazed during the contract period. The ban on grazing begins at the end of the signup period and is usually lifted after normal harvesttime.

Specific crops you can grow on all or part of the acres diverted from wheat or feed grains this year are: Guar, sesame, safflower, sunflower, and castor beans.

You can grow and harvest these crops without affecting your eligibility for wheat or feed grain program benefits, but your diversion payments will be reduced, and with safflower, you forfeit all the payment. With sesame, you get 40 percent of the farm's regular diversion rate; guar and castor beans 30 percent; sunflower, 20 percent.

Note that production of flaxseed, rapeseed, and mustard seed will not be permitted this year on diverted acres.

What about starting crops next fall on diverted acres? Yes, you can, if it's a crop that's normally fall-seeded, and one you will not harvest before the end of the year when your contract ends.

This means you can start crops such as alfalfa, wheat, barley, or winter oats next fall on diverted acres. You can start new orchards of fruit or nut trees on diverted acres, too, provided required conservation measures are followed.

Seedling legumes or grasses is probably one of the best ways to use your idle acres. Although you can't harvest the crop while the land is in the program, this is a good way to establish a hay crop for the following year. Or you can plow it under and build up soil fertility.

Since legumes on diverted land don't have to be managed to produce good feed, there's no point in clipping early, unless you want to avoid too heavy a blanket of material on the ground. By waiting until late-bloom stage to clip alfalfa, reserves build up in the roots and crowns, strengthening the plants.

A topdressing of phosphate and potash is recommended on established legume stands. The reason is that legume clippings left on the soil result in a buildup of nitrogen. This favors grasses at the expense of the legume.

Check into getting conservation cost-sharing help through the ASCS. While the law doesn't specifically provide for ACP cost-sharing on diverted acres, neither does it prohibit it. The decision is left up to individual county committees. So visit your local ASCS office to find out about this and for answers to other questions about diverted acres.

## The Political Perils of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER**
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the following article points up the extreme partisanship of this administration. The Kennedy family in building their ruthless, political juggernaut is perfectly willing to sacrifice national policies to gain one seat in the House as evidenced by the Dr. Walter Judd case.

More than any other Member of the House, Dr. Judd was responsible for the passage of the foreign-aid legislation last session. This case should be a warning to other Members of the House that you cannot buy political immunity by going along, but you possibly can purchase internal revenue immunity or antitrust immunity by giving $1,000 for a Presidential interview or $1 million to free the Cubans.

Under unanimous consent, I insert the article by William S. White which was published in the Washington Star, January 28, 1963:

THE POLITICAL PERILS OF FOREIGN AID
(By William S. White)

Both past and present instances of small bore Democratic partisanship have already brought danger to the only proper conduct of our foreign policy—which is to say its bipartisan conduct. They may bring yet more.

The Republican leaders of the House of Representatives have just repaid President Kennedy's participation in the defeat last fall of the veteran internationalist Representative Walter Judd, of Minnesota. They have calmly stacked the Republican side of the House Foreign Affairs Committee with five new anti-foreign-aid members.

This comes at a time when the continuation of the foreign aid program, one of the keys to the administration's world approach, is admittedly in hard straits in Congress.

No one on the administration's side can fairly cry "foul" at this action of the GOP. For if ever there was a case of built-in and inevitable tit for tat it was this unhappy instance of Presidential intervention against a first-rate Member of Congress simply because he happened to be in the other party.

Judd in fact risked his political life last fall by staying on in Washington to assist Mr. Kennedy's then current foreign aid bill—while the President was out in Minnesota demanding Judd's head in behalf of the Democratic Party.

It was a singularly clear illustration of the odd unwisdom of President Kennedy's uncharacteristic decision to go all out in a domestic campaign to return a Democratic Congress which just might be more amenable to him on such relatively picayune issues as medicare.

The President has always regarded the cold war as neither a Democratic nor a Republican but simply an all-American undertaking. But for this momentary switch from his usual course he has tried to keep partisan home politics out of his foreign policy.

Whatever moved him, it was a melancholy "victory" for him. For Judd's absence from the House will cause the President infinitely more trouble on the things that really matter than any possible gain it can bring him on the things that matter a great deal less.

Nor is this the end. While the House Republicans have been moving to retaliate, the ultraliberal Senate Democrats have been maneuvering in a characteristically myopic way to spread the damage, by way of both petty ideological and purely party partisanship.

They have been attempting to bar the Senate Republican leader, Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois, from a seat on the tax-writing Senate Finance Committee. They proceed here on the curious theory that DIRKSEN is likely to be critical of the President's tax bill; ergo, DIRKSEN has no right to be on the committee.

But this touches foreign policy, too, because DIRKSEN until now has been a tower of bipartisan strength to the President on all the top foreign crises in which he has thus far had to be engaged.

The same Democratic ultraliberals are running a muttering campaign against the ascent to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee of the few public men in the country who have been right about Castro Cuba from the start, Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, of Florida. SMATHERS' crime? Why, he does not support the President on every little domestic issue that may come up.

The ultraliberals are highly unlikely to be able to bar either DIRKSEN or SMATHERS from earned committee advancement. The mere fact that they have set off upon these absurd and juvenile vendettas, however, will surely do nothing to promote bipartisan foreign policy unity in a world in upheaval everywhere. The President himself could do worse than to call off these frantic advocates of a total conformism at the cost of what really matters—the proper, or bipartisan, conduct of foreign policy.

## Congress Must Assume Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. BOB WILSON**
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 29, 1963*

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Union of Saturday, January 26, 1963.

CONGRESS MUST ASSUME CONTROL

A feeling of dismay is sweeping over the country.

A cascade of words is tumbling out of Washington—but they seem to make little sense to the people. We speak for the Western Alliance—and our allies reel in doubt and confusion.

The President's fiscal program has lost all meaning. Even leading members of his own party, and many of them normally political liberals, also seem bewildered.

On the one hand, the President says taxes are a drag on the economy, proposes to cut them and practice fiscal frugality; on the other hand, he dumps on Congress a vast new spending package and waves aside a fantastic deficit.

As one Democratic Congressman is supposed to have expressed it, "if that is being frugal, I'm Peter Rabbit."

Walter Heller, the professorial Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, says he has the answer to all of this. He says that the deficit merely "means, after all, that the Government is putting more money into the economy than it is taking out."

The old chain-letter fad seems to have been adapted to economics. Even the President refers to a "chain reaction" of spending, as if every dollar not collected in taxes and every dollar that is spent by the Government automatically carries its own seed of prosperity.

What has emerged in Washington, and is being passed off as a fiscal program, is a hodgepodge reflecting the diverse suggestions coming to the President from left-liberal politicians, radical professors, immature advisers, and assorted speech writers. Dropped in here and there, with an eye to public support, are concessions to conservative, or orthodox thinking.

Tax reduction is necessary for economic growth, but it was too much to expect that those who sought more Federal power would suddenly favor a freer economy. The administration is merely restoring inflation. The President's messages have been speeches more than programs.

In these messages the President has almost abdicated his responsibility. He has swept up a conflicting mass of ideas and thrown them at Congress—or you might say, at the people.

If it all doesn't work, he says, he'll try something else.

To whom are the people to turn for guidance? For understanding of what is right or wrong?

The Congress must step in and take hold of the Government of the United States, as far as constitutionally possible.

The Congress must immediately assert its full authority over the spending and taxing powers of Government and over its fiscal policies. It should throw out the President's program in its entirety, and begin the task of charting a clear and acceptable course of action.

The United States cannot be governed by chance and by theory. Congress must act, for the good of the country.

The appropriate committees of the Senate and House also must begin thorough hearings into our foreign policy, our relations with our allies, into the truth about the situation in Cuba, and into the manipulation of public information.

Let's find out what is going on, who is doing what and why, and what can be done about it.

## George Washington Alumni Rank High in Number of Federal Executives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. E. ROSS ADAIR**
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 29, 1963*

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I recently came across an article relating to the alumni of the George Washington University and thought that since there are so many of them in the public service it

would be of interest and include it herewith:

GEORGE WASHINGTON ALUMNI RANK HIGH IN NUMBER OF FEDERAL EXECUTIVES

The George Washington University ranks first (men) and second (women) among educational institutions from which Federal executives (those in the Federal civil service at GS grade 14 and higher have received undergraduate degrees.

In an article entitled "Women Executives in the Federal Government," by W. Lloyd Warner, professor of social research at Michigan State University; Paul P. Van Riper professor of administration at Cornell University; Norman H. Martin, professor of management at New York University; and Orvis F. Collins, professor of business administration at Michigan State University, which appears in the October 1962 issue of Public Personnel Review, the authors include in their statistical study a ranking of those educational institutions from which women Federal executives have been graduated, with a comparative listing for men Federal executives.

The top institutions from which women Federal executives have received undergraduate degress in order are California, George Washington, Vassar, and Wisconsin. Those from which men Federal executives received undergraduate degress are George Washington, City College of New York, California, and Harvard, in that order.

At the master's level, George Washington is not among the top four alma maters of women Federal executives (Columbia, Chicago, Harvard, and California), but again ranks high among alma maters of men: Harvard, George Washington, Columbia, and Chicago in that order.

## State Opposes FCC Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 29, 1963*

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Communications Commission has announced its intention of holding a public hearing in the city of Omaha, Nebr., for the purpose of inquiring into the local service given by Omaha TV stations. This highhanded action has aroused the Nebraska State Legislature into adopting a resolution that I think should be read by every person who is alarmed at the prospect of Federal interference.

The resolution follows:

LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 8

(Introduced by William Moulton, 10th District, George Syas, 4th District, Fred O. Gottschalk, 26th District, Matt Wylie, 27th District, Cecil Craft, 38th District)

Whereas the Federal Communications Commission in Washington, D.C., has announced its intention to hold a public hearing in the city of Omaha, Nebr., for the purpose of inquiring into the local service rendered by the television stations of Omaha to the citizens in and around this great community of our State; and

Whereas this forthcoming hearing which is scheduled to commence to January 28 is not related to any complaints received from the citizens of this State, as to the kind and quality of service which is provided by the Omaha television stations, nor has any issue been raised in any renewal or revocation proceeding as to the qualifications of these licensees to operate in the public interest; and

Whereas television in this country constitutes a major and vital arm of our free press which should not be subject to direct or indirect pressure or control by government at any level if it is to exercise its full responsibility of serving and informing the people in our democratic society: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 73d session assembled:*

1. That the Legislature of the State of Nebraska convened on this 24th day of January in the year of our Lord 1963, does register its strong opposition to the scheduling of this public hearing by the Federal Communications Commission without just cause or reason, believing that this action constitutes an unwarranted intrusion by the Federal Government into the freedom of broadcasting, and the affairs of the citizens of this sovereign State.

2. That the Legislature of the State of Nebraska expresses both pride and commendation for the outstanding service which is provided by television stations, KETV, KMTV, and WOW-TV, Omaha, and the broadcast media generally of this State, in advancing the best interests of our citizens.

DWIGHT W. BURNEY,
*President of the Legislature.*

I, Hugo F. Srb, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of Legislative Resolution 8, which was passed by the Legislature of Nebraska in 73d regular session on the 24th day of January, 1963.

HUGO F. SRB,
*Clerk of the Legislature.*

## United States of Europe—Dream of Christian Democratic Leaders in Europe a Century Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Tuesday, January 29, 1963*

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, during these chaotic days, when every effort is made to establish peace, we should recall that a century ago Christian democratic leaders in Europe were planning and visualizing a United States of Europe, based on the pattern of our American democracy. Had such a plan been adopted, communism probably would not have succeeded in taking over these Christian democratic countries.

Mr. President, in order that we may better understand the plan these people had in mind, I ask unanimous consent that an article on this subject be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The author of the article is Mr. John C. Sciranka, of Passaic, N.J. Mr. Sciranka is a well-known American Slovak journalist. The article was published in the Dobry Pastier (Good Shepherd), official organ of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BROTHERHOOD OF CYRIL AND METHODIUS CENTURY AGO COULD HAVE SAVED RUSSIA FROM COMMUNISM

(By John C. Sciranka)

When two high officials of the Russian Orthodox Church, the bearded Archpriest Vitali Borovoy, professor at Leningrad Theological Faculty and representative of the Russian Church at the World Council of Churches headquarters in Geneva, and Archimandrate Vladimir Kotliarov, vice chief of mission of the Russian Church in Jerusalem, were received by Pope John XXIII in Vatican after the opening of the 21st Ecumenical Council, we were reminded of the efforts for the SS. Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood (Bratstvo) in Russia a century ago.

We often mention the historical meeting of Slavs, held in Prague in 1848 inspired by our famous Ján Kollár, where the Slavonic leaders pledged unity for the liberation of their nations. But 2 years before this historical meeting, an informal group of pan-Slavists met in Kiev and formed the Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood in honor of the apostles of the Slavs.

This brotherhood, although representing the organization of saints, was a democratic and semipolitical society with far reaching ideals. It advocated the Federated pan-Slavdom, ruled by the principles of representative government and constitutionalism. These democratic concepts, the historians inform us, remained the backbone of the society, which had been part of the intellectual atmosphere of eastern Europe from the time of the French Revolution.

Other historians inform us, that the prototype of the society had existed in Russia under Czar Alexander I. This Brotherhood of Cyril and Methodius composed of some 100 Ukrainian intellectuals. The leaders were: M. I. Kostomarov, teacher and future historian; P. A. Kulish, writer; Hulak and Biloziersky, students and Taras Shevchenko, the liberated serf and artist, who became the national poet of Ukraine.

The members believed and advocated that the Ukrainians were equal to any other Slav nation. Although they advocated independence, nonetheless they felt that Ukraine was surrounded by enemies and would become as an independent state a pawn of more powerful neighbors. They have, therefore, advocated a federation and led a movement for unification. The society conceived a federation like the early Greek republics or the United States of North America, which would maintain basic laws, internal free trade, etc., prohibiting serfdom.

They were then so precisely informed about America and its democracy that way back in 1846 they formulated and proposed two plans for this federation. One was for a "Slavonic United States," with a president serving 4-year terms, and the other plan was to form a "Slavonic District of Columbia", an independent capital city. Of course, Kiev was to be given preference. They had then formulated a plan of embracing the empire of Russia and forming 14 states, including Poland, Bohemia, Ukraine, Moravia, Slovakia, Servia, Croatia, Slovenia, Bulgaria, etc.

The Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood (Bratstvo), although bearing the names of two saintly Slav apostles, was breathing such liberal principles that the drafts of its rules and aims, omitted references to religious sects and emphasized guidance by "Christian teaching."

Unfortunately the group dissolved in March 1847, when the czar's police acted on reports of an informer and arrested those it considered most dangerous. However, no conspiracy against the state could be proven.

But Kostomarov and Hulak were anyway sentenced to prison and later exiled. Shevchenko was forced into army and forbidden to write. Others were exiled. Yet the cause of liberation and ideal of SS. Cyril and Methodius never died and it has more adherents now than ever before. It was through the efforts of such movement, that a century ago, the millenium of SS. Cyril and Methodius was observed by some 80 million Slavs.

It is providential that the Holy Father, John XXIII, called the 21st ecumenical council to the Eternal City during the observance of the 11th centennial of the arrival of SS. Cyril and Methodius to Slovakia. All Slavs honor these two brothers as their apostles, even the Slav Protestants. With the representatives of Slav nations in Vatican, during this ecumenical council, even from the satellite countries, we hope and pray that the ideals of those apostles will mark a new era of stopping the persecution of Christian church in Soviet Russia and the satellite countries.

Although the Brotherhood of Cyril and Methodius was dissolved in Russia in 1847 the faith in the people continued to live and lives even under the Communist persecution. In the past century the heritage of SS. Cyril and Methodius has grown in adherents. There were more churches and various institutions built in the past century in honor of SS. Cyril and Methodius than in all 10 centuries put together. This is a vindication of their sacred cause. We Slovaks are most fortunate that during this 21st ecumenical council the building of SS. Cyril and Methodius Institute in Rome will commence and will be dedicated in 1963. Since even the Russian Orthodox Church sent its representatives to Rome for ecumenical council, let us be more encouraged to make even greater sacrifices for this Cyril and Methodian heritage.

## The Political Perils of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 29, 1963*

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Evening Star of Monday, January 28, 1963:

THE POLITICAL PERILS OF FOREIGN AID—KENNEDY'S FALL DRIVE TO DEFEAT JUDD BLAMED FOR GOP COMMITTEE CHOICES

(By William S. White)

Both past and present instances of small bore Democratic partisanship have already brought danger to the only proper conduct of our foreign policy, which is to say its bipartisan conduct. They may bring yet more.

The Republican leaders of the House of Representatives have just repaid President Kennedy's participation in the defeat last fall of the veteran internationalist, Representative Walter Judd, of Minnesota. They have calmly stacked the Republican side of the House Foreign Affairs Committee with five new anti-foreign-aid members.

This comes at a time when the continuation of the foreign aid program, one of the keys to the administration's world approach, is admittedly in hard straits in Congress.

No one on the administration's side can fairly cry "foul" at this action of the GOP. For if ever there was a case of built-in and inevitable tit for tat it was this unhappy instance of Presidential intervention against a first-rate Member of Congress simply because he happened to be in the other party.

Judd in fact risked his political life last fall by staying on in Washington to assist Mr. Kennedy's then current foreign aid bill, while the President was out in Minnesota demanding Judd's head in behalf of the Democratic Party.

It was a singularly clear illustration of the odd unwisdom of President Kennedy's uncharacteristic decision to go all out in a domestic campaign to return a Democratic Congress which just might be more amenable to him on such relatively picayune issues as medicare.

The President has always regarded the cold war as neither a Democratic nor a Republican but simply an all-American undertaking. But for this momentary switch from his usual course he has tried to keep partisan home politics out of his foreign policy.

Whatever moved him, it was a melancholy victory for him. For Judd's absence from the House will cause the President infinitely more trouble on the things that really matter than any possible gain it can bring him on the things that matter a great deal less.

Nor is this the end. While the House Republicans have been moving to retaliate, the ultraliberal Senate Democrats have been maneuvering in a characteristically myopic way to spread the damage, by way of both petty ideological and purely party partisanship.

They have been attempting to bar the Senator Republican leader, Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois, from a seat on the tax-writing Senate Finance Committee. They proceed here on the curious theory that DIRKSEN is likely to be critical of the President's tax bill; ergo, DIRKSEN has no right to be on the committee.

But this touches foreign policy, too, because DIRKSEN until now has been a tower of bipartisan strength to the President on all the top foreign crises in which he has thus far had to be engaged.

The same Democratic ultraliberals are running a muttering campaign against the ascent to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee of the few public men in the country who have been right about Castro Cuba from the start, Senator GEORGE SMATHERS of Florida. Smathers' crime? Why, he does not support the President on every little domestic issue that may come up.

The ultraliberals are highly unlikely to be able to bar either DIRKSEN or SMATHERS from earned committee advancement. The mere fact that they have set off upon these absurd and juvenile vendettas, however, will surely do nothing to promote bipartisan foreign policy unity in a world in upheaval everywhere. The President himself could do worse than to call off these frantic advocates of a total conformism at the cost of what really matters, the proper, or bipartisan, conduct of foreign policy.

## The Honorable John J. Bell

SPEECH
OF
### HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, news of the untimely and sudden passing of our former colleague, the Honorable John J. Bell, of Cuero, Tex., was particularly distressing to me. The day before, I had written to him in response to a request of his, a request not for anything in his own behalf but something to help a constituent of mine who was particularly well known to him.

John, even after he left Congress, continued to be a natural-born public servant and one who was always ready to be of assistance to anyone who needed it.

I was especially close to him because when he was a State senator, a portion of the Ninth Congressional District was also a part of his senatorial responsibility. He worked together on many projects in complete harmony and mutual regard. Our friendly relationship continued after he returned to private practice of law, and I relied on him frequently for advice.

I shall miss him, and I know how much more his loss will be felt by his devoted wife, Mabel Claire. She and all the members of the Bell family have my deepest sympathy.

## High Cost of Keeping Our Powder Dry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 29, 1963*

Mr. HATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "High Cost of Keeping Our Powder Dry," which appeared in the January 22, 1963 issue of the Messenger of Madisonville.

The editorial is as follows:

HIGH COST OF KEEPING OUR POWDER DRY

A fellow has merely to glance at items in the $98.8 billion budget submitted to Congress by the President to see that a lot of the money asked goes for war and preparation for war.

More than half the budget, in fact, as is shown when you tally up the items to find that outlay for the cold war in which our Nation is engaged with the Bolsheviki runs to something like $53 billion a year. This is the U.S. outlay, not that of the other countries of the West, and the $53 billion is the amount spent directly on defense preparations alone, and does not include the carrying charges on other wars in which our country has engaged.

Yet, burdensome though this heavy obligation may be, and however expensive to the American taxpayer, the following thoughts will not down:

The thing which caused Nikita Khrushchev to back down some weeks ago on the Cuba issue, and which caused him to pick up his deadly nuclear hardware and cart it back home was the simple fact that we were better armed for war than Russia, that we had the drop on the Soviet Union, nuclear bomb wise, and that we showed a determination to wage devastating war on the Russians if we were obliged to.

We had kept our powder dry, to use a phrase from the pioneer days, we had mended our stockade, and we were ready

for the worst that the enemy in pioneer days the Indian and in modern days the Bolshevki could send against us.

Our defense preparations paid off, in other words, and won a considerable victory for us without the firing of a single shot. Nikita Khrushchev has changed his tune, and in recognizing that the paper tiger has nuclear teeth, has widened Russia's split with Mao and Red China, willing to see world war on the simple mathematical possibility that enough Chinese would be left to take over whatever of the earth happened to survive.

As for the cost of defense, everybody is aware that it far exceeds all other costs of government. Yet it has been pointed out recently that, burdensome though this heavy obligation may be, the effect probably would be far more serious if by some chance, remote though it be, the necessity for defense spending were removed. By disarmament, for instance.

Prof. Seymour Melman of Columbia University said the other day that it might be time for industry in this country to begin thinking about the possibility and planning how to convert its vast production facilities to nondefense purposes.

Melman and other professors cited our country's heavy reliance on defense spending at a symposium of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. They came up with an estimate that 6 million Americans and 50 million persons in the world are actively engaged in defense activities. Also that more than half of all research and development activities are paid for by the Government, being connected in one way or another with military projects and needs.

Assuming that Russia spends as much as the United States, and adding the expenditures of smaller nations, it is considered likely that $120 billion a year or even more is devoted to warmaking preparations and related activities.

A fellow doesn't have to look any further than Fort Campbell to our south or Fort Knox to our east to see two examples of defense expenditures in the United States, and to guess at the vast cost when you toss in all the larger and smaller forts and plants and ships and aircraft and whatnot.

Professor Melman's remarks were prompted in part by the fact that the United States has submitted to the United Nations a proposal for general disarmament, and that Washington insists that the proposal is meant in earnest and is not a mere gesture.

"What if it were accepted?" the professor asks, adding that the economic dislocation would be severe. Economic dislocation is always severe, come an end to war, and it has happened to us before, but on no such vast scale as would be the case now.

So far as we can see now, the United States might as well be watching migratory wildfowl as offering disarmament to Russia in any hope that the Bolsheviki might agree. Old Khrush hopes capitalism may die without the necessity of killing it by gunfire, but he doesn't hope it strong enough to quit the arms buildup. And this buildup, which we are obliged to top if we are to survive, is what makes it necessary for us to devote a major portion of our resources and energies to defense against the Communist threat.

A threat which was deadly real, a few weeks ago, in little Red Cuba just 90 miles off our shores.

## Proposed Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 29, 1963*

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be general agreement that our high income tax rates should be reduced. In this connection, I should like to submit a letter received by me from Mr. Joseph L. Manning, managing director, the Independent Retail Food Distributors of Maryland, also, a copy of one written by him to President Kennedy. The suggestions made by Mr. Manning are, in my opinion, sound and I commend them to the attention of the Members of the House.

THE INDEPENDENT RETAIL FOOD DISTRIBUTORS OF MARYLAND,
*Baltimore, Md., January 17, 1963.*

Hon. GEORGE H. FALLON,
*U.S. Congressman, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FALLON: Since we so strongly believe that any tax out passed by the Congress should contain provisions to generate full employment and increase sales volume, we have written to the President urging certain studies be made in an effort to accomplish that purpose.

We are aware that time is of the essence, since the tax bill has been submitted to Congress. However, in the committee hearings and discussions we hope the suggestions we have made will be given consideration. If opportunity is afforded, we plan to attend any sessions in Washington we believe will be helpful to the committee studying this matter.

In writing directly to the President, we have no intention of bypassing our duly elected Senators and Members of the House of Representatives. We felt, however, that it was urgent to have our views placed before the President as early as possible. All of our elected Representatives will receive a copy of this letter which is enclosed.

I would appreciate deeply your reaction to this suggestion and ask your advice and help in stimulating and generating this suggested proposal. Won't you please let me hear from you as soon as you possibly can, since I intend to publish this letter in the February edition of the Maryland Grocers' Food Trade magazine, the Skirmisher.

Best wishes for a happy and healthful new year.

Sincerely yours,
JOSEPH L. MANNING,
*Managing Director.*

THE INDEPENDENT RETAIL FOOD DISTRIBUTORS OF MARYLAND,
*Baltimore, Md., January 17, 1963.*

President JOHN F. KENNEDY,
*The White House,*
*Washington, D.C.*

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are sure any income tax cut proposed by the administration will have for one of its purposes the stimulation of our economy in the form of increased employment with resultant increments to general income to Federal, State, and local governments.

If there is any reasonable device which would encourage improvements to dwelling properties where part of the costs of such improvements could be deducted from the individual homeowners income tax, it would put many hundreds of people to work and encourage property improvements, thus reducing the cost of urban renewal programs. Prevention is cheaper than demolition but our present laws offer little or no incentive for improvements.

I am sure you are aware that in most jurisdictions properties which have been well maintained are assessed for more than similar properties in the same block but which have been allowed to fall into disrepair.

A considerable number of plumbers, electricians, carpenters, bricklayers, etc., were employed for a fairly simple neighborhood rehabilitation project such as we conducted here in Baltimore several years ago. In addition, building materials, fixtures, etc., are required for each individual improvement. We cannot help but believe that if some tax incentive were offered, thousands of properties would be improved and in the long run, less money would be required for urban renewal.

We also learned that providing new and modern kitchens, bathrooms, family rooms, etc., creates an incentive to purchase new furniture, rugs, and other items, and to generally refurbish the entire property.

In another field, domestic help could be employed if some relaxation on withholding taxes and a simplified form of reporting were adopted. Part-time help around the home could result in considerable employment if the property owner had less bookkeeping to do. Also, as soon as you tell a part-time gardener, maid, or handyman you will have to withhold certain taxes and pay social security, he or she is not interested in the job.

Perhaps these are oversimplifications. However, we sincerely believe they merit study in any new tax revision.

In our judgment, what is needed is tax revision designed to stimulate business and promote employment, and we believe the items we suggest will generate considerable business activity.

Sincerely yours,
JOSEPH L. MANNING,
*Managing Director.*

## Exemption of Pension Payments by Retired U.S. Government Employees—H.R. 533

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 29, 1963*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 9, 1963, I introduced H.R. 533 to exempt from income tax, annuities, and pensions paid by the United States to its employees.

It has long been believed that most people should retire at 65 years of age. However, every day more and more people eligible for retirement refuse to quit

because they find that their pension will be inadequate to live on. Especially is this true for the Government employee who finds that his small annuity is further reduced by income taxes.

Anyone who retires on a pension or annuity of $3,000, $4,000, or $5,000 will usually be forced to live on an income considerably less than his former income. Steadily rising living costs and the depreciation of the dollar will make life in the late years of life an even more unpleasant prospect. Therefore, the Government should not place further obstacles in the way by taxing the small income of these people during the declining years of their lives when their expenses are especially high. Rather, the Government should encourage its people to retire and take steps to insure financial independence in their old age. Exemption of Government employees' pension payments from the income tax will provide a long step in the right direction.

I do not urge that the Congress should restore to all annuitants the same purchasing power they once had, but it can and should allow them the same tax benefits that it allows others who draw pensions from the Federal Treasury. For example, pensions paid under the Railroad Retirement and Social Security programs are exempt from all Federal income taxes. As an illustration of how this discriminates against the retired Federal Government employee, I call attention to the fact that while a retired railway worker enjoys this tax relief for his pension, the retired railway postal employee who may have worked right beside him enjoys no such relief. This discrimination cannot be justified. Therefore, my proposal is introduced to promote equity where there is need for it.

## George Maurer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 29, 1963*

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, it was with a deep sense of personal loss that I learned of the passing on November 16 of my dear friend, George J. Maurer, from a heart attack.

George was a native of Easton, Pa., who received his education in the parochial school of his hometown and at the George Washington University School of Law here in Washington.

At the time of his passing, he was only 56 years of age, but he had already distinguished himself by his long and outstanding career of service in the legislative branch. His first job was with the Library of Congress from where he was requisitioned as a clerk in the Speaker's Office in 1939. In September 1943 he began his work as a reading clerk of the House and during the long years that have since gone by George won the friendship and admiration of the Members of the House by his unstinting devotion to his work as well as by the efficient way in which he discharged his responsibilities.

We are all going to miss George and the smooth efficiency he displayed in discharging his duties has set a high target for his successor to achieve and emulate.

May I take this occasion to extend to George Maurer's widow and the other members of his family my heartfelt condolences and to assure them that their grief and sorrow is shared by the host of George's good friends here at the Capitol.

## Tariff Loophole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 21, 1963*

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I think, as we opened the new session, the fears that some of us had on our trade policies and where they would lead us are beginning to become realities. The case of stainless steel is one in point. I believe the following news release issued from my office on January 28 tells a story that should have the attention of every Member of Congress. Those of us who believe job protection is essential to the well-being of our Nation will find ourselves ofttimes condemned by those whose interest is subject to question on more than one ground. Those among us who believe that we can have free trade without having foolish trade and the defense of our Nation goes beyond that of military and physical defense, but must, of necessity, in order to guarantee the security of the Nation reach into economic defense. The economy of this Nation is dependent entirely upon the work security of the people. This Nation, which could not live half free and half enslaved, cannot live half working and half loafing. This economy cannot change into a prosperous and growing era unless we reevaluate our job security.

The release follows:

Congressman JOHN H. DENT today introduced legislation calling for an amendment to the Tariff Act to close a loophole which is causing a serious disruption in the domestic production of stainless steel. The attached memorandum covers the contents of the legislation and its purposes.

"This is a very serious matter because of a veto by GATT of the tariff schedules, included in last year's Tariff Classification Act of 1962, which would have closed this loophole, but since the GATT veto in October, this act of Congress has not been put into effect, thereby creating a situation which has become acute," said Dent.

"Because of the discovery of a loophole by the Japanese in the spring of 1960, imports on stainless steel in 1959 totaled $14,000. In 1960, when the loophole was discovered, it jumped to $257,000, and in the first 11 months of 1962, $5,518,000.

"Specifically, stainless steel carries a duty of 14½ cents per pound but, by manipulation of the loophole interpretation, the Japanese—with their cheap labor—polish one side of a sheet of stainless steel and come in under paragraph 309–1001 of the Tariff Act of 1930, and thereby pay a duty of only 1¼ cents a pound on an ad valorem equivalent of less than 3 percent. This subterfuge was not employed by any exporters to the United States, but since the Japanese steel complex has grown to a surplus production unit, they are seeking any and all means to dump their surplus into the United States.

"This is not an attack against free trade as such. This is a move intended to preserve the jobs fast disappearing in the steel industry of the United States," concluded DENT.

The following memorandum is designed to bring to your attention a serious import problem facing U.S. producers of stainless steel and their employees and to urge remedial legislation which would eliminate threat of substantial economic injury to domestic firms.

The legislation we recommend is in the nature of a technical amendment to the Tariff Act of 1930, it would neither conflict with present foreign trade agreements nor interfere with trade expansion goals. It would merely close a disturbing loophole.

TARIFF LOOPHOLES

The appropriate duty rate on stainless steel sheets is at least 14 percent ad valorem. Stainless steel sheets which are polished, however, enter under paragraph 309, 1001, Tariff Act of 1930, at a duty rate of 1¼ cents per pound, a figure which, based on recent import values, may be expressed at 2.9 percent in ad valorem equivalent.[1]

These contrasting duty rates can be outlined as follows:

| | Specific duty per pound (cents) | Ad valorem rate |
|---|---|---|
| A. 1. Plates and sheets, n.s.p.f. (par. 304). | ---------- | 9½ percent. |
| 2. Additional duty based on alloy content of stainless steel (par. 305). | ---------- | 4 percent plus 1 percent additional. |
| 3. Total | 5.94 | 14½ percent. |
| B. Plates and sheets, polished, planished, or glanced (total). | 1.25 | 2.9 percent. |

There is no justification for such a discrepancy in effective duty rate: Stainless steel sheets properly dutiable at 14 percent, are subject to a duty of less than 3 percent simply as a result of the polishing process. Ironically, since polishing necessitates greater labor content and commensurately increases the competitive labor cost advantage of foreign over U.S. stainless steel sheet, the process should militate in favor of a higher rather than a lower import duty.

The history of paragraph 309 of the Tariff Act of 1930 explains its illogical impact. Tariff provision for "sheets and plates of iron or steel, polished, planished, or glanced, by whatever name designated" as found in 309 has existed with only minor changes since 1883. Stainless steel, however, is of comparatively recent commercial importance, not being in production in significant quantities until well after World War I. It is apparent that the provision was intended to apply only to high-tonnage carbon steel. This duty, when applied to substantially higher value stainless steel sheets, however, presents the opportunity for tariff evasion.

[1] The average value of imports of this item is 42 cents per pound.

The apparent discovery of this loophole in 1960 creates the present serious problem.

INCREASE IN IMPORTS

As a result of the discovery of the discrepancy, the importation of stainless steel sheets and plates has increased by more than 1,000 percent since 1960, a rate of increase which far exceeds any precedent. The level of importation itself, even assuming stabilization of the increase rate, threatens serious injury to domestic producers of stainless steel.

The import situation is clearly revealed by the following chart:

| | Imports, schedule A No. 6039700 [1] | |
|---|---|---|
| | Pounds | Value |
| 1955 | 32,755 | $19,102 |
| 1956 | 30,478 | 18,881 |
| 1957 | 32,574 | 31,168 |
| 1958 | 42,952 | 11,020 |
| 1959 | 15,650 | 14,251 |
| 1960 | 736,746 | 257,160 |
| 1961 | 1,872,909 | 814,059 |
| 1962 (11 months) | 14,056,178 | 5,518,943 |

[1] "Sheets or plates of iron or steel, polished, planished or glanced." Over 90 percent of this total is comprised of stainless steel.

Source: Bureau of Census, U.S. Department of Commerce.

Japan is by far the greatest source of these polished steel sheets, accounting for well over 90 percent of the imports during the first 10 months of 1962. Japan's share of imports under paragraph 309 during the month of October 1962 alone was 1,493,018 pounds, a figure which exceeds the all-nation total for the entire period from 1955 through 1960. Foreign competition of this nature threatens immediate injury to the U.S. industry. It is inexcusable that the threat is greatly enlarged by an obvious tariff loophole.

THE ANOMALY HAS BEEN RECOGNIZED BY THE TARIFF COMMISSION

Acting under legislative mandate, the Tariff Commission has recently completed a series of tariff schedules which collate and simplify the U.S. tariff structure. In cognizance of the anomaly, the Commission would correct it by classifying plates and sheets in a single category, thereby eliminating the illogical result in accordance with the standards of the Customs Simplification Act of 1954. Congress authorized the proclamation of the tariff schedules early last year in the Tariff Classification Act of 1962 when the President implements this act, the schedules will have the force of law.

Unfortunately, by reason of the difficulty of conforming the schedules to trade agreements, the proclamation has been delayed. As the matter is dependent upon successful negotiation with principal foreign nations, there is no way in which domestic stainless steel producers can know when this loophole will be closed.

LEGISLATION NECESSARY

Corrective legislation is the only solution which will effectively prevent the continuation of injury. Such legislation would provide for the deletion of the reference to polished, planished or glanced plates or sheets from paragraph 309. No tariff adjustment, or other adjustment assistance relief, may be sought, since polished, planished or glanced sheets have never been the subject of a trade agreement.

There is ample precedent for legislation to correct an inequity of this sort. See Public Law 749, 83d Congress; Public Law 454, 85th Congress. Furthermore, the proposed amendment would not constitute a discriminatory duty against foreign suppliers—the current import duty on polished stainless steel sheets is 15 percent ad valorem in Japan itself.

In conclusion the industry is certain that it was not and is not the intent of Congress to permit an obvious loophole in tariff structure to imperil the continued existence of a viable segment of domestic industry.

## Joseph P. Riley: Dynamic Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 29, 1963*

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this moment to call attention to the selection of an outstanding South Carolinian to head our State chamber of commerce in South Carolina.

He is Joseph P. Riley, of Charleston, a dynamic civic leader and businessman.

Joe, as he is called by his many friends in the low country and the State, is a member of countless civic and community organizations.

Well versed in the ways of business promotion, he is a successful real estate executive and will do well for the Palmetto State in cultivating a warm industrial climate for new industry seeking a favorable site to locate.

In his new post, he will play a vital role in directing an organization which influences the economic welfare of our citizens to an important degree through attracting new payrolls by extolling our assets—industrial and otherwise.

The chief position of our South Carolina Chamber of Commerce is in capable hands. I personally extend to Joe Riley my best wishes for a fruitful tenure of office.

In Charleston's two large newspapers, editorials were carried on January 24 and 25 concerning the high regard people hold for Joe Riley. Under leave to extend my remarks to the Appendix of the RECORD, I hereby insert these editorials for the information of my people and the Members of the Congress:

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier, Jan. 24, 1963]

BUSINESS TEAM

Selection of Joseph P. Riley of Charleston as the new president of the South Carolina Chamber of Commerce brings to State leadership a low countryman already well versed in the ways of business promotion. For years Mr. Riley has been among the leaders in community and civic projects in Charleston. We commend him to the people of South Carolina as a likable and aggressive personality.

Mr. Riley has served as president of the Charleston Chamber of Commerce, as a director of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and in countless other capacities. He is well acquainted with business and political leaders of this region.

With his associates—G. G. Dowling of Beaufort as vice president for the eastern district and James Chapman of Spartanburg for the western district, and W. G. Edwards of Columbia as chairman of the board—Mr. Riley leads a strong team to represent the business interests of the entire State. We know something about all these men and the work they have been doing for the public service. The public would be fortunate to obtain their services at high salaries—and they are donating their time. When we wish them well, we are wishing for everybody.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) Post, Jan. 25, 1963]

RILEY ELECTED BY STATE CHAMBER

To the long list of high civic and business offices to which Joseph P. Riley has been elected is added still another—the presidency of the South Carolina Chamber of Commerce. The Charleston real estate and insurance executive assumed that office this week.

Few people can claim to have given as much time to worthy causes as Joe Riley has given in the last 25 years. To list the organizations he has served would require a column or more of space.

Among the groups he has headed as president are the Charleston Chamber of Commerce, the Charleston Board of Insurance Underwriters, the Charleston Board of Realtors, the Charleston Lions Club, the Hibernian Society, the Charleston United Fund, the St. Francis Hospital Advisory Board and numerous others. He has served on the board of directors of the United States Chamber of Commerce, the Charleston Development Board, the State development board, the Charleston Red Cross, the Coastal Council of the Boy Scouts, etc.

In his new post, Mr. Riley will direct an organization which plays an important role in the orderly development of a favorable climate for the growth of business and industry in South Carolina. The State chamber remains in capable hands and we wish for Mr. Riley a fruitful tenure of office.

## Part 3: Let's Keep the Record Straight — A Selected Chronology of Cuba and Castro, September 21, 1961-February 20, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 29, 1963*

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, in the third part of my chronology of events on Cuba and Castro—we find outlined the growing realization of Latin American countries that Cuba is indeed Communist-controlled, and Castro's admission publicly that he is a Marxist-Leninist "and will be one until the day I die."

Fifteen Latin American countries and the United States have severed diplomatic relations with Cuba. The Organization of American States held a Foreign Ministers' conference on January 31, 1962, and voted—14 to 1, with 6 abstentions—to exclude Cuba from participation in the inter-American system. Later this conference action was to culminate, on February 14, 1962, in Cuba being formally excluded from the Organization of American States.

We find that $12 million a year in U.S. exports are being sent to Cuba, via Mexico, and that 18 American firms and individuals later are penalized by the U.S.

Commerce Department for their part in ignoring the U.S. embargo.

We find on February 3, 1962, that President Kennedy has decided it is necessary to proclaim an embargo on almost all U.S. trade with Cuba, with the exception "on humanitarian grounds" of exporting certain foods and medicines—thus continuing the embargo which President Eisenhower had originally proclaimed and which then-Candidate Kennedy had criticized as being a gesture which was almost meaningless.

It is good to review history—and with the continuing threat of a Communist Cuba only 90 miles from our shores—it is good to learn from history. Our 20th President, James A. Garfield said:

History is philosophy teaching by example, and also by warning; its two eyes are geography and chronology. History is but the unrolled scroll of prophecy.

The article follows:

A SELECTED CHRONOLOGY ON CUBA, SEPTEMBER 21, 1961–FEBRUARY 20, 1962,[1] BY THE LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE, THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

September 21, 1961: President Osvaldo Dorticos leaves Moscow for Peking, after a 10-day visit to the Soviet Union. In a speech at the Kremlin on September 20, Dorticos expresses the solidarity of Cuba with the Soviet Union on all foreign policy issues, and says that Cuban industrial development is based on Soviet credits. "In Havana, Premier Fidel Castro announced that Socialist countries have guaranteed to buy 4,500,000 tons of Cuba's sugar for each of the next 5 years. The message was conveyed to Cuba's Premier by President Dorticos now visiting in Moscow. It means Cuba will be able to sell her total crop of some 6,500,000 tons of sugar for the next 5 years, a gratifying assurance to the Castro government which is having its economic difficulties."

September 22, 1961: President Dorticos is greeted on his arrival in Peking by Communist Chinese head of state, Liu Shao-chi, who praises Cuba as "standing in the forefront of the struggle against U.S. imperialism, which is the common enemy of the peoples of both our countries."

September 25, 1961: Dorticos (addressing a mass rally in Peking) declares that the Nationalist occupation of Taiwan "reminds us of the shameful occupation of a part of our territory in the Guantanamo Base. Cuba and China will recover these territories through a resolute and tenacious prolonged struggle; the imperialists will have to give up these territories." Five men are executed and 64 are imprisoned for terms ranging up to 30 years for alleged anti-Castro activities. "Firing squads already have executed 20 persons this month, 111 this year, and 944 since Castro came into power in January 1959."

October 9, 1961: Cuban Government (in a "white book" presented to heads of 31 foreign missions in Havana) accuses the United States of training anti-Castro invasion forces at 20 U.S. bases and 9 camps in the Caribbean (in Puerto Rico, Guatemala, Nicaragua, the Panama Canal Zone, and at Guantanamo).

October 10, 1961: U.S. State Department declares that Cuban accusations that the United States is training new invasion forces "are not only totally unfounded but are ridiculous." On the same day, Foreign Minister Raul Roa (in the U.N. General Assembly) accuses the United States of planning a new attack against Cuba which he described as the scene of "the building of a Socialist society 90 miles from a stubborn empire determined to repress the inexorable flow of history." He says that Cuba would welcome "the amicable mediation of a number of American governments to explore the possibilities of worthy and honest negotiations with the Government of the United States."—"Although he implied that these efforts had failed, Latin American sources said that this was Cuba's first public acceptance of the idea of mediation."

October 17, 1961: Council of the Organization of American States (meeting in Washington) votes 20 to 1 (Cuba) to study a Peruvian request for a meeting of American Foreign Ministers to consider taking collective action against Cuba. Peru claims that such action is both justified and necessary to protect the Western Hemisphere from Communist subversion. The Cuban Ambassador to the OAS accuses Peru of acting on orders from the United States.

October 18, 1961: U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk (in a press conference) praises the Peruvian Ambassador to the OAS for having "eloquently described the causes for hemisphere-wide concern with development in Cuba since the Castro government transformed that country into an accomplice of the Sino-Soviet bloc." Rusk adds: "The world will be watching the OAS approach to the Cuban problem. The central question here, as it is in other parts of the world, is: Can people who are devoted to a world of free choice, opposed to a world of coercion, keep Communist intervention from undermining and destroying independent nations?"

October 25, 1961: OAS Council votes to delay action on the Peruvian proposal by referring it to a committee for further study: "It is known that the United States was not in favor of bringing the issue before the OAS just yet, because it has not been able to persuade a majority of the Latin American nations to support any moves against Cuba. * * * Some of the larger and more influential South American countries, notably Argentina and Brazil, are firmly against such OAS action." (Times, London, October 26, 1961): "Brazil and Ecuador led a movement to kill the proposal outright. The smaller Central American nations and the United States sought a compromise formula that would keep it alive. Opposition from the big nations, especially Argentina, Chile, and Mexico, made it impossible to expect outright approval by the council."

November 8, 1961: President Kennedy (at a press conference in Washington) declares that U.S. exports to Cuba now amount to about $12 million a year.

November 9, 1961: Colombia asks the Organization of American States to convene an Inter-American Foreign Ministers' conference on January 10, 1962, to consider measures for the defense of the Western Hemisphere against any threat posed by the intervention of extracontinental powers. Although the request did not mention Cuba, the Colombian proposal is specifically designed to counter what is regarded, in effect, as the Habana alliance between Premier Fidel Castro's regime and the Communist bloc as well as the subversive activities of Cuban agents in most Latin American countries.

November 11, 1961: Venezuela severs diplomatic relations with Cuba.

November 21, 1961: Cuba requests urgent meetings of the U.N. Security Council and the OAS Council to consider her charge of U.S. military intervention in the Dominican Republic.

November 22, 1961: OAS Council meets (in Washington) to hear Cuban charges refuted by the U.S. delegate as a new low of irrelevance, hypocrisy, and slander, and adjourns without taking action.

November 28, 1961: U.N. Security Council ends its debate on Cuban charges of U.S. aggression against the Dominican Republic without taking any action. In the three-day debate, Cuba had asked the Council to brand the United States as an aggressor and to demand the recall of American ships from the Dominican coast. She was supported only by the Soviet Union, but Soviet support did not extend to submitting a resolution in the matters.

November 29, 1961: President Kennedy (at a press conference) declares that the United States would be most concerned if the Castro regime in Cuba attempted to overthrow the existing government in the Dominican Republic or in any other Latin American State.

December 2, 1961; Premier Castro (in a 5-hour television speech) declares: "I am a Marxist-Leninist, and will be one until the day I die." He says "the world is on the road to communism," and he is taking Cuba along that path. He also says: "We must study all the experience in the building up of the world's first Communist society [the Soviet Union]." He rejects neutralism, saying: "There is no half way between socialism and imperialism. Anyone maintaining a third [neutralist] position is, in fact, helping imperialism." Like Soviet Premier Khrushchev, he denounces the cult of personality, and says: "It would be absurd for a single man to make government decisions. * * * I firmly believe in collective leadership. * * * I never have wanted to be a Caesar." He announces that he is forming a "United Party of the Cuban Socialist Revolution," as a single, monolithic party which will lead Cuba to "a people's democracy or the dictatorship of the proletariat."

December 4, 1961: OAS Council adopts the Colombian proposal by a vote of 14 to 2 (Cuba and Mexico), with 5 abstentions (Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, and Ecuador).

December 9, 1961: Colombia severs diplomatic relations with Cuba, a few hours after Premier Castro denounced Colombia and Panama as "accomplices of imperialism." Colombia is the 12th nation of the Americas to sever relations with Cuba. The others are the United States, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Peru, and Venezuela.

December 14, 19611: Panama announces that it has severed diplomatic relations with Cuba, and that the break is to be considered effective as of December 8 when Premier Castro made insulting remarks about Panama.

December 18, 1961: Cuba (in a letter to the Organization of American States) rejects a request of the Inter-American Peace Commission that it be allowed to visit Cuba to investigate Peruvian charges of Communist subversion against other American republics and claims that the Castro government is violating human rights. The Cuban note refers to "the servile, corrupt, despotic" Government of Peru, and the "abject submission and repugnant immorality of the Inter-American Peace Commission." (The Commission is an autonomous body of the OAS, whose members are from the United States, Colombia, El Salvador, Uruguay, and Venezuela.)

December 20, 1961: U.S. Commerce Department announces it has taken action penalizing 18 firms and individuals for illegal shipments of aircraft, automotive and other equipment to Cuba via Mexico. A Department statement says: "There has been great effort on the part of the Castro regime to attempt to obtain U.S. parts and equipment in the face of the U.S. embargo."

December 22, 1961: OAS Council (meeting in Washington) agrees to hold the Foreign Ministers' Conference, convoked at Colom-

[1] Sept. 21, 1961–Sept. 20, 1962, excerpted from Deadline Data; reproduced with the permission of Deadline Data on World Affairs. September 1962–October 1962 from New York Times.

bia's request, at Punta del Este, Uruguay, on January 22 (originally scheduled for January 10). "The 19-to-0 vote [Cuba abstained; Mexico, which opposed the conference, was absent] did not reflect the sharp division that has persisted among the 21 member nations of the Organization of American States on the desirability of considering collective action on the Cuban problem. The question today was limited to the date and place of the ministerial conference."

January 2, 1962: Premier Castro (at a mass rally in Havana to celebrate the 3d anniversary of the overthrow of the Batista regime) declares: "We reiterate that we are Marxist-Leninists and we do not repent it." He attacks the OAS Foreign Ministers' meeting (to be held in Punta del Este on Jan. 22), and warns "governments of America sold to [United States] imperialism who are willing to attack a brother people" against any military adventure. He says that if any new invasion force attacks Cuba, "we will exterminate [them] to the last man." "The Premier backed his statement with a display of military might supplied by his Communist allies. Soviet-built MIG fighter jets, multirocket launching units and twin antiaircraft guns were shown during a 90-minute military parade."

January 3, 1962: Expert on cannon law, Msgr. Dino Staffa of the Vatican Secretariat of State, declares to the press that Premier Fidel Castro and certain officials of his regime have fallen under automatic excommunication because they are responsible for "impeding and imprisoning" Roman Catholic bishops. He says the excommunication has been incurred without formal announcement.

On the same day, the U.S. State Department makes public a document entitled "The Castro Regime in Cuba," which was submitted by the United States on December 6 to the Inter-American Peace Committee (an organ of the OAS). The document says that "as a bridgehead of Sino-Soviet imperialism within the inner defenses of the Western Hemisphere, Cuba under the Castro regime represents a serious threat to the collective security of the American republics."

January 4, 1962: Government announces the execution of an anti-Castro guerilla leader, Margarito Lanza, convicted of killing three militiamen. "It was the first execution to be announced in 1962. Firing squads killed at least 136 Cubans in 1961 and an estimated 968 since Fidel Castro assumed power 3 years ago."

January 10, 1962: Soviet news agency Tass announces that the Soviet Union and Cuba have signed a trade protocol for 1962, which provides for "a considerable increase" of trade between the two countries. Under the agreement Cuba will export sugar, alcohol, rum, tobacco, canned fruit, nickel ore, and other products to the Soviet Union. The latter will export to Cuba oil and petroleum products, ferrous and nonferrous metals, chemicals, fertilizers, sawn timber, cellulose, paper, cotton, wheat, flour, animal fats and vegetable oils, various plants and equipment, instruments, and other commodities. The Associated Press quotes Cuban Foreign Ministry sources as having said that the Cuban-Soviet protocol provides for trade worth $700 million between the two countries, a rise of $150 million over 1961.

January 18, 1962: Inter-American Peace Committee publishes a report (approved unanimously by the five members of the committee—Colombia, El Salvador, Uruguay, Venezuela, and the United States), which denounces Cuba's ties with communism, subversion, and violations of human rights. The report declares: "Such acts represent attacks upon inter-American peace and security as well as on the sovereignty and political independence of the American States, and therefore [constitute] a serious violation of fundamental principles of the inter-American system."

January 22, 1962: Conference of Foreign Ministers of the 21 American Republics meets in Punta del Este, Uruguay, to consider collective action against Cuba.

January 31, 1962: OAS Foreign Ministers Conference votes by a two-thirds majority—14 to 1 (Cuba), with 6 abstentions (Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, and Mexico), to exclude Cuba from participation in the inter-American system. President Osvaldo Dorticos of Cuba declares that the exclusion of Cuba from the OAS will convert the organization into a "political-military bloc at the service of the United States." He says: "You may expel us but you cannot extract us from America. You may put us out of the OAS, but the United States will continue to have a revolutionary Cuba 90 miles from its shores." On the same day (Jan. 31), President Kennedy declares (at a press conference in Washington) that he is satisfied with the outcome of the Punta del Este Conference. He says: "It is the first time the independent American States have declared with one voice that the concept of Marxism-Leninism is incompatible with the inter-American system."

February 3, 1962: President Kennedy proclaims an embargo on almost all United States trade with Cuba, with the exception—"on humanitarian grounds"—of the export to Cuba of certain foods and medicines. The embargo (which goes into effect Feb. 7) will stop U.S. imports from Cuba of tobacco, industrial molasses, and vegetables—thereby depriving Cuba of an annual income of about $35 million—"Through sales of sugar, tobacco and some other food products, the Cubans are thought to have earned about $100 million in the free world last year. The U.S. action thus is expected to reduce Cuban dollar income by about one-third." (New York Times, Feb. 4, 1962): "The embargo * * * is frankly described * * * in the serious Eastern press [of the United States] as a unilateral act meant to compensate in part for the failure of the OAS to act as a punitive body."

February 4, 1962: Premier Castro denounces (at a mass rally in Havana) the U.S. trade embargo as "another economic aggression." In answer to the exclusion of Cuba from the OAS, voted by the American Foreign Ministers at Punta del Este, Castro issues a "Second Declaration of Havana" which states that the Punta del Este conference has shown the OAS "in its true light [as] nothing more nor less than the U.S. Ministry of Colonies."

February 7, 1962: Brazilian Foreign Minister Francisco San Tiago Dantas (in a report to the Brazilian Chamber of Deputies on the Punta del Este Conference) defends Brazil's abstention in the vote excluding Cuba from the OAS. He says that the American Republics should negotiate with Cuba rather than isolating her. He declares: "It is not true that Cuba is lost as a nation for coexistence with the other countries of the hemisphere." He denies that the U.S. delegation tried to use economic pressure on the six countries (Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, Mexico) which abstained in the vote on Cuba.

February 8, 1962: Argentina severs diplomatic relations with Cuba.

February 11, 1962: Cuban Revolutionary Council, headed by Jose Miro Cardona, announces (in Miami, Fla.) the formation of a hemispherewide anti-Communist, anti-Castro alliance. The announcement lists among the adherents Pres. Romulo Betancourt of Venezuela, former Pres. Jose Figueres of Costa Rica, Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín of Puerto Rico, former Pres. Luis Batlle Berres of Uruguay, Gov. Carlos Lacerda of the state of Rio de Janeiro in Brazil, Victor Raul Haya de la Torre and Eudocio Ravines, leftist leaders in Peru, and many others. The primary object of the body is described by Cardona as inter-American action against the Castro regime and internationalization of the struggle of Cuban exiles to free their country from communism.

February 14, 1962: Cuba is formally excluded from the Organization of American States by the OAS Council—thereby carrying out the resolution voted by the Conference of Foreign Ministers at Punta del Este.

February 15, 1962: U.N. General Assembly's Political Committee rejects a Czechoslovak-Rumanian resolution calling on the United States to cease "interference in the internal affairs of Cuba." (All Latin American countries—except Cuba—vote against this resolution.)

February 20, 1962: United States asks its NATO allies to prohibit voluntarily trade in strategic materials with Cuba and to reduce in general their trade with that country. The request is submitted to the Permanent Council of NATO in Paris.

## Swede Nelson and the Carens Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, January 29, 1963*

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein an excellent article by the able, distinguished writer of the Boston Traveler, Tim Horgan, concerning my dear friend, the incomparable N. V. (Swede) Nelson, recent recipient of the Carens Award at Boston.

This award, given annually to the person who, in the opinion of the committee, has done most for football in New England for the year, is a very great honor, and its presention to Swede Nelson this year has met with overwhelming public acclaim and approval.

Swede Nelson has distinguished himself in many ways—great football star in his college days at Harvard, well-known coach and football expert, successful businessman, resolute advocate of highest standards of sportsmanship, many-sided humanitarian and an inspiring human being.

Devoted in his many activities for worthwhile, charitable causes, diligent, effective worker for the underprivileged, the handicapped, and the helpless, Swede Nelson throughout the years has furnished a striking example of noble achievement and unselfish service.

A widely known wit and accomplished after-dinner speaker, he has given most generously of his time, efforts, and amazing talents to innumerable fine causes in Boston, New England, and throughout the Nation. He is loved, admired, and respected by all who know him and by a host of people of every rank and station throughout the country.

Certainly no one has ever received this valued award, given in the honor

of the late, very distinguished George Carens, famous Boston newspaperman and sports authority, who more truly and wholeheartedly exemplifies the highest aims and traditions of American football and dedicated citizenship than Swede Nelson.

I congratulate my beloved friend, Swede, and his lovely family upon this great honor, and wish for him and for them continued success and true happiness for many years to come.

The article follows:

SWEDE GIVES ENTIRE LIFE TO FOOTBALL

(By Tim Horgan)

Nils V. Nelson visited his barber the other day, and in the course of his once-over-lightly, the barber wondered about Swede's age.

"I'm 43," Swede reported.

"On one side," the barber scoffed.

"You cut the hair," Swede told him, "and I'll tell the jokes."

That's the way is should be, of course, because nobody tells a joke quite as well as this loyal son of Harvard, 1918. Very few have told so many, also. This is partly because it all began back in 1914, when no less than the late A. Lawrence Lowell advised the toastmaster at the Harvard freshman football banquet: "You were terrible, but you can be very good if you stick at it."

Since this came from the president of his beloved Harvard, Swede went out and set a world record for tenacity.

He had made approximately 150 talks per year after year since, although his arthritis and those 43 years of age have cut him to 40 or 50 recently. If there are people in New England who haven't heard Swede speak, they haven't been in New England more than an hour.

"Out in the open spaces," he begins launching his favorite gag of all time in that rollicking voice, "out West, they do a lot of proselyting. That's a Harvard word, I can't spell it. I can't even pronounce it, but it sounds good."

It sounds better every time he tells it, and nobody enjoys it more than Swede himself. "I speak," he says, "because I love it." That's part of the reason.

Swede is one of those men everybody knows but very few know much about. One of the least known aspects of this incomparable buffoon is that behind the raucous guffaw and the wagging cigar is a superb and dedicated man.

This was discovered when the football writers, in a startling turn of events, gave Swede an award yesterday. The man who has given so many awards, they finally named one after him, got the George C. Carens Memorial Trophy. Its for the person who has done the most for New England college football over the years, and the choice was perfact, if not evitable.

Nobody has done more for New England college football, in his own inimitable way, than Swede. This is even apart from his work on the Bulger Lowe Committee, for the Gridiron Club, or as a former Harvard coach. It's also not only because he has entertained more football groups than the shotgun formation.

What Swede does is live, breathe and, mostly, talk football with a purpose. He's a man with a message, a message to the effect that people are good, life is wonderful, and football is the best part of both.

He carries the message wherever he goes, because it's as much a part of him as his wit. In fact, it's why he goes to so many places, particularly where there are teenagers.

In the past 2 weeks, he has spoken at Somerville and Beverly High Schools, the Shirley Industrial School and the Dedham County Jail or maybe he's kidding. He goes to the teenagers and he says: "I understand you kids because I spent the best 9 years of my life in high school."

The kids love him for it and are thus available for the message, which Swede slips in between jokes, in epigrammatic form. Some of his favorites:

"The greatest thing in life is enthusiasm. The finest things of life are born out of it. Everything in life is dull and drab without it."

"Never hate in the plural. Dislike individuals if you want, but don't indict a whole race or a nation because of an individual."

"Truth is the best defense of all. It's better than a nine-man line."

His goodness, as much as his humor, makes Swede an extraordinarily popular man, which is why he shouldn't have been so genuinely surprised to get the Carens Award. After all, Swede admits: "Everywhere I go somebody is opening a door for me or holding my coat or giving me two scoops of ice cream."

---

## Columnist Appraises the First 2 Years of the Kennedy Administration

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, January 29, 1963*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Members to an editorial by David Lawrence in U.S. News & World Report, January 28, 1963. Mr. Lawrence makes a keen appraisal of the President's first 2 years in office and his analysis is a serious indictment of the failures of this administration. My purpose in including it as a part of these remarks is not to make of it a partisan issue, but in the hope that President Kennedy made be made to realize before it is too late that his policies of playing politics at all costs may prove disastrous for this Nation.

Under unanimous consent I insert the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD.

AFTER 2 YEARS

(By David Lawrence)

There are two ways to appraise an administration at a given time, either in terms of political popularity or by a realistic evaluation of the actual progress that has been made in the Nation's economy.

If an election were held today, President Kennedy would win a second term. This would be due not to his own efforts on television, radio, and in the press to present an image of successful leadership, but largely to the failure of the Republican Party, both inside and outside of Congress, to tell the American people the other side of the story.

The record of the Republicans as an opposition party in the last 2 years is the poorest in a half century of American politics. The Republicans have ignored the lessons of the past and feel they must fashion their strategy to fit Democratic Party concepts. They argue among themselves about "liberalism" and "conservatism," or about "old Republicanism" and "new Republicanism," while they should be uniting to tell the country of the scandals that are emerging under the Kennedy administration. For rarely in history have governmental powers been so brazenly used to build a national political machine.

The administration has kept the peace. After waiting until Soviet missiles were actually assembled and emplaced in Cuba, President Kennedy finally acted with a show of firmness. Even though his action was belated, and there is still considerable doubt as to whether the danger has been removed, the fact remains that on balance today the electorate would on this specific issue vote to sustain the President.

But does the country know the facts? Why hasn't the truth about the illfated invasion of Cuba in April 1961 been disclosed? Is it conceivable that our military chiefs did not protest an invasion plan that failed to provide adequate air cover of some kind? If they did recommend it, did the President disregard their advice? Didn't this debacle give the Soviets their opportunity to threaten us and bring on our worst war scare in recent history?

Premier Khrushchev concedes that the United States now has at least 40,000 nuclear bombs and warheads and that war is unthinkable. So the average man feels more secure for the time being.

If, to be sure, the Republicans hadn't been asleep at the switch, they would have been pointing out that the military strentgh of this country could not have been built up to its present superiority in just 2 years.

The charge that the Eisenhower administration permitted a "missile gap," for instance, is no longer heard in debate. It remains nevertheless as one of the biggest falsehoods ever perpetrated in American politics.

The Republicans can hardly rely on the present administration to give credit for what was really achieved militarily and on the diplomatic front in the preceding 8 years.

Measured in the perspective of history, the administration has failed to come to grips with the fundamental problems of our economic life. Most important is the inability either to balance the budget or to cure the unemployment problem. The President's recent messages call for budget deficits which will run until 1967. The administration intends to stand in 1964 on a platform of deficit spending which, without a curtailment of spending on nondefense items, must result in gradually cutting down the purchasing power of the dollar.

The economy at present is bogged down by labor troubles. The longshoremen's strike, which has obstructed the Nation's shipping, and the newspaper strikes in New York City and Cleveland do not augur well for the future. Such situations are not conducive to business planning despite the stimulants to private spending being offered through tax cuts.

For the President has been patently unwilling to deal with the growing monopoly power of labor unions. The administration has not hesitated to harass and slander American businessmen, but it has cravenly refused to use its inherent powers to quell the conspiracies that restrain commerce and provoke costly strikes.

From the standpoint of political morality, the huge campaign funds collected by labor unions from their members present a glaring example of an unholy alliance between the administration and a large group that enjoys a special privilege in America today. The country has been told little about this, and the Republican Party has not fought hard enough for an investigation by Congress to expose the truth.

To curry favor with political groups, President Kennedy, by his Executive orders on a variety of subjects, has ignored the law of the land. Yet the Republicans have failed to emphasize this usurpation of governmental power.

All in all, the country needs a purging of political immoralities. It needs an opposition party with the courage to present the facts to the American people consistently and persistently. For when the people are given both sides, they usually recognize truth.

## National Geographic Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, January 29, 1963*

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, 75 years ago last Sunday a small group of scientists gathered here in Washington at the Cosmos Club, January 27, 1888, and their deliberations resulted in the founding of the National Geographic Society, respected and well known throughout the world for its fine publication of the literate and informative journal, the National Geographic.

Under leave to extent my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith a history of the National Geographic Society that appeared in the Washington Sunday Post, January 27:

THE NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC IS 75 TODAY

(By Sterling Seagrave)

Today is the 75th anniversary of the National Geographic Society.

Founded by a small group of scientists at the Cosmos Club in 1888 to promote "the increase and diffusion of geographical knowledge," the Society's thin, arid journal has blossomed into one of the most highly respected publications in the world, famous for its lavish color illustrations, a household furnishing adored by adults and children.

Its 3,500,000 readers loyally renew their subscriptions in advance each year. For their small annual fee, they become members of the society, participate by proxy in countless expeditions, and enjoy seven 10-color map supplements a year.

Washington members attend regular illustrated lectures at Constitution Hall from famous explorers, scientists, and off-the-beaten-path travelers.

The society has built an immense reserve fund of many millions and helps sponsor research programs, expeditions, and photographic junkets. "Junior Geographics" are sent to schools each week as part of a subsidiary educational program that helps maintain the society as a tax-exempt, nonprofit institution.

Its 1,500 staff members work in quietly elegant surroundings gorged with trophies and artifacts collected all over the world, slowly and painstakingly crafting each month's issue.

In autumn of this year, the society will move into a new building designed by Edward Durell Stone at 17th and M Streets NW., a $10 million structure with thin fluted ribs, individual offices, and an expansive Explorers Hall filled with displays and exhibits.

Behind the success is Gilbert Grosvenor, the first editor of the magazine. Now in his eighties and retired to his estate in Coconut Grove, near Miami, Grosvenor built the society and magazine with a keen eye at public relations and less attention to the restrictive definition of "geography."

Grosvenor is probably the only man ever to have his name given to four babies, a fish, a seashell, a lake, and a plant.

He is a modest man, once described as having the "sprightly air of an inquiring grasshopper," and he usually cannot remember all the things named after him. However, when the Interior Department in 1925 decided to change the name of Grosvenor Lake because it did not seem right to name topographical features after living persons, Grosvenor contacted President Coolidge who was two classes ahead of him at Amherst. The President chided the Interior Department for even thinking of such a thing.

Although Grosvenor retired in 1954 to become chairman of the board of trustees, his influence, character, and personality still pervade the society and its offices. That influence has made the society condemned or complimented diversely as a brown study, an aristocratic fief, a stuffy and protectively dignified private club, or one of the last strongholds of all the good things that went with 19th century manhood, a mood of great adventure, bearded men with weathered faces, tweed and privacy.

For years, no staff member dared smoke in the building. One always wore a coat in the hallways and never went out without a hat.

Men and women staff members ate in separate cafeterias, and do so to this day, to permit "blue" conversation among the men without offending the women. Senior staff men dined sedately in a separate room.

Viewed as a benevolent monarchy, the National Geographic Society has a remarkable genealogy.

At its founding in 1888, Boston philanthropist Gardiner Greene Hubbard became first president. Hubbard had financed Alexander Graham Bell's experiments with the telephone. Bell married one of Hubbard's daughters and became second president.

By 1899 the National Geographic magazine was several thousand dollars in debt and had only 200 readers. It was cryptic reading for anyone outside the scientific community and not exactly inspiring to those inside the community who submitted its cold, learned papers.

Bell brought in Gilbert Grosvenor, a lad fresh from Amherst, and explained that he wanted to make the magazine a success by popularizing the science of geography and taking it into the homes of the people.

In half of a tiny office, Grosvenor took on the job of transforming bleak geographic facts expressed in hieroglyphic terms into a vehicle for carrying the human interest truth about this world of ours into homes everywhere.

The next year he married Bell's daughter, Elsie May. She later designed the Society's flag of brown, green, and blue, for earth, sea, and sky.

For 5 years Bell paid Grosvenor $100 a month. Grosvenor did everything himself, including hand-addressing magazine wrappers. His first purchase as the new editor was a $20 addressing machine.

Grosvenor was convinced that the magazine should use pictures to draw readers into the little-known corners of geography. A fluke gave him the opportunity—and simultaneously started the magazine on its way to setting many firsts in photography.

"I came into the office one December morning in 1904 deeply discouraged," Grosvenor said. "The printer was urgently demanding copy for 11 pages for the January issue. I simply had no manuscript available."

A bulky envelope lay on his desk. He opened it listlessly and out fell 50 striking photographs of Lhasa, Tibet, taken by a Russian explorer. Grosvenor took a chance on offending the handful of members and filled the 11 pages with the pictures.

During the following decades, the magazine printed the first natural color photos taken from the air, underground, and beneath the sea. The society helped finance Peary's expedition to the North Pole, Amundsen's to the South Pole, Byrd's flights over both, and many other explorations into the darkest recesses of the earth. Each expedition brought fame and the gratitude of the explorers, not to mention their photographs and personal accounts for the magazine.

As the age of exploration became a page of history, so it became many colorful pages in National Geographic.

The magazine described everything from the first exploration of Carlsbad Caverns to the discovery of Machu Picchu, unearthing giant carved stone heads in Mexico, tribal customs in Borneo and New York City, fossils in Africa, mountains in Alaska and the Himalayas and the Alps, volcanoes hither and yon, bird life in New Zealand, ruins in Italy, unclad maidens in Africa and the Amazon, bird life in the Caribbean, coral reefs off Australia, bird life in Canada, balloon flights into the stratosphere, lizards in New Guinea, fishes in the Pacific, and bird life in Grosvenor's backyard in Maryland.

In the last 10 years alone, circulation (i.e., membership) rose by over 1 million.

A distinct style has evolved with Grosvenor's determination to make the science of geography both popular and intelligible. Known within the profession as the "Dear Aunt Sally," the style strives to give a refreshing first person account of faraway places with strange sounding names, exciting and sometimes frightening sights.

It is an effective style, and equally great pains are taken to select vivid photographs.

There is no reckless rush at the magazine, where care and precision are all important.

A crack newspaperman was hired once and his first assignment was to write captions for several pictures for the magazine.

Accustomed to the adrenal pressure and precipitous pace of a newspaper city room, the ex-reporter hammered out the captions adroitly and had them back in his new editor's office in 15 minutes.

"Good grief," said the dismayed editor, "you have 2 weeks to do those. Take them back and stew over them for a while."

The society's photographic staff is equally diligent and no man has yet been lost on an expedition, although several have plunged into the drink, equipment and all.

Volkmar Wentzel shot thousands of pictures during a month in Southwest Africa's skeleton coast diamond mines. He was about to clear customs on his way home when a diamond-conscious customs official decided to X-ray all his baggage for smuggled gems. Before Wentzel could stop him, the official had X-rayed out all of Wentzel's film.

The society's membership extends around the world, including King Paul and Queen Frederika of Greece.

A number of Presidents have written for the magazine, including President Taft and President Theodore Roosevelt. President Franklin D. Roosevelt had a National Geographic mapcase he liked so much he asked the society to make another as a gift for Winston Churchill. There is a similar mapcase in President Kennedy's office.

The present board of trustees, elected for life, includes Gilbert Grosvenor, chairman; Thomas W. McKnew, vice chairman; Robert B. Anderson, former Secretary of the Treasury; Lyman J. Briggs, director emeritus of the National Bureau of Standards; Leonard Carmichael, secretary of the Smithsonian Institution; Rear Adm. L. O. Colbert, U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey (retired); Hugh L. Dryden, Deputy Administrator of NASA; and T. Dale Stewart, of the Museum of Natural History.

When Grosvenor retired, his longtime right-hand man John Oliver LaGorce succeeded him as president and editor. LaGorce, who had a few mountains named after him, retired in 1957 and died in 1959.

Melville Bell Grosvenor became president and editor, continuing the dynasty established by his father, grandfather, nad great-grandfather.

An intense, nervous man deeply involved with his work, he has brought outward changes to the staff, which is younger, and added color pictures to the sacred yellow-bordered cover of the magazine.

While still conscious of the dignity, ethics, and discretion traditional to the society, the younger generation smokes, including the women; shirtsleeves appear in the halls, and that last stronghold of masculine privacy, the dining rooms, will be combined in the new building.

The birds have given way to missiles and satellites in the National Geographic's pages, fishes have been made obsolescent by nuclear submarines, and soon even the famous sections on native girls in more or less native costumes may give way to articles on the denizens of distant planets.

Melvin M. Payne, executive vice president and secretary, a man with a word gift who directs the society's worldwide research and exploration, thumbnailed just a few of the current projects.

They include the American team setting out to conquer Mount Everest; archeological undersea digging off Turkey on a sunken Byzantine ship; anthropological research at Olduvai Gorge, Tanganyika, where fossil beds are giving up clues to the ever-missing link; a photographic study of the brighter planets by astronomers at Flagstaff's Lowell Observatory.

## Consumer Reports Calls for Safe Cosmetics Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the February issue of the magazine, Consumer Reports, published by Consumers Union, contains a very worthwhile discussion on the need for tighter laws to protect the public in the purchase and use of cosmetics. This is an objective which I have been pursuing ever since coming to Congress in 1953. I have introduced safe cosmetics bills in every Congress since then, and I am delighted that this magazine which is held in such high esteem by so many consumers has also been championing the same cause over the years.

The article, which I am placing in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of my remarks, is entitled "Cosmetics Versus the Consumer," and is based on an address given by CU's medical adviser, Dr. Harold Aaron, as part of a symposium of the American Medical Association's Committee on Cosmetics at the annual meeting of the American Academy of Dermatology in Chicago last December.

There is one oversight or inaccuracy in the article which I feel I should mention, in placing it in the RECORD. After discussing gaps in the law which often prevent the Food and Drug Administration from moving effectively against an unsafe cosmetic item until a great deal of harm has already been done to consumers, the article states:

When injuries do occur, especially allergic reactions, the problem is compounded for the victim and his doctor by the lack of a requirement that ingredients be revealed. The law proposed to the last Congress did not take cognizance of this problem. CU believes that cosmetics makers, like food processors and drug manufacturers, should be required to list ingredients on their labels.

H.R. 1235 CONTAINED REQUIREMENTS FOR IDENTIFICATION OF INGREDIENTS OF COSMETICS

Mr. Speaker, the omnibus bill which I introduced on January 3, 1961, to rewrite the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act of 1938 and to require, among many other things, the pretesting for safety of all cosmetics, contained exactly the sort of cosmetic ingredient identification requirement Consumer Reports mentions. Hence, the bill the article refers to when it says: "the law proposed to the last Congress did not take cognizance of this problem" would not have been H.R. 1235.

Subsection (f) of section 9 of H.R. 1235 in the last Congress (it is now renumbered as section 8 in the new H.R. 1235 introduced January 9, 1963, in this Congress), would add a new subsection (3) to section 602 of the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act dealing with misbranding, of cosmetics, to read as follows:

(e) Unless its labeling bears (1) the common or usual name of the cosmetic chemicals, and (2) in case it is fabricated from two or more ingredients, the common or usual name of each such ingredient: *Provided*, That to the extent that compliance with the requirements of clause (2) of this paragraph is impracticable, or results in deception or unfair competition, or is not in the best interest of the consumer, exemptions shall be established by regulations promulgated by the Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, with that one exception or oversight clarified, I think the article in Consumer Reports on the need for better laws to protect users of cosmetics represents an excellent outline of the problem. I am happy that H.R. 1235 covers all of the major points raised in this article, plus some additional ones not mentioned by Consumer Reports such as the exemption in the present law for soap, an exemption which H.R. 1235 would repeal.

The article referred to is as follows:

HEALTH AND MEDICINE—COSMETICS VERSUS THE CONSUMER—CU HOPES IT WON'T TAKE A THALIDOMIDE TRAGEDY TO TIGHTEN COSMETICS SAFETY LAWS

Although there have been no great cosmetics scares in recent years, an addition to consumer protection legislation to require that cosmetics be tested for safety before they are marketed is sorely needed. Legislation to require protection was introduced in the last Congress, but no action was taken; it will undoubtedly be reintroduced this year.

Americans now spend more than $2 billion a year on cosmetics, a 300-percent increase from 1940. And despite the prominence of the word in the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, the protection afforded consumers of cosmetics under present Federal law is minimal.

PROVISIONS AND DEFICIENCIES OF THE LAW

The cosmetics sections of the law as it now stands do little more than require sanitary production, honest weights and measures, and disclosure of the manufacturer, packer, or distributor of the product. The buyer of an unfamiliar cosmetic has no assurance of its safety in normal use. The FDA has authority to act on a hazardous cosmetic before it actually does harm to a buyer only in the not very likely event that a manufacturer incorporates a known hazardous ingredient in his formula. New ingredients or elaborate new concoctions of ingredients may be placed on the market without previous testing, and, if the products turn out to be harmful, the FDA may step in only after enough people have been hurt—and have reported the fact—to demonstrate that the produce is harmful. With TenDay Press-on Nail Color a few years ago (Consumer Reports, May 1958), 700 women had reported damaged fingernails before the FDA could get the product off the market.

When injuries do occur, especially allergic reactions, the problem is compounded for the victim and his doctor by the lack of a requirement that ingredients be revealed. The law proposed to the last Congress did not take cognizance of this problem. CU believes that cosmetics makers, like food processors and drug manufacturers, should be required to list ingredients on their labels.

That a cosmetics tragedy of thalidomide proportions has not brought a precipitous correction of deficiencies in the law, CU's medical consultants believe, can be credited only to good fortune plus the instinct for self-preservation, if not social reponsibility, on the part of the large cosmetics manufacturers. While there have been no recent serious outbreaks of injury comparable to the cases of blindness caused by hair dyes in the 1930's, it is almost impossible to obtain a reasonable estimate of the safety record of today's cosmetics. There is no systematic reporting program, and even if there were a great many of the less spectacular injuries, especially allergic reactions, would never be counted.

CU recently received a letter from a professor at Yale University telling of some inquiries he made after a bubble bath product had caused severe irritation of the vulva in his 3-year-old daughter. From talking to local physicians and friends he learned of eight similar cases in young girls. Although this seeming epidemic in one area is not likely to be an isolated instance, the FDA has not had a notable number of complaints on this product. Unless a severe complication sets in, an injured person apparently just crosses the product off her shopping list and lets the incident drop.

The regular channels for exchange of medical information show little interest in cosmetics injuries. Except where a novel and interesting kind of toxicity is involved, very few cases are given space in the clinical literature. Medical societies, State and local regulatory agencies, better business bureaus, consumer groups, and other such organizations receive reports of cosmetics injury sporadically, but they are often lax about passing the word on. If all these sources funneled to the FDA the information they receive, the protection of other people might be speeded. Consumers, too, could do a real service by taking the time to notify the FDA of any unhappy experiences they may have with cosmetics, giving the name of the product and details of their trouble with it (see "Government Aids to Consumers" in the current buying guide issue, p. 93).

LIMITATIONS OF TESTING

Pretesting, important as it is, cannot fully avert the possibility of cosmetics injury. There are inherent limitations in the testing procedures. The manufacturers which now test products before marketing them generally engage commercial laboratories which chiefly use animals. Such testing screens out highly toxic products. It is in the shift to human subjects, particularly in the search

for allergic reactions that problems arise. Often a cosmetics company carries out the first tests of a new product in significant numbers of human beings simply by selling it in a limited area. If there are no complaints, marketing is expanded.

While a law could bring this practice within better scientific and ethical control, the final verdict on the safety of a product might still have to await use more widespread than desirable from the point of view of maximum safety. Researchers know that in allergy investigations a test population as large as 30,000 may fail to reveal a reaction rate of 1 in 10,000, enough to bring complaints with a popular cosmetic. Premarketing tests for safety are unlikely ever to reach that scale.

Even large-scale testing might fail to uncover unusual hazards. Would it, for example, have revealed a potentially lethal effect of the powdered hair-coloring agent with which teenage girls put a streak in their hair: A 7-year-old boy in California recently had to have a tracheotomy to open breathing passages irritated by the powder inhaled as he watched a 12-year-old girl use it.

A good reporting network of consumer experience with cosmetics, then, will continue to be important whatever changes are made in the law.

THE NEED FOR CAUTIONARY LABELING

Even the best possible consumer protection would still leave open another source of injury, those products which are known to have some degree of potential hazard but are permitted on the market anyway, because their usefulness is judged to outweigh the hazard. A great many products fall in this class. Most cosmetics, for example, may be irritating when they get into the eyes. A commercial testing laboratory has found that nearly all of a group of 140 cosmetic products for use on the head, including various antidandruff products, shampoos, and hair sprays, would have to be labeled as eye irritants if they were subject to the Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act. Perfumes, which are most commonly the ingredients that cause allegic reactions, are added to almost every cosmetic product. And there are some products, depilatories, for example, which have to be potentially injurious to accomplish their purpose. Few cosmetics now bear any cautionary labeling.

What is needed, then, to assure a minimum of injury from the growing use of cosmetics is a combination of better laws, continued vigilance, and intelligent consuming.

COSMETICS ADVERTISING

It is not so easy to suggest an approach to another aspect of consumer difficulties with the cosmetic industry, the modus operandi of cosmetics promoters.

The world of cosmetics advertising is a strange one. A girl can spend her holiday on the deck of a sailboat beating into a 10-knot breeze, one would judge by the slant of the deck, without disturbing a hair of her well-sprayed head. A previously lonesome male suddenly has to fight off the feminine pursuers after he slicks down his unruly hair with a magic cream. In the commercials for another product the cream, in turn, becomes "that greasy kid stuff" in the he-man atmosphere of the locker room. In this remarkable world, you are invited to lubricate the skin with a product whose prime action removes fats and oils—Dove detergent bar. You can be tranquilized by a simple antiperspirant ("Ice Blue" Secret). And you can cure dishpan hands by washing dishes (Ivory Liquid).

All these exaggerations are embellishments attributed for promotional purposes to products of basically limited usefulness. Commonsense says the products cannot possibly do all that is claimed for them. Why, then, does not the Federal Trade Commission step in?

The answer is simple if the remedy is not. The FTC must prove an advertising claim to be false before banning it. With cosmetics claims this raises a multitude of problems. For one thing, most cosmetics claims are not susceptible to proof, either true or false; what researcher would care to find proof, for example, of the claim that a cosmetic can make your body "a scented column of silken smoothness and your presence a sheer delight?"

Another group of claims difficult for the FTC to attack are those based on data which are scientifically weak but still can be dressed up to impress lay judges and juries; toothpaste claims often fall in this category.

Still other questionable claims rest on physiological notions which are extremely difficult if not impossible to disprove with today's knowledge and technology; the claims for products which cater to dry skin are cases in point. Virtually all these products are emollients of one sort or another; yet it has been shown that dryness of the skin is caused by escape of water from the tissues, not by the removal of fats or oils. The best that an emollient can hope to do is to give the dry skin a smooth feel and inhibit further evaporation of moisture. Moreover, there is no objective measurement for skin dryness.

SKIN ILLS MADE TO ORDER

Cosmetics promotion, both through advertising—especially on TV—and through the hidden persuasion of the women's magazines, is having a profound effect. Good Housekeeping, in surveying the purposes for which women apply substances to their skin, found a remarkable growth in skin problems between 1957 and 1961: dryness up from 35 to 41 percent; chapping, 10 to 18 percent; flaking, 14 to 21 percent. Such a marked increase in dryness, if real, could only have been produced by a meterological upheaval resulting in unprecedented changes in the mean relative humidity or by a nationwide metabolic disturbance. But the survey also showed oily skin increasing, as well as freckles, large pores, and blemishes.

The commercial philosophy of this Nation invites anyone with initiative to enter the marketplace and sell whatever he can, short of harming his customers, and it need not be a better mousetrap. If it can be artfully enough promoted, it need not work at all. Considering the limited range of physical effects that cosmetics can have, one may argue that the purposes of cosmetics are mainly psychological; that if the buyer can be convinced she is benefited by using the product, full value is received. While this reasoning may contain some truth in respect to cosmetics, it is also a justification for any kind of deception, so long as the victim is unaware of it and makes no complaint.

CU has no ready answer to the ethical questions posed by the general acceptance of gross deception in cosmetics promotion. But there is perhaps some comfort in the thought that a mind well supplied with reliable information is less likely to be gullible. CU intends to continue contributing to its readers' fund of reliable information.

(The article above was prepared from material gathered for an address given by Harold Aaron, M.D., CU's medical adviser, as part of a symposium of the American Medical Association's Committee on Cosmetics at the annual meeting of the American Academy of Dermatology in Chicago last December.)

FULL TEXT OF COSMETIC PROVISIONS OF H.R. 1235

Mr. Speaker, the section dealing with cosmetics is only one of many sections in H.R. 1235 to rewrite our nearly 25-year-old Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938. Other provisions of H.R. 1235 would tighten the labeling requirements for all foods and drugs, as well as cosmetics, to prevent deceptive packaging and other consumer frauds; attack the sale of fake cures for cancer; require new therapeutic devices to be proved both safe and efficacious before they can be sold; provide more adequate controls over the distribution of habit-forming barbiturates and amphetamines—the sleeping pills and "pep" pills; strengthen the factory inspection laws for all products covered by the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and make other important and long-overdue changes in our basic consumer statute.

Relevant to the article from Consumer Reports which appears above, however, would be only section 8 of the bill as it now stands, applying entirely to cosmetics.

I, therefore, submit for inclusion at this point in the RECORD, section 8 of H.R. 1235, as follows:

PRETESTING COSMETICS

SEC. 8. (a) The following new section is added at the end of chapter VI of such Act:

"PRETESTING COSMETICS

"SEC. 604. (a) No person shall introduce or deliver for introduction into interstate commerce any cosmetic—

"(1) the composition of which is such that such cosmetic is not generally recognized, among experts qualified by scientific training and experience to evaluate the safety of cosmetics, as having been adequately shown to be safe for its intended us and other uses reasonably to be anticipated, or

"(2) the composition of which is such that such cosmetic, as a result of investigations to determine its safety for such a use, has become so recognized, but which has not, otherwise than in such investigations, been so used to a material extent or for a material time, unless an application filed pursuant to subsection (b) is effective with respect to such cosmetic.

"(b) Any person may file with the Secretary an application with respect to any cosmetic subject to the provisions of subsection (a). Such persons shall submit to the Secretary as a part of the application (1) full reports of investigations which have been made to show whether or not such cosmetic is safe for use; (2) a full list of the articles used as components of such cosmetic; (3) a full statement of the composition of such cosmetic; (4) a full description of the methods used in, and the facilities and controls used for, the manufacture, processing, and packing of such cosmetic; (5) such samples of such cosmetic and of the articles used as components thereof as the Secretary may require; and (6) specimens of the labeling proposed to be used for such cosmetic.

"(c) The Secretary, within ninety days after the filing of an application under this subsection, shall notify the applicant that the application is effective or shall give the applicant notice of opportunity for a hearing on the question whether to permit the application to become effective, except that prior to the ninetieth day after such filing the Secretary may notify the applicant in writing that the time for action by him has been extended to such time (not more than one hundred and eighty days after the date of filing the application) as the Secretary deems necessary to enable him to study and investigate the application.

"(d)(1) If the Secretary finds, after due notice to the applicant and giving him an

opportunity for a hearing, that (A) the investigations, reports of which are required to be submitted to the Secretary pursuant to subsection (b), do not include adequate tests by all methods reasonably applicable to show whether or not such cosmetic is safe for its intended use and other uses reasonably to be anticipated; (B) the results of such tests show that such cosmetic is unsafe for any such use or do not show that such cosmetic is safe for such uses; (C) the methods used in, and the facilities and controls used for, the manufacture, processing, and packing of such cosmetic are inadequate to preserve its identity, strength, quality, and purity; or (D) upon the basis of the information submitted to him as part of the application, or upon the basis of any other information before him with respect to such cosmetic, he has insufficient information to determine whether such cosmetic is safe for its intended use and other uses reasonably to be anticipated, he shall, prior to the effective date of the application, issue an order refusing to permit the application to become effective.

"(2) A cosmetic shall be deemed unsafe and an application with respect to it may not become effective—

"(A) if its intended use or any use which can reasonably be anticipated will or may result in ingestion of all or part of such cosmetic and (i) the cosmetic is found by the Secretary to induce cancer when ingested by man or animal or (ii) it is found by the Secretary, after tests which are appropriate for the evaluation of safety of cosmetics, to induce cancer in man or animal, or

"(B) if its intended use or any use which can reasonably be anticipated will not result in ingestion of any part of such cosmetic and, after tests which are appropriate for the evaluation of the safety of the cosmetics for any such use, or after other relevant exposure of man or animal to such cosmetic, it is found by the Secretary to induce cancer in man or animal.

"(3) An application with respect to a cosmetic may not become effective if the data before the Secretary show that its intended use or any use which can reasonably be anticipated would promote deception of the consumer in violation of this Act or would otherwise result in misbranding or adulteration within the meaning of this Act.

"(e) The effectiveness of an application with respect to any cosmetic shall, after due notice and opportunity for hearing to the applicant, by order of the Secretary be suspended if the Secretary finds that (1) for reasons set forth by him, there is reasonable doubt as to the safety of the cosmetic for its intended use or any other use reasonably to be anticipated, or (2) the application contains any untrue statement of a material fact.

"(f) An order refusing to permit an application with respect to any cosmetic to become effective shall be revoked whenever the Secretary finds that the facts so require.

"(g)(1) An order of the Secretary after a hearing unnder this section shall be based upon a fair evaluation of the entire record at the hearing and shall include a statement setting forth in detail the findings and conclusions on which it is based.

"(2) Orders of the Secretary under this section shall be served (A) in person by any officer or employee of the Department designated by the Secretary or (B) by mailing the order by registered mail or certified mail addressed to the applicant or respondent at his last known address in the records of the Secretary.

"(h) In case of denial or withdrawal of approval of an application under this section, the applicant may file in the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such applicant resides or has his principal place of business, within sixty days after serving of notice of such order, a written petition praying that the order of the Secretary be set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Secretary, or any officer designated by him for that purpose, and thereupon the Secretary shall file in the court a transcript of the record of the proceedings on which he based his order, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition the court shall have jurisdiction, which upon the filing of the record with it shall be exclusive, to affirm or set aside the order. The finding of the Secretary as to the facts shall be sustained if based upon a fair evaluation of the entire record at the hearing. If any person shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence, and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for failure to adduce such evidence in the proceeding before the Secretary, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the Secretary and to be adduced upon the hearing in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as to the court may seem proper. The Secretary may modify his findings as to the facts and order by reason of the additional evidence so taken, and he shall file with the court such modified findings and order. The court, on judicial review, shall not sustain the order of the Secretary if he failed to comply with any requirement imposed on him by subsection (g)(1). The judgment and decree of the court affirming or setting aside any order under this section shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subsection shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court to the contrary, operate as a stay of the Secretary's order.

"(i) The Secretary shall promulgate regulations for exempting from the operation of this section cosmetics intended solely for investigational use by experts qualified by scientific training and experience to investigate the safety of cosmetics."

"(j)(1) Every person engaged in manufacturing, compounding, or processing any cosmetic with respect to which an application, filed pursuant to this section, is in effect shall establish and maintain such records, and make such reports to the Secretary, of data relating to experience and other data or information, received or otherwise obtained by such person with respect to such cosmetic, as the Secretary may by general regulation, or by order with respect to such application, prescribe on the basis of a finding that such records and reports are necessary in order to enable the Secretary to determine, or to facilitate a determination, whether there is or may be ground for invoking subsection (e) of this section.

"(2) Every person required under this section to maintain records, and every person in charge or custody thereof, shall, upon request of an officer or employee designated by the Secretary, permit such officer or employee at all reasonable times to have access to and copy and verify such records."

(b) Section 201(i)(2) of such Act is amended by changing the semicolon to a period and deleting the words "except that such term shall not include soap."

(c) Section 301 of such Act is further amended—

(1) by striking out in paragraph (d) thereof "or 512" and inserting in lieu thereof "512 or 604".

(2) by inserting before the period at the end of paragraph (e) thereof a semicolon and the following: "or the failure to establish or maintain any record, or make any report, required under section 604 (i) or (j), or the refusal to permit access to or verification or copying of any such record."

(3) by inserting "604," in paragraph (j) after "507,".

(4) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(q) The using, on the labeling of any cosmetic or in any advertising relating to such cosmetic, of any representation or suggestion that an application with respect to such cosmetic is effective under section 604, or that such cosmetic complies with the provisions of such section."

(d) Section 304 of such Act is further amended—

(1) by striking out in subsection (a) thereof "or 512" and inserting in lieu thereof "512 or 604".

(2) by striking out in subsection (d) thereof "404 or 505" and inserting in lieu thereof "404, 505, or 604".

(e) Section 601 of such Act is amended—

(1) by changing the semicolon after the word "usual" in subsection (a) to a period, and deleting the remainder of the subsection.

(2) by changing subsection (e) to read as follows:

"(e) If it is, or it bears or contains, a color additive which is unsafe within the meaning of section 706(a)".

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) If it is a cosmetic to which the provisions of section 604 apply but with respect to which an application is not effective under such section."

(f) Section 602 of such Act is amended by adding the following subsection:

"(e) Unless its labeling bears (1) the common or usual name of the cosmetic chemicals, and (2) in case it is fabricated from two or more ingredients, the common or usual name of each such ingredient: *Provided*, That to the extent that compliance with the requirements of clause (2) of this paragraph is impracticable, or results in deception or unfair competition, or is not in the best interest of the consumer, exemptions shall be established by regulations promulgated by the Secretary".

## Congressional Travel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to see that the House Rules Committee is taking steps to institute urgently needed reforms in the business of congressional travel.

I strongly believe that Members of the House and Senate should educate themselves on world problems, problems which we often tend to judge with little knowledge of overall global conditions and international pressures. It is healthy for Members to be continually confronted by the other man's point of view. Proper travel under proper circumstances can, therefore, be a definite aid to the Member in discharging his responsibilities and such travel is to be encouraged. However, it would more than strain my imagination to justify some of the trips made by Members of Congress, trips which neither promote the

Members' understanding of world affairs nor contribute to the American legislative process. And we are all aware that some of the worst abuses of the Congress transpire in the use of counterpart funds by Members traveling abroad.

Hence, there is a need for the firm tightening of the rules and procedures concerning congressional travel. The least of these reforms should be an accurate and complete public accounting of all expenditures including both those itemized in travel vouchers and those taken from counterpart funds. Experiencing once again how the flagrant abuses of the few reflect upon the conscientious actions of the many, we should all recognize the need of exercising self-discipline and of establishing a code of ethics. This we owe to the public and to ourselves.

## The Small Business Administration Must Remain an Independent Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 29, 1963*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following correspondence between George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, and President Kennedy.

If the Small Business Administration is to continue its very effective and necessary work, it must remain independent of the Department of Commerce.

Those who know the value of SBA's work will be interested in the reply that Mr. Burger received from the White House expressing the President's strong support for an independent Small Business Administration.

The correspondence follows:

JANUARY 10, 1963.

Re: Small Business Administration.
Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
*President of the United States,*
*White House, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The record will disclose from the first instance the National Federation of Independent Business has been in the forefront supporting legislative action creating the Small Business Administration.

Our action was authorized by the registered vote of our nationwide membership, all independent business and professional men in the 50 States, now numbering approximately 200,000, all individual members comprising all types of industry in small business.

This agency has served a necessary and important function, opening up credit channels that heretofore, by State or Federal regulation in banking circles were prohibited.

During the life of this agency these past 10 years the Federation has stood in the forefront in supporting any legislative move that would strengthen this agency in its aid to small business, not alone in financial matters but all other actions within the agency, provided by law.

We understand that during the life of the agency, up to December 31, 1962, 35,072 small businesses have been able to help themselves through the help of this agency. Then again, the agency has assisted, in no uncertain terms, in making certain that small business receives its fair share of Government contracts.

A more important aspect is that during the life of the agency the banks nationwide have taken more receptive action in cooperation with the Small Business Administration in loan participation.

If this agency had not been established by the Congress, all this needed help to small business would have been denied, which would have resulted in possibly increased small business failures.

There have been rumors that there is a movement underway for the Small Business Administration to be taken over as a Department within the Department of Commerce. This rumor has been in existence for nearly 2 months, and more recently the rumor is more or less confirmed by responsible sources.

Now, Mr. President, we are committed, in behalf of small business, to oppose any such action of the Department of Commerce absorbing the Small Business Administration, and we are further on record opposing any duplication of action within the Department of Commerce now being performed by and originating with the Small Business Administration.

This is a very serious matter if there is merit in the rumor.

Mr. President, can we expect your wholehearted cooperation in keeping the Small Business Administration as a separate and distinct agency of the Federal Government, and may we expect to hear from you at your very earliest convenience?

Sincerely,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
*Vice President, National Federation of Independent Business.*

THE WHITE HOUSE,
*January 17, 1963.*

Mr. GEORGE J. BURGER,
*Vice President, National Federation of Independent Business, Washington Building, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR GEORGE: The President has asked me to reply to your letter indicating there are currently rumors that the Small Business Administration is to have its functions transferred to the Commerce Department. I can reassure you without any reservations or qualifications, there is absolutely no justification for any such story.

As you know, the President has given strong and vigorous support to the Small Business Administration. I am pleased to advise you that this support will continue and that the Small Business Administration will remain an independent agency.

Sincerely,

LEE C. WHITE,
*Assistant Special Counsel to the President.*

## Poem by a Golden Ager

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to extend my remarks to include a letter from my friend and constituent, A. J. Goldsmith, and a poem the reading of which I recommend to all my colleagues.

This is the letter:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: I am taking the liberty of sending to you what I believe is a very beautiful poem written by Alta Schoenbrod, a 75-year-old resident of the Jewish Federation's Drexel Home for the Aged located in your district.

The poem was published in a special Chanukah edition of the Drexel Home News that is written and edited by the residents.

Perhaps, Congressman, you could enter this poem in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a tribute to the many golden agers who are seeking to live full lives in our great land.

Very truly yours,

A. J. GOLDSMITH,
*Assistant Director of Public Relations.*

Mr. Speaker, this is the poem written by Alta Schoenbrod, 75 years of age, a resident of the Jewish Federation's Drexel Home for the Aged located at 6140 South Drexel Avenue:

FREEDOM

While walking home to the Annex, across the street,
I stopped at a tree and heard the young birds tweet!
I am not fond of poetry, much more of prose
But the muse then got me, so here goes!
I was inspired many hours, to appreciate the twittering of birds,
A garden of beautiful flowers,
The sunshine, the air, that is free,
Also stars, and the moon.
A God-made tree! (Joyce Kilmer.)
The mountains, rivers, and lakes,
So numerous and lovely
In our United States!
We live and are blest, unaware
Of the many features, that are free as the air.
Freedom of speech, pursuit of happiness
Which we crave
Are in our beloved America!
Land of the free, and home of the brave.
We should pray for peace,
Thankful for natural courses
And take advantage of its many resources.

## Khrushchev Charts a Course

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 29, 1963*

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I wish to include in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Khrushchev Charts a Course," which appeared in the Phoenix Gazette, of January 19, 1963. This editorial is a grim warning of the method employed by Communists to infiltrate free nations in their quest for world domination, and should be of interest to every Member of Congress.

The editorial follows:

KHRUSHCHEV CHARTS A COURSE

Nikita Khrushchev has just made things a lot tougher for leaders of the Western alliance, particularly President Kennedy. In what may be one of the major speeches of his career, the world's boss Red has made it clear just where he thinks communism is going in the next few years, and how he thinks it is going to get there.

It is not at all beside the point that this Communist chieftain at the age of 68 boasts that he will be alive to see socialism, that is, the Communist system, triumphant in the world. It is highly significant that the boast

was repeated in the same speech in which Khrushchev inferentially warned Communists against provoking the United States into nuclear war.

The new cult of Kremlinologists in this country, beset by a fixation that compels them to picture Khrushchev on the defensive, hastily interpreted his Berlin speech of last Wednesday in terms of what they call a split between the Soviet Union and Red China.

It makes a great deal of difference if you look at the talk as a blueprint for a continuing attack on the free world. What Krushchev said makes a great deal more sense in this light. He said he will live to see communism triumphant. He said the triumph can be achieved only by avoiding a head-on war with the United States. He noted that this country has 40,000 nuclear warheads—his spies are still at work—and that it would be folly to challenge this strength directly.

Then he cited Cuba as an example of the way in which communism will win. He had a point there. He had backtracked to avoid a head-on clash over Cuba, but by doing so he protected tremendous gains. Soviet troops are in Cuba. Soviet arms, short of nuclear missiles, are there. Communism is far ahead of what it was a year ago in Cuba. This is what Khrushchev was saying.

He was telling Communists throughout the world what Lenin first told them years ago, that it is orthodox Communist procedure to take one step back if you have taken two steps forward. Khrushchev took a step back in Cuba, a sensational step, it is true, but it left him still one step forward.

He took a step forward when he built the Berlin wall, and he has not taken a step back there yet. So he is ahead on that front. A troika government in Laos was his step ahead in Southeast Asia. His pal, Sukarno, took over West New Guinea, which was another half step ahead in that part of the world.

Against this, Khrushchev has taken nuclear missiles out of Cuba, one step backward, and withdrawn a deadline on a Berlin settlement, which was a psychological if not an actual step backward. Also he has engaged in a dispute over dogma with Red China's Mao Tse-tung, the question being whether it is better to destroy the free world piecemeal or all at once.

In view of this record, we believe Khrushchev was saying in his Berlin talk that he has measured Mr. Kennedy, and found him ready to fight when directly challenged. We believe this is a proper estimate. Khrushchev says further that communism cannot win in an all-out fight. Again, a proper estimate. So, he says, Communists must outsmart the free world. He says they have been doing it, and will continue to do it.

We can only hope Mr. Kennedy understands communism well enough to know what he means.

## Report on Foreign Film Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 21, 1963*

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker I would like to add to the RECORD at this time a report of an important meeting just held in the office of Secretary of Labor Wirtz dealing with the problems of the movie industry.

This meeting was the result of suggestions made in the report filed by the Committee on Joint Labor Management, which I had the privilege of chairing during its studies into the many problems posed by our trade policies.

All of us are hopeful that the end may be in sight of international trade piracy and discriminations against U.S. enterprises.

The report follows:

WASHINGTON, January 24.—Hollywood's Joint Labor-Management Committee on Foreign Film Production came to the Kennedy administration today, January 24, for help to increase domestic motion picture production.

The joint group formally petitioned Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz for administration assistance in obtaining the removal of unfair foreign trade barriers that lead to American film production abroad. The group urged our Government to work through appropriate international bodies to get rid of foreign subsidies, import quotas, screen time quotas, remittance restrictions, and other unfair competitive handicaps.

The group pointed out that a shifting of production to film centers overseas has been created by such foreign trade practices.

Secretary Wirtz is Chairman of the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy, which is responsible for recommending to President Kennedy "policies designed to insure that American products are competitive in world markets."

The labor-management delegation was led by its cochairmen, Pat Somerset, president of the Hollywood AFL Film Council, and Charles Boren, executive vice president of the Association of Motion Picture Producers. Eric Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association of America, introduced the delegation to Secretary Wirtz.

The joint committee was established a year ago as the result of a proposal by Representative JOHN H. DENT, of Pennsylvania, chairman of a House Education and Labor Subcommittee which held hearings on the problem. DENT suggested that the best solution would be found through joint labor-management action within the industry.

In its comprehensive 29-page petition, the joint committee said: "Only by standing together and energetically working together on a realistic and constructive basis can labor and management in the American motion picture industry perform the big internal job that needs to be done within the industry to encourage domestic production.

"But we need the willing and earnest help of the Federal Government too in fighting against the unfair and discriminatory trade practices engaged in by some foreign governments that attempt to place American-made pictures at an artificial disadvantage in foreign markets."

In addition to Johnston, Somerset, and Boren, the following labor-management representatives attended the meeting in the office of Secretary Wirtz:

Representing the Hollywood AFL Film Council: Richard Walsh, president, IATSE; George Chandler, president, Screen Actors Guild; Jeffrey Sayre, president, Screen Extras Guild, O'Neill Shanks, secretary, Film Council; John Lehners, film editors; Cappy DuVal, property craftsmen; Phil Fischer, American Federation of Musicians; Tex Jarrard, studio utility employees; and Robert W. Gilbert, counsel for Film Council.

Representing the producers: Gordon Stulberg, Columbia Pictures; Alfred P. Chamie, secretary treasurer, AMPP; Maurice Benjamin, counsel, AMPP; and E. L. DeLeVigne, Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer.

Also attending was Herbert Aller, cameramen.

## Judge Max M. Meltzer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the East Side News on January 25, 1963, commemorating the anniversary of the death of Judge Max M. Meltzer, a friend of all of us who have long resided in the lower East Side of New York:

JUDGE MAX M. MELTZER, 1908–62

(By Abe E. Eisenstein)

January 30, 1 year ago, the last mortal breath left the lips of Max M. Meltzer, one of East Side New York's beloved sons, a friend of youth and adults, an outstanding lawyer, a noted community and civic leader, a great humane being, industrious, able, and respected jurist.

Max M. Meltzer, son of Mrs. Rose Meltzer and the late Israel Meltzer, was born in an old tenement house on the lower East Side. His father was for many years a secretary of a benevolent society. He died at the age of 59, on August 20, 1959. His mother is a typical East Side woman and well liked in the neighborhood.

"He was a marvelous soul, modest, unassuming, gentle, qualities that endeared him to us all. Service was his chief commitment in life."—Justice Birdie Amsterdam, New York Supreme Court.

Famed old public school 20, De Witt Clinton High School, St. John's University, New York University, and University Settlement alumnus, Max Meltzer's early life was far from easy and this developed in him an inner strength and courage reflected in his entire career. The late brother of Abe, Lillian, Phyllis, Anna, was employed during the day while attending New York University Law School. In 1931, Max was admitted to the New York bar and was an associate in the office of Skinner & Bermant. From 1945 to 1948, he served as law secretary to Lazarus Joseph, then comptroller of the city of New York.

"Judge Meltzer's word was his bond. We learned to know him as a scholar and gentleman. He bred in us a respect and admiration for his unselfishness and for his human sympathy and understanding."—Judge Eugene B. McAuliffe, of civil court.

Organizer and secretary of the HIP for the New York City civil service employees, member Alfred E. Smith Democratic Club, New York Lodge No. 1 Elks, Knights of Pythias, Samuel Dickstein Lodge, B'nai B'rith, New York County Lawyers Association, the Community Synagogue Center, University Settlement Alumni, Max M. Meltzer was appointed in May 1948 a judge of the municipal court (Manhattan Borough, second district) by the then Mayor William O'Dwyer. In the fall, he was elected for the full 10-year term. His popularity with all the people (endorsed by all political parties) was evidenced by his reelection in 1958.

"Judge Meltzer was one of the most beloved and respected jurist—possessing a fierce moral fire and exemplifying honesty, decency, integrity in the fullest sense of the word."—Judge Xavier C. Riccobono, of civil court.

Past president and charter member Forton Club Lodge, a director of Public School 20 Alumni Association, honorary member University Amigos, member East Side Chamber of Commerce, Manhattan Democratic Club,

East Side Housing Conference, Grand Street Boys' Association, Civic Center Synagogue (a plaque unveiled in his memory on April 2, 1961), board member University Settlement House, etc., Judge Meltzer was loyal to the traditions of his beloved East Side. His dreams, no less than his desires and talents, were always put at the disposal of the greatest possible good.

Judge Max M. Meltzer was a resident of 230 East Sixth Street. He was married to the former Miss Eva Paskin. They were the parents of three children: Mrs. Arlene Ochberg (grandchild Ricky), Miriam and Charles. He died on the Hebrew date of Shevat 25, 5722, and was buried in Beth David Cemetery, Elmont, N.Y.

We salute the memory of Judge Max M. Meltzer who has been a strong ally and a great influence for good in our midst.

## Medical Aid for Senior Citizens Under the Social Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JACOB H. GILBERT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am giving top priority to the proposal to give medical aid to our senior citizens under the social security program, and further liberalization of the social security laws.

I have again introduced my bill providing for such medical aid, and will spare no efforts to secure its passage. I consider this a major responsibility of the Congress and one which should be met without further delay. It is inconceivable that we should continue to ignore the hardships being suffered by our older citizens because of their inability to pay for adequate medical care. It is estimated that half of our senior citizens over 65 years old—8,000,000 of them—live in abject poverty. The average per capita income of those over 65 is now estimated to be slightly over $20 a week—about $1,000 a year. Now consider that medical costs during the 1950's went up by 36 percent, hospitalization costs rose by 65 percent, and group hospitalization costs—Blue Cross premiums—rose by 83 percent. When our senior citizens can barely afford to eat, they have no alternative except to deny themselves necessary medical attention.

I consider it a sad commentary upon our great Nation that we have so blithely and shamefully neglected this large portion of our population. Congress must be made to face, and effectively deal with, this grave problem and help our senior citizens.

I have also reintroduced my bill to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits under social security and to provide that full benefits thereunder, when based upon the attainment of retirement age, will be payable to men at age 60 and to women at age 55.

Under existing law, social security annuitants are permitted to earn only up to $1,200 per year; if they earn more than this sum, they are penalized; deductions are made from their social security payments. No one can possibly support a home on his social security check. When social security payments represent a pensioner's entire income, if he wishes to enjoy a dignified existence and not become an object of charity, he must find some employment. The law as it stands now hurts the very people for whose benefit it was originally intended—those who work for their living. If the morale and well-being of our older citizens is to be restored, the limitation must be removed.

Another important amendment provided in my bill would enable men to collect full social security benefits at the age of 60; women could collect at the age of 55. Many workers who wish to retire at an earlier age and are financially able to do so when they can include social security payments should be given that opportunity. They are entitled to enjoy their later years in leisure after many years of toil. Also, by retiring, they provide vacancies for the younger men and women who need employment. There are many workers in poor health who must struggle to work in their last years because they cannot afford to quit, looking forward to the age of 62 and their social security benefits and a lessening of their hardships. A realistic approach to the problem of assisting our senior citizens is to reduce the age limits as provided in my bill.

I have also introduced a bill to increase, in the case of children who are attending school, from 18 to 21 years the age until the child's insurance benefits may be received under the Social Security Act. Many of our young people are forced to leave high school after completing a year or two, upon reaching the age of 18, and go to work, because social security payments are stoppped. Those who wish to attend college are prevented from doing so. This occurs when the family is in poor circumstances and dependent upon such payments to take care of the child's expenses and support. Education of our youth is important; the assistance provided by my bill is necessary, so that our young people may have the opportunity to secure the highest degree of education possible.

## The Honorable John Bell

SPEECH
OF
### HON. OMAR BURLESON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, the death of our former colleague, John Bell, brings with it a sadness which occurs with the passing of one with whom we had an association and for whom a strong friendship was developed.

John Bell was a real friend to those who wanted a friend. He was quiet and unassuming, but his influence was felt wherever he was.

I join with my other colleagues from Texas in expressions of sorrow and extend deep sympathy to his lovely wife, Mable Claire, who also made many friends while they were in Washington.

## Analyzing the President's Message on Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 29, 1963*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, everyone is for education the best for the most; in quality second to none; in quantity, all of our people, if that is possible. We all agree with the President when he says, "Education is the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress." The many general statements he makes are good reading, such statements as, "fundamentally, education is and must be a local responsibility, for it thrives best when nurtured at the grassroots of our democracy."

Where then is there any disagreement with the President. Here it is, on page 13 of his message:

The program here proposed is reasonable and yet far-reaching. It offers Federal assistance without Federal control.

There it is, the nonsequitur. The President's inconsistencies are the basis for honest disagreement.

Federal aid requires Federal control or else we fail to do our fiscally responsible job as Congressmen. And Federal control contradicts the local control the President eulogizes.

There is no need for me to evaluate selectively, as the President endeavors to do, the various programs because the statement is utterly self-contradictory and self-defeating.

The best and only maximum educational program in a free society will come from local and private effort, not government. This is the maximum to follow.

Perhaps the President's own languge shows most pitilessly his misunderstanding and inconsistency:

In all the years of our national life, the American people—in partnership with their governments—have continued to insist that "the means of education shall forever be encouraged," as the Continental Congress affirmed in the Northwest Ordinance. Fundamentally, education is and must always be a local responsibility, for it thrives best when nurtured at the grassroots of our democracy. But in our present era of economic expansion, population growth, and technological advance, State, local, and private efforts are insufficient. These efforts must be reinforced by national support, if American education is to yield a maximum of individual development and national well-being.

Now study that statement. What did he say and mean. For example, "The American people, in partnership with their governments." This is impossible. We have a Government of, by and for people, do we not? So it follows according to the President that people are in partnership with themselves—a rather ridiculous situation. Such error of judgment and of the role of Government is particularly serious when it is our President who is erring. We must point out and correct his errors—not permit their acceptance as basic American thinking.

The President goes on:

In our present era of economic expansion, population growth, and technological advance, State, local, and private efforts are insufficient.

Mr. Speaker, under our system there is nothing but the private efforts and initiative of the people. The Government creates no wealth, only the industry of the people does that. What you propose is to take the wealth from the people at the local level and return it to them in whatever manner an all-encompassing Federal bureaucracy determines. This is not the way we have been taught to solve our problems. It is not in accordance with the spirit of the Constitution which gives to the people the right and the opportunity to do for themselves.

Because we are experiencing population growth, economic expansion, and technological advance are we to throw the Constitution out the window? Are we no longer sure the people can be the government? I do not believe it. The best way to handle education is still at the local level. The most help the Federal Government can give is to trim the fat from the budget so that people will be able to keep more of their own money and they, at the local level, will take care of building enough schools, hiring the best teachers, and providing for their children the best educational system.

## The Fight Against Organized Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. EMANUEL CELLER**
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 29, 1963*

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to insert the report to the President from the Attorney General on the fight against organized crime. The report follows:

JANUARY 10, 1963.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The administration during 1962 greatly expanded its coordinated drive against organized crime and racketeering.

In the Department of Justice, racketeering prosecutions involving the organized crime section of the criminal division increased approximately 300 percent over 1961 and 700 percent over 1960. Convictions increased more than 350 percent over 1961 and almost 400 percent over 1960.

Internal Revenue Service figures show a sharp decline in gambling, the source of the enormous profits which bankroll other forms of racketeering. We prosecuted gambling cases in 20 States and further gambling investigations are underway in 45 States. Federal law enforcement agencies also took major action against other types of racketeering, such as narcotics, labor-management payoffs, and, most important, corruption of public officials.

These actions, while significant and encouraging, are not conclusive. Organized crime continues to tap the pocketbooks and sap the morality of our citizens.

At the beginning of this administration's antiracketeering effort, we sought to develop close coordination among the 26 Federal law enforcement agencies; to develop within the Department of Justice the manpower and dedication required for an effective effort; and to obtain the antiracketeering laws necessary for the fight against modern crime.

FEDERAL COORDINATION

I can report to you that all the Federal law enforcement agencies have participated with total dedication and cooperation. The successful record of 1962 is in large part the result of their activity.

With their help, we have been able to set up and expand a central information pool on the background and activities of more than 1,100 major racketeering figures. Because of this intelligence and because of the agencies' accelerating assistance, the criminal and tax divisions of the Department of Justice have been able to prosecute cases not previously possible.

I mention particularly the outstanding work of the FBI, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Internal Revenue Service, Federal Bureau of Narcotics, Secret Service, Bureau of Customs, Postal Inspectors, and Bureau of Labor-Management Reports.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE ORGANIZATION

Within the Department of Justice, the work of the organized crime and racketeering section of the criminal division has been greatly expanded. Since January 1961, the personnel strength of this section has been more than tripled, from 17 attorneys to more than 60. Permanent field units have been set up in Chicago, New York, Los Angeles, and Miami and teams of special attorneys have been assigned to various other cities to develop and assist in specific cases. The work statistics of Assistant Attorney General Herbert J. Miller's entire criminal division reflect this section's intensified effort:

| | 1960 | 1961 | 1962 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Man-days in court | 283 | 555 | 809 |
| Man-days in field | 1,963 | 5,086 | 7,356 |
| Man-days before grand juries | 388 | 1,052 | 1,146 |

NEW LEGISLATION

Passage of the new antiracketeering laws has been instrumental in this increased activity. Five of the laws now have been in effect for 15 months. They forbid interstate shipment or transmission of gambling information or paraphernalia and interstate travel in support of racketeering, and expand previous laws against flight to avoid prosecution and shipment of firearms.

In the 15-month period, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has investigated 852 cases under the new laws. Of these, we so far have secured indictments in 34 cases involving 134 defendants, and convictions in 12 cases involving 37 defendants. There were three acquittals but in one of these, the defendants were convicted under another law. While no case brought under these new laws has yet been appealed to the Supreme Court, the constitutionality of the new gambling laws has been upheld in lower courts.

Last year, I reported to you that the passage of these laws had the immediate effect of forcing many of the Nation's major racing wire services to shut down. Since then, two more have closed their doors. So have telephone gambling information services. So have large- and small-scale bookmakers across the country. Others have seen their business greatly reduced.

We have taken action under the five laws against a variety of gambling enterprises. In one case, we uncovered a numbers game operation in an eastern seaboard State which alone took in more than $20,000 a day and nearly $6,250,000 annually.

In another numbers case, in the Northeast, we found that while the average daily bet was only about 30 cents, the annual gross of the operation exceeded $2 million.

Action in a large western city resulted in the closing down of a multi-million-dollar sports gambling operation. A total of 19 different outlets were involved; the annual gross in only 1 of these exceeded $600,000. Shortly afterward, the mayor declared that the city's policy of tolerating gambling had ended and sent police out to close down other betting operations.

Last fall, a national magazine conducted its own survey of the betting situation across the country. It concluded that "the new laws have succeeded surprisingly well. * * * Bookmakers all over the country are up against it as they never have been before."

Internal Revenue Service figures further indicate the decline in illegal gambling. Gamblers across the country reported accepting bets of $53,490,000 during fiscal 1962. This represents a 20-percent drop from fiscal 1961 and is the lowest total since 1952, the first year this tax was collected.

Even more graphic are the figures for specific localities in which there has been sustained law enforcement activity. In fiscal 1961, for example, Kentucky bookmakers reported accepting a total of $7,650,000 in bets. In fiscal 1962—following the cleanup of gambling in Newport, Ky.—the figure was $2,200,000.

A sixth antiracketeering law was enacted in the last session of Congress and went into effect December 17. This law, greatly expanding an earlier statute, forbids interstate shipment of gambling machines and requires manufacturers, repairers, and sellers of such machines to register with the Department of Justice. Enforcement of this statute will further assist local authorities in action against illegal gambling.

Nevertheless, betting on sports events particularly remains a major problem. In both 1962 and 1961 we investigated reported attempts by gamblers to fix professional and amateur athletic events. Federal responsibility in this area is limited and further legislation might well be necessary. We will continue, however, to take action under present authority should it be required.

The combination of new coordination, new organization and new legislation has enabled the Federal Government to launch a sustained and successful effort against not only gambling but against all organized crime and racketeering.

One of the most insidious of the other aspects of organized crime is illegal traffic in narcotics. This administration sponsored the first coordinated inquiry into the causes and treatment of addiction—the recent White House Conference on Narcotics and Drug Abuse and the resulting effort to draft new legislation dealing with the problem. At the same time, continued outstanding work by the Bureau of Narcotics has resulted in important prosecutions.

For example, John Ormento and Carmine Galante, among the most important narcotics

dealers in the country, were convicted in New York of smuggling millions of dollars worth of heroin into this country over a 5-year period. Sentences for the 13 defendants in the case totaled 276 years, including 40 years for Ormento and 20 years for Galante.

In Chicago, Nathaniel Spurlark, organizer of a large-scale smuggling ring, and five other defendants were convicted and sentenced to terms of 5 or 10 years in prison. Other important cases were successfully prosecuted in Texas, Tennessee, California, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and elsewhere.

In the labor-management field, we have continued to intensify the efforts of the Federal Government both against employees who seek to bribe union representatives and against union officers who seek to extort funds from employers. In 1962, 79 persons were indicted and 44 so far convicted for violations of the Taft-Hartley, Hobbs, or Labor-Management Reporting Acts in cases involving our Organized Crime attorneys. These totals compare with 20 persons indicted and 11 convicted in 1961 and 15 indicted and 13 convicted in 1960.

During the year, the Department also secured favorable decisions in deportation actions against a number of foreign born racketeers, including Frank Costello and Paul "The Waiter" Ricca DeLucia.

Probably the most damaging of all the uses to which racketeers put their illicit profits is corruption of public officials, and we have exhorted particular effort to expose and prosecute such official corruption—in Newport, Ky.; Lake County, Ind.; New York City; and elsewhere. We have investigations of official corruption underway in 22 States.

The acceleration of our effort against all forms of organized crime is indicated by these statistics for cases involving the Organized Crime Section:

| | 1960 | 1961 | 1962 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Number of indictments | 17 | 45 | 118 |
| Number of convictions | 22 | 24 | 86 |
| Number of individuals indicted | 49 | 121 | 350 |
| Number individuals convicted [1] | 45 | 73 | 138 |

[1] Includes trials of indictments returned in previous years.

Other important convictions of the past year include—

Anthony (Tony Ducks) Carallo, New York labor racketeer, Justice James V. Keogh of the New York State Supreme Court, and Elliott Kahaner, a former assistant U.S. attorney, for conspiring to fix a Federal bankruptcy case;

George Chacharis, mayor of Gary, Ind., who recently pleaded guilty to charges that he failed to report and pay taxes on more than $250,000 in payoffs from construction firms;

Henry Grillo, an Internal Revenue Service official in Boston, and three attorneys, for attempting to bribe another IRS official to fix a tax case;

Frank Andrews, well-known Newport, Ky., numbers game operator;

George Roxburgh, business agent of Detroit Teamster Local 299 on Taft-Hartley payoff charges;

Frank (Buster) Wortman, of St. Louis, Michael Coppola of Miami, and Metro Holovachke, former prosecuting attorney of Lake County, Ind., all on tax charges.

Los Angeles gambler Alfred Sica, brother of Joseph Sica, who was convicted last year with Frankie Carbo and Frank "Blinky" Palermo, on charges of making false statements to the Government.

Irving Tolub, New York City, a former officer of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, on extortion charges;

Samuel J. Marroso, Detroit, labor consultant, on charges of transporting $190,000 in stolen Ohio Turnpike bonds across State lines;

Anthony Zambito, West Virginia "layoff" gambler, on charges of conspiring to violate and actually violating the new antigambling statutes;

Christopher Columbus Parker, one of the leading gamblers in the Southeast, also on charges of violating the new laws.

We also have secured a number of important indictments, which have not yet come to trial. Defendants in these cases include James G. Cross, former president of the Baker & Confectionery Workers Union, on charges of embezzlement and conspiring to fix his trial for perjury; Leo Carlino, of New York on charges of making grossly exorbitant expense deductions; Benjamin Dranow, previously convicted for tax evasion and mail fraud, for jumping $25,000 bail in Minneapolis; August J. Lippi, president of United Mine Workers District No. 1, on charges of embezzling more than $300,000 from a Pennsylvania bank; Matthew (Mike) Rubino, Detroit, for a wide-ranging hundred-thousand-dollar retail sales fraud; Anthony Dolasco, Newark, N.J., and Abe Zimmerman, Chicago, gamblers charged with tax evasion.

The past year also was a successful one in law enforcement areas other than racketeering. The Department is charged with the responsibility for protecting the integrity of Government operations through enforcement of the bribery and conflict-of-interest laws.

Cases in this area include the indictment of two Members of Congress, Thomas F. Johnson and Frank Boykin, on charges involving nearly $25,000 in payments and more than $3 million in real estate transactions. Two military officials at Fort Monmouth, N.J., were indicted on charges of attempting to influence Government contracts. Continuing investigation also led to the return of additional indictments in Massachusetts in connection with Federal highway projects.

Cooperation with other agencies also has been extremely effective in areas other than organized crime. At the request of the Food and Drug Administration, the Department this year instituted more than 150 seizures of misbranded or otherwise legally sold food and drugs—including the sale of stale and falsely labeled human blood to hospitals.

In close cooperation with the Post Office Department, we have brought a record number of mail fraud arrests—an estimated 702—and have secured an estimated 500 convictions, also a record. Included in these cases was the initial prosecution of Texas Businessman Billie Sol Estes, for mail and securities fraud. He also is under indictment for filing false statements with the Government. The past year saw a particular resurgence of fraudulent retirement haven land sales and more than 150 investigations are underway in this area alone.

The record of the year, then, against crime generally and against organized crime in particular is an encouraging one. We have made significant progress. Again, let me make it clear, however, that no one believes the tide of the battle is turned. It is not likely to be decided by one set of laws, one anticrime program, or one administration. Ultimate success will require years of cooperation among Federal and local agencies. It will require energy and integrity on the part of all law enforcement officers. Most of all, it will require the interest and involvement of every citizen.

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. KENNEDY.

## When the Communists Take Over

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. FRANK J. HORTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 21, 1963*

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday we in the House and our colleagues in the Senate set aside time for Members to speak in tribute to the 45th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence. During that time, it was my privilege to address the House and to offer a resolution (H. Res. 175) calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

Because of my concern for the Ukraine and the blatant example of Soviet suppression that exists in that country of proud people, I recently read with special interest a Rochester, N.Y., newspaper column about a naturalized citizen in my home community who had given a first-hand account of the Communist enslavement of his homeland. The story of George Kusiw as he told it to Bill Beeney, of the Democrat and Chronicle, is one that should not go unread by our fellow Members.

I hereby offer it for insertion in the RECORD:

STALIN'S 100 DOGS

(By Bill Beeney)

One evening recently I met a man named George Kusiw who pronounces the "s" in his name like "jsh" because he is a Ukrainian and that is the way they do it.

He is remarkable in a sense, and like many Europeans he also is a knowledgeable student of modern European history. Not by reading about it in books, but by having lived it.

After the manner of almost anyone who has felt the weight of the Communist yoke upon his shoulders, he is an outspoken critic of communism.

"If you think Hitler and his Nazis were bad—and they certainly were bad enough—you should know how the Communists treat the people in countries they take over. When they take over a town, they simply post the rules and regulations on the street corners; the first one is that no longer does any individual own any property, it belongs to the state.

"It is impossible to live a life of dignity and decency under communism. And little by little, in maybe 40 years, I believe communism will perish by its own inadequacies."

George operates a restaurant in Hudson Avenue. He is 44 years old, was born in Rohatin, Ukraine, and is a storybook example of what some people may shortsightedly consider a myth, that America is a land of golden opportunity.

"When the Russian Army advanced on the Ukraine in July 1944, I escaped to Czechoslovakia. I stayed there for about two years and as the Russians began taking over the country I fled to Germany and stayed there for a couple of years. It was always my dream to come to America; I made it in 1949."

He was nearly penniless when he arrived in this country alone (his wife and father had been killed in the war). He buckled down to work, getting a job at Wollensak Optical Co., also working part time as a

baker, and spending his spare time buying older houses, fixing them up and selling them. He saved his money.

He saved well. Exactly 7 years later, in March 1956, he was able to make a cash downpayment of $16,250 for the $44,000 restaurant he purchased at 858 Hudson Avenue. He had become a U.S. citizen in 1954.

The Russian philosophy has not always been clear to some of us. Perhaps George Kusiw shed some light.

"Have you ever heard the story about Stalin and the dogs?" said Kusiw. "It is a true story.

"Shortly after he took over, Stalin conducted an experiment. Or demonstration. He rounded up 100 dogs. He put 50 of them in one large kennel, and 50 in another.

"He gave one group of dogs everything it wanted—the choicest food, plenty of exercise, fine quarters. They had the run of the place and nothing was too good for them.

"He gave the other 50 dogs just enough food to keep them alive. He did not starve them, but he kept them going on the barest essentials. Their lives were bleak and barren.

"The dogs who were living high became arrogant, well muscled, independent. Stalin pointed that out to anyone who visited their kennel.

"The other dogs were pitifully abject to visitors. They wagged their tails and tried to lick the hands of the visitors and cried and whimpered as they begged to make friends.

"Stalin said: 'The way it is with these dogs is the way it will be with the people we rule. We will give them the barest essentials, just enough to keep them alive, and they will always be figuratively wagging their tails and licking our hands to try to better their lot.'

"That is the Communist way of operating."

## Youth Conservation Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 29, 1963*

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I am again sponsoring the bill to create a Youth Conservation Corps. Under this bill unemployed young men between the ages of 17 and 23 would be given the opportunity to undertake useful conservation work in America's great out-of-doors. The bill authorizes the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps of 150,000 young men for a year's service.

This bill presents an approach which would go a long way in directing the energies of the youth of America, in developing our young men physically and morally, besides having an inestimable value in conserving our natural forestlands and parks.

I have been active for many years in the legislative field to eliminate some of the hazards which are attached to the problem of youth. Dr. John Otto Reinemann, director of probation of the county court of Philadelphia, was a great supporter of the bill which I sponsored in the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to create forestry camps. It was enacted in the 1955 session and it operates under the supervision of the department of welfare and the department of forests and waters.

In Philadelphia under the leadership of Commissioner Randolph Wise the city's welfare department has had considerable success with a youth conservation corps program since 1959.

I hope that this important legislation will be enacted in the 1st session of the 88th Congress.

## Arab League Boycott Continues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues may recall that more than a year ago I initiated correspondence with the Departments of State and Commerce to express my profound concern and deep regret with reference to the policy and practice of the U.S. Government regarding the Arab League Nations' boycott and the consequent invasion of American rights. I later, in testimony presented to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, expressed my disappointment in the terminology used in the replies I received, for it was my opinion that both Departments were adopting an ostrichlike policy on a situation which demanded firm action.

While the Foreign Assistance Act of 1962 did not contain language as strong as that which I advocated, it did nevertheless contain the provision that the "President shall transmit to the Congress after the close of each fiscal year a report concerning operations in that fiscal year under this Act. Each such report shall include information on progress under the freedom of navigation and nondiscrimination declaration contained in section 102." I, for one, shall be eagerly awaiting such progress report.

Thus I found of particular interest an article in the January 25, 1963, issue of the Los Angeles Times by the noted columnist, Victor Riesel. In the belief that this is of vital interest to us all, I have requested permission to have this article inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and it follows:

CARGO FOR CASTRO AND RED CHINA: WHO HALTED THE BLACKLIST MOVE?

(By Victor Riesel)

Apparently some authority quite high in the State Department does not deem the Communist buildup in Cuba a personal insult nor offensive to the United States. For someone inside the State Department has prevented other Government bureaus from punishing those shipowners who have run Communist supplies into Havana.

There is definite evidence that this authority has insisted that the United States continue to do business with ship operators who have been serving mainland China as well as Fidel Castro's military and economic machines.

Just why the Department of State has reversed decisions of other Federal agencies no one really knows. But that it did is quite certain, as in the case of the SS *Nora*, a Norwegian vessel of 8,998 tons. As recently as last July, at the height of the Soviet's secret buildup in Cuba, the *Nora* ran for Castro.

On October 2, the U.S. Maritime Administration publicized a list of NATO nations ships trading with Cuba, and the SS *Nora* was on the sheet.

Not long after that the United Arab Republic chartered the *Nora* to pick up 12,000 tons of tallow in the port of New York. This tallow is a sheep and cattle fat. It is used in making soap and in industrial finishing processes, such as the finishing of leather. The UAR was to receive the tallow under our foreign aid program.

Since the U.S. Department of Agriculture handles such transactions and checks on the ships' charters to see that we're not getting rooked on transportation costs, it checked the *Nora*.

The Department's special unit discovered her on the Maritime Administration's list. The Agriculture people vetoed the vessel.

Then they heard from the Department of State, which is in almost daily contact with Agriculture. The word from the State Department was firm. If the UAR wanted to use the *Nora*, it must be used. That was final. The charter was approved on December 17.

But there was an outcry from the Seafarers, from the American Maritime Association, which follows such matters closely, and from many of us who take the Cuban fascism as a personal insult.

On December 22, the *Nora* left without the tallow. But that's just the beginning of this story. Why are the UAR's wishes so paramount and pressing inside the State Department? It appears to be almost forgotten that the Nasser government in Cairo has blacklisted 33 U.S. vessels.

This blacklist is operated out of Alexandria by the Arab League's Israel Boycott Office. Any ship which does any business with Israel not only is prevented from doing business with members of the Arab League, but is forbidden to use the Suez Canal.

Yet, the State Department insists on giving the UAR full rights, though Cairo denies 33 of our ships the right to pass through the Suez, at both ends of which are ports to which we send so much foreign aid. These harbors are Port Said and Alexandria.

Furthermore, the United Arab Republic could hire American ships, giving work to U.S. seamen to carry U.S. Government-generated cargoes of aid from our gulf ports to Egypt.

But to add insult to this injury to our shipping people, as well as to our national dignity, there is another United Arab Republic practice unreported until this very moment.

Here's what the United Arab Republic has done: It has boycotted some 300 ships in all by placing them on the proscribed list in Alexandria. These ships are operated by owners in Greece, Norway, Britain, Italy, Sweden, as well as in the United States. Any operator can get his vessel off the list if he pledges not to deal with Israel.

Recently the boycott office lifted the blacklisting of the Norwegian ship *Tove Lilian* after the owners promised not to trade with Israel.

Last summer this column discovered that the *Tove Lilian* was in the port of Leningrad being loaded. It was taking on vital cargo for Cuba.

Thus we find that the United Arab Republic prefers to deal with ships that supply Communist cargoes to Communist Cuba rather than vessels which deal with the

democratic Government of Israel. And our State Department then insists that we still defer to the wishes of the United Arab Republic when it comes to transporting the generous aid we send to Egypt, mostly at our expense.

## President of All the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 18, 1963*

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has a very difficult role in these days of grave international crises. No other public official in the world is subject to more universal criticism than our President.

John F. Kennedy is constantly bringing new and greater respect to the office of the Presidency. A recent Gallup poll indicated almost unprecedented popular support in this country for his endeavors.

The other day I had the opportunity of seeing the London Sunday Telegraph for January 13, 1963, which contained a most glowing tribute to the President by an Englishman, Peregrine Worsthorne.

The critique of our President's accomplishments contained in this article certainly reflect in the eyes of one noted expert on the subject that the President is realizing his desire of molding Western interests together in a supranational spirit of peace and prosperity.

Mr. Worsthorne makes very significant points in his article and under leave to extend my remarks, I am very pleased to present this article for the RECORD:

PRESIDENT OF ALL THE WEST

(By Peregrine Worsthorne)

After 2 months of working in Washington from Cuba onward, I began to think about Mr. Kennedy, not as the 35th President of the United States, but as the first President of all the West, and to feel a much wider and stronger political involvement with him and his administration than I do with the British Prime Minister and his government.

For rather an old-fashioned Tory like myself this was a most disturbing experience, affecting my whole attitude to political relations, comparable in political terms to what a change of sex would be physically.

By this I do not mean that I began to feel in any way more American or less British. Nothing as straightforward as that. The magnetism of Mr. Kennedy's Washington is that it is genuinely supranational, with a style of government and an approach to the world which is quite as un-American as it is un-English, just as exhilaratingly—or disturbingly—new and strange and challenging for the native American from Chicago, say, as it is for the Englishman from London.

It is quite simply a Government which is the first in history to be absorbed, even obsessed to the exclusion almost of all else, with the revolutionary challenge of thermonuclear power.

Unlike Mr. Khrushchev, whose political attitudes are even now primarily governed by Communist ideology, or General de Gaulle, still poignantly concerned with the glories of France, or Mr. Macmillan, urgently preoccupied with the search for new British alinements, or Mao Tse-tung, faced with the stark threats of famine and ruin, or Nehru, Adenauer, and the rest, all of whose past experiences and present political anxieties preclude concentration on the facts of thermonuclear life, President Kennedy is alone able and willing to put first things first.

PARAMOUNT PROBLEM

That is why of all the world's capitals, including Moscow, Washington is the only one today where the thermonuclear problem takes precedence over all else. To have an administration with its head permanently in the mushroom clouds is as irritating and frustrating to American Senators seeking to promote special State interests as it is to allied heads of government seeking to enlist U.S. aid for their own national interests. But to the visiting reporter, without any particular ax to grind, this absorption with the No. 1 new question of the age is precisely what has restored to Washington its pristine quality of revolutionary dedication.

This could not have been more apparent than in the weeks immediately after Cuba. Talking to Presidential aids like McGeorge Bundy and Walt Rostow, both of whom had been closely involved with decisions that could have destroyed the world, it was impossible not to recognize that this experience had introduced a new dimension into their political thinking almost wholly lacking among their counterparts in this country.

The kind of ordeal which they had just been through is almost impossible to imagine, particularly if it is extended even higher in the chain of responsibility to the President himself, who, on the fateful night just before Khrushchev blinked, had even ordered the transport to take him and his staff to the deep shelter Headquarters in Virginia from where thermonuclear war would be fought to its catastrophic end.

AND NOW IMPATIENCE

It is surely scarcely surprising that men who have lived through that week, and well realize that they, and only they, will have to live through it again in the event of another comparable crisis, find it difficult to understand why any ally should wish to complicate their problems. Against this background they find the arguments for a British national deterrent as irrelevant and archaic as those absurd demarcation disputes which used to convulse the prerevolutionary French court about which duke should be allowed to carry the King's slippers.

Like so much else, British reactions to this American impatience is very much a question of generations, but since returning from the United States 10 days ago I have found nobody under 30 who is not fully prepared to accept American strategic leadership. What is more, it seems to me that more and more young people respond to Kennedy much more readily than they respond to their own Prime Minister; read his speeches, look at his television appearances, and talk about his family, etc., as if in their minds he was already far more relevant politically than any of the leaders whom they have themselves elected.

GLITTERING COURT

I do not believe this is just accident. One of the most revolutionary changes which President Kennedy has introduced into American government is a conscious effort to attract European popular support, even at the expense of shocking and alienating his own countrymen. In many ways Washington today is attempting to be what Versailles was in the 17th century, not merely a center of a great national Government, but a glittering court that casts its spell across the whole civilized world. Artists, philosophers, couturiers, chefs, leaders of fashion and of thought, drawn for the most part from Europe than from America itself, throng the White House in a way that would have seemed shocking and shameful to its earlier occupants.

More un-American activities of this kind go on in the American capital than in any other place in the world. Senator McCarthy, not to mention George Washington, would turn in his grave. What other President's wife, for example, would have thought of inviting the Mona Lisa to Washington, or if she had, is it likely that the French would have sent it?

These are, of course, only the outward and visible signs of a new style of American life at the top—a determination to bring America's social and cultural horizons into line with her worldwide expansion of power. Under Truman and Eisenhower the United States sought to lead the world metaphorically speaking, from a log cabin. President Kennedy has purposefully discarded this traditional American approach, consciously choosing a style which owes far more to the Old World than to the New, and one which is likely to appeal far more to Europe than to the Middle West.

FAREWELL TO PRINCE HAL

This is not only conscious choice. It is also inescapable necessity, since Mr. Kennedy himself could not fit into the traditional folksy American style, even if he tried. His manner is essentially unplebian, harking far back to the early aristocratic 18th century leaders of the young Republic. Watching him perform at his first post-Cuba press conference I was tempted even to go further and see him almost in a Shakespearian light, as he marched to the rostrum, royally handsome and commanding, far more like a young king back from foreign wars than a Republican leader about to be questioned by the press.

Indeed, to someone like myself who had not seen him in the flesh since his carefree senatorial days, the occasion was intensely, almost theatrically, moving, reminding me of that superb scene in Henry IV, part II, when Prince Hal ceases to be the playboy friend of Falstaff and assumes the grave authority of sovereign power.

Nobody who saw Mr. Kennedy then, restrained, yet gloriously confident in his hour of victory, could avoid concluding that in him the West has a leader who in personal style can out-act any other figure on the world stage today, a glittering heroic figure out of an earlier age.

MAN OF DESTINY

Perhaps this sounds like the lucubrations of a "Limey at the Court of King Kennedy." But as the President's full impact begins to make itself felt I am convinced that many others will react in the same way.

For what we are witnessing is the conjunction of two historic facts. First the mounting evidence that the security of all the free peoples rests primarily on the shoulders of this man, and that he, more than anyone else in the next 6 years, is likely to take the decisions that most crucially affect our lives; and secondly that the man destiny has chosen for this role has the stuff of greatness about him.

I do not see how, in the long run, this conjunction of circumstances can fail to change the way Europe looks at the United States, making it possible for the first time to conceive of a new office, in fact if not in name: President of the West. With the grand old men, Macmillan, de Gaulle, Adenauer, Nehru, not to mention Khrushchev and Mao, still on the scene, perhaps this is merely fanciful. But it is more than likely that these venerable figures will soon pass away, leaving Mr. Kennedy behind to confront their successors, no longer as the brash young newcomer but as the only remaining

veteran of the old order. To his other qualities, in short, superior experience will soon also be added.

I find this, frankly, an exciting prospect and one which the Allies should welcome and exploit, since it offers the forces of freedom the greatest uncovenanted blessing since God gave us Winston Churchill.

## New York State Republican Shenanigans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, January 29, 1963*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following joint statement of Senator Joseph Zaretzki and Assemblyman Anthony J. Travia, Democratic legislative leaders in New York.

It is most unfortunate that the Governor of New York resorts to the political conduct, or should I say misconduct, referred to.

Under unanimous consent I insert the following statement in the Appendix of the RECORD:

JOINT STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOSEPH ZARETZKI AND ASSEMBLYMAN ANTHONY J. TRAVIA, DEMOCRATIC LEGISLATIVE LEADERS

This session of the legislature will be called upon by Governor Rockefeller to appropriate funds to finance his personal gestapo. The Governor seeks to have the legislature endorse and retroactively finance his re-creation of the one-man investigating commission—a post that the legislature itself previously abolished.

The one-man investigating commission originally was created under the Dewey administration, but the Republican legislative majority hastened to abolish the post when it came under the control of a Democratic State administration, and in its place established the four-man bipartisan State Commission of Investigation.

But Governor Rockefeller, for his own political purposes, wanted a personal gestapo beholden only to him to do his dirty work. He did not dare to propose this openly to the legislature. He waited until long after the legislature had adjourned and, in the midst of his reelection campaign, appointed Herman T. Stichman as a special commissioner and special assistant attorney general with vast and virtually unlimited powers to pry into anything the Governor chose. With the acquiescence of the Republican legislative leaders, he advanced $300,000 of State funds to finance the job.

The Governor already had cut this year's appropriation for the State commission of investigation, thus curtailing its operations. He allowed the State investigation commission only $600,000, but he gave his new private eye half of what the State investigation commission got to cover the entire State for one job only—to go into New York City to pry for purely political purposes; to do a hatchet job.

Why does this 1-man OGPU need $300,000 to investigate in one city while the State investigation commission, with the responsibility for conducting investigations throughout the entire State is given only $600,000?

If the Governor were at all sincere about wanting a job done on a bipartisan or nonpartisan basis, then he should have given the additional $300,000 to the State investigation commission, which already has the responsibility and the authority, instead of creating a new post to overlap the State investigation commission's field. Nor was there any need to assign the investigation of the telephone company boiler explosion in New York City to his own personal investigator instead of to the State investigation commission, except to make it a purely political probe for campaign purposes.

Why did he need a personal investigating agent when he already had an established State investigating agency if it were not to serve his own political purposes? Why did he take the underhanded method of creating this personal investigating agency by executive order in the absence of the legislature if it were not because he dared not do it openly?

But he had no qualms about using the taxpayers' money to set up his own private political detective agency as long as it could be done by executive order before the public knew anything about it.

We intend to demand a detailed accounting of the activities of this private eye before we approve any appropriation.

### PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

### RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

### LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

### GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

### CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

### CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

# Appendix

## Administering a Public-Land State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. HOWARD W. CANNON

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, January 30, 1963*

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, on December 11 through 13 of 1962, the National Association of Counties held its grazing, water, and revenue conference in Las Vegas, Nev. During the course of the conference, Gov. Grant Sawyer gave an address entitled "Governing a Federally Owned State." In that address he pointed out some of the difficulties which arise as a result of the high percentage of federally controlled land and some of the efforts being made to facilitate the cooperative agreements that must necessarily be entered into.

His speech gives an interesting and informative résumé of the admission of Nevada to the Union and for these reasons should make interesting reading for Members of the Congress.

During past sessions I have attempted at different times to abate the view held by many people that Nevada was not a good place to hold conventions. In each case where meetings have been scheduled and held these reservations have been eliminated. Consequently, I am pleased that Governor Sawyer chose to begin his remarks by setting out for the record the true facts as they relate to some of these misconceptions.

I ask unanimous consent that Governor Sawyer's remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY GOV. GRANT SAWYER, OF NEVADA

I would like, at the outset of your gathering, to make an observation: I am most confident that you will find that the facilities and environment for serious deliberation in Las Vegas rank with the best in the world. After all, gentlemen, your meetings take place in the day time. And the dazzle of our entertainment grows brightest after sundown. So, unless you insist upon enjoying all of the sights of this remarkable city, you will find ample opportunity to get down to the business of good government.

But seriously, there has been concern in some quarters about the selection of Las Vegas for no-nonsense conventions.

The highly proper American Medical Association was invited in 1961 to hold its convention in this city. The bid was rejected for an outspoken minority felt the atmosphere was unfit for a serious-minded convention such as theirs.

This year, however, an equally august group, the American Academy of General Practice, held its convention here in Las Vegas. The membership was delighted with the results. The Las Vegas site drew the largest turnout the academy had ever enjoyed at a convention.

In a letter to the Las Vegas convention director, the executive director of the academy had some words of advice for the other cautious groups. He wrote: "To whatever extent I may have felt originally that we were gambling in selecting Las Vegas, I can only say now that we hit the jackpot. To those other groups who have waited to see how the academy fared, I can give hearty reassurance that Las Vegas can be included in their future schedules with full confidence."

So the American Medical Association also came to Las Vegas, and enjoyed one of the finest conventions of its distinguished existence. AMA's success has been repeated by many other of the Nation's top-ranking organizations. During the first 9 months of this year, 91 convention groups, totaling 89,752 delegates and associates, have been held in our Las Vegas convention center. Our resort hotels, moreover, provide the best in convention facilities.

Las Vegas, then, offers the ideal package for conventions: the proper atmosphere for serious deliberations, and the drawing power of the world's finest entertainment. I am confident you will find this to be a fact during your visit in this city.

The subject of administering a public-land State is perhaps not too different than in States where a large percentage of land is in private ownership. Nevada does, however, point the problem up more than other States because Federal ownership controls all but about 13 percent of the land area of the State.

Before going into some of the statistics of the State, you might be interested in a brief review of some of the early history of Nevada. What is now Nevada was owned by Mexico up to the time of the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848 when Mexico ceded to the United States the area covered by the States of California, Nevada, and Utah, the larger part of Arizona, about one-half of New Mexico and small parts of Wyoming and Colorado. This cession, representing about 18 percent of the total area of the United States, cost about $16 million.

It was in 1846, 2 years previous to the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, that the fatal journey of the Donner party in its attempt to reach California over the Sierra Nevada Mountains a few miles westerly of Reno, took place, and it was in 1847, 1 year later that the Mormon people, led by Brigham Young, arrived in the region adjacent to Great Salt Lake. Some years after arriving in the great basin, Brigham Young and his people began to colonize this little-known region, and in 1849 organized the free and independent State of Deseret. This State embraced a large area extending south from the 42d degree of latitude, which is the northern boundary of California, Nevada, and Utah, to the 33d degree of latitude near the southern Arizona boundary and westerly from the Rocky Mountains to the Sierra Nevada Mountains, and including a section of territory now in southern California, with Salt Lake City as its capital. Congress rejected a memorial asking for recognition as a territorial government. In 1850 California was made a State, the territory of Utah was created, and also the territory of New Mexico. The Utah territory extended from the Rocky Mountains to the California State line and from the 42d degree of latitude to the 37th degree of latitude.

At that time, what is now Clark County with Las Vegas as its county seat, was in the territory of New Mexico and remained so until it became a part of the territory of Arizona which was created in 1863.

On March 2, 1861, the Territory of Nevada was created and James Nye was appointed Governor of the Territory by Abraham Lincoln. When Governor Nye arrived to take over his duties he brought with him Orien Clemens as his secretary. Orien Clemens was accompanied by his secretary, his brother Samuel Clemens, better known by his nom de plume of "Mark Twain," who subsequently related in one of his books that he found out after arriving his job carried no salary.

On October 31, 1864, the Territory of Nevada became a State. Clark County and parts of Lincoln and Nye Counties were not in the State but were still in the Territory of Arizona. In 1866, by a congressional act, this southern boundary of the State was moved 2° southward, which took in Clark County. However, it was provided that this area could not be added to the State without approval by the State legislature, which was not obtained until 1867. History relates that during the legislative deliberations there was some discussion as to whether or not they should add to the State such a barren waste of volcanic rock. Little did the early pioneers visualize the present-day Las Vegas.

Nevada has an area of 70,265,000 acres of which 61 million is owned by the Federal Government. This represents 86.9 percent Federal ownership. Other than Alaska, Nevada has more Federal ownership than any other State. California follows with 45 million acres representing 44.9 percent, then Utah with 36,400,000 acres or 69.1 percent federally owned.

The federally owned land in Nevada is under the jurisdiction of a number of agencies, the major ones being Bureau of Land Management, 47,360,000 acres; Forest Service, 5,058,000 acres; Air Force, 3,331,000 acres; Fish and Wildlife, 2,927,000 acres; and Bureau of Reclamation, 1,160,000 acres.

The 9,240,000 acres not in Federal ownership includes the grants to railroads comprising 5,086,000 acres. The remaining lands in private ownership represent about 6 percent of the State's total area.

In 1867 Nevada, through its legislature, consented to take advantage of the 16- and 36-section grant, but in 1880, also through its legislature, it consented to relinquish the 16 and 36 section grant and to take in lieu thereof 2 million acres to be selected on any part of the surveyed open public domain. Apparently the State at that time felt it necessary to enter into that compromise. The surveys of the public lands were proceeding so slowly and the young State so desperately in need of revenue on which to exist that, at that time, there seemed no alternative.

Nevada received in total grants 2,733,564 acres of land. At this time, in 1962, there are only a few hundred acres of land remaining from the grants in State ownership. Of the 11 Western States, Nevada received by far the smallest acreage in grants. The next lowest was the State of Washington with 3,077,000 acres in grant land. New Mexico received 13,153,000 acres, Arizona 10,589,000 acres, California 8,837,000 acres, Utah 7,550,000 acres.

The basic industry in Nevada has until recently been agriculture and mining. Of recent years recreation has become one of Nevada's major industries and it is growing. Not content to rely upon this one industry, Nevadans have started a new State program to attract industry to Nevada and it is paying off in new payrolls of hundreds of thousands of dollars. Names such as Rolley, North American, Aerojet, and Sandia grace the State roll of home industries and many others are surveying the State as sites for branch offices and plants.

But what is most important, industry is discovering a political and personal climate created by aggressive, warm, friendly, imaginative, and progressive people. This is the greatest inducement of all, along with a low and limited tax structure. So, within the last 3 years small industries have been locating in both our large and small counties. I do not intend to indicate that we have scored an industrial breakthrough. But we have started, and we must walk before we can run.

The population of the State 10 years ago was approximately 150,000. Today it exceeds the 350,000 mark. Next to Alaska, we are the smallest State in population, but per capita we are the fastest growing State in the Union.

Informed predictions tell us to expect over 500,000 residents in the next 8 years. Of this number, more than 135,000 will be of school age. This would be 25,000 more than the entire population of the State in 1940.

As we daily lay the solid foundations for the future, we can also expect a record prosperity. The personal income of Nevadans, estimated at $512 million in 1960, should increase to almost $2 billion by 1970. Tourism, which should bring in about $660 million this year, is expected to double in the same period.

This, then is a brief picture of Nevada. We are in a period of fantastic boom and we must do everything we can to develop all the resources at our disposal. Being a State with 87 percent of her land owned by the Federal Government, we have attempted to use another very valuable resource at our disposal—the Federal Government.

Along this line, I authorized the creation of a resources council under the direct charge of our State department of conservation. This council, known as the Governor's natural resources council was enacted in November of 1959 and is made up of 14 State agencies and 5 Federal agencies, all working in the field of natural resources. The five agencies are Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Forest Service, Soil Conservation Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, and Indian service.

I cannot stress too much the important work this council has done in the field of better coordination and better operations. It has provided a mechanism to facilitate exchange of information so that each agency can plan its program with full knowledge and better understanding of the related programs of other agencies. The council provides a forum for discussion and clarification of matters of mutual concern. At the present time the council is working out the final details of a proposed State development plan.

Our relations with the Federal agencies has been good. We have made every effort to bring around good working relationship and have made them feel they are a part of our team. I can say that we have found the personnel of these agencies most receptive. This is, we think, important in a public-domain State such as Nevada if we are to develop our natural resources to meet the ever-increasing demands of rapid growth.

## Fortune Magazine Article on Cuban Invasion Worth Rereading in Light of Recent Discussion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, after the ill-fated Cuban invasion, Charles J. V. Murphy, the respected and thorough Washington editor of Fortune magazine, did a full scale study of what had taken place and this I placed in the RECORD of September 20, 1961, A7456–A7460. It is noteworthy that at that time President Kennedy called the article "the most inaccurate" published about the Cuban affair, and although we have all become more used to the heavy handed pressures of the Kennedy administration upon the press, we had not reached the stage of "managed news" that exists now. The Murphy Fortune article was later awarded the best foreign reporting award by the Overseas Press Club of New York—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 16, 1962, page 7829—an organization not exactly noted for being critical of the Kennedy administration. What happened was that honest reporters and editors knew these were the facts and were able at that time to vote as their consciences dictated. Now in a recent interview with President Eisenhower, David Kraslow, of the Chicago Daily News—St. Louis Post-Dispatch service, in an article dated December 23, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, says:

He mentioned favorably an article that appeared last year in Fortune magazine, purporting to give the inside story of what went wrong in the Bay of Pigs planning.

General Eisenhower repeated his praise for this article and its accuracy on CBS–TV during an interview with Walter Cronkite, Wednesday, January 23, as part of the "CBS Report" series. In view of the fact that reliable reports reached me at the time of the original Fortune piece that the White House had sent at least one general and others up to New York to try to suppress this story, and having failed to do so, sought to discredit it, it does seem appropriate for all of us to reread this Fortune article. This is all the more necessary in light of Attorney General Robert Kennedy's interview in U.S. News & World Report this month rewriting history about Cuba. It is to be hoped that the editors of Fortune will continue to report the news as they find it and that efforts to blackball, intimidate, and otherwise harass editors like Mr. Murphy will be stopped. We need a free press and the members of the press need to fight a lot harder for it.

The above-mentioned article follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Dec. 23, 1962]

EISENHOWER ADVOCATES TRUTH OVER MANAGED NEWS POLICY

(By David Kraslow)

GETTYSBURG, PA., December 22.—Former President Eisenhower believes that truth is a better weapon in the cold war against communism than managed news.

In an exclusive 1-hour interview in his office on the Gettysburg College campus, Eisenhower spoke with feeling on the controversy that erupted in the wake of the Kennedy administration's handling of news in the recent Cuban crisis. He spoke as one who had lived with the problem during 8 years in the White House.

His comments implied criticism of President Kennedy's news policies, but not once did Eisenhower refer by name to Mr. Kennedy or any official in his administration.

However, when Eisenhower wanted to urge more truth and less news management, he chose to turn around a statement made by a Department of Defense official in the Cuban crisis. The statement he chose was the one made by Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs. Sylvester admitted that news was used as a weapon in the showdown with the Soviet Union.

Eisenhower had known for several weeks that the interview would deal almost entirely with the news management issue. He was told so in the written request for the interview.

NECESSARY COLORING

We have to recognize, he stressed, that on sensitive international matters governments occasionally have to color or withhold news, but he warned that this can be heady stuff, that such a practice, unless sharply controlled, can easily lead to distortion and manipulation of news for political convenience rather than for national security.

He said that there was some indication of management of news not merely in the interests of national security, but for personal reasons. He did not relate this remark to the Cuban crisis or otherwise explain it.

Eisenhower said that he has no reason to think that the American people have not been told the truth on the Cuban situation, but he noted that he does not know all the facts.

He said that he sees no reason why the administration should not now release a full and official version of what happened in the abortive attempt to invade Cuba in April 1961. The Bay of Pigs invasion is history, he said, and the official story should have been told long ago.

He mentioned favorably an article that appeared last year in Fortune magazine, purporting to give the inside story of what went wrong in the Bay of Pigs planning.

Eisenhower expressed surprise when informed that Mr. Kennedy, at a press conference, branded the article as inaccurate. He said that he was not aware that the President had made such a statement.

A TOUGH QUESTION

If management of news is to be accepted, Eisenhower was asked, how can the people feel assured that the Government is not using this power to conceal mistakes and even scandals?

That, he replied, is a really tough question, one that he wrestled with in the White House. He is not sure that there is a satisfactory answer. He was aware, he said, that he had been criticized severely a number of times for what was called excessive secrecy.

He said that there must be a certain amount of trust in a President and that a

President should apply a rule of reason consonant with the first amendment's guarantees of a free press.

As a matter of principle, he said, he is against censorship, even in wartime, because he regards it as self-defeating. "We don't want to tell the enemy anything, of course," he noted, "but the important thing is to keep faith with the American people and our heritage. We must not confuse our people and undermine the credibility of our Government."

REGRETS ACTION IN U-2 CASE

Eisenhower then indicated his regret that he did not obey his instincts when Francis Gary Powers and his U-2 reconnaissance plane were shot down over the Soviet Union. His advisers urged him to put out the cover story that had long been prepared to disguise the spying mission in such an eventuality.

His instinct told him to say nothing, he said, but he finally accepted the strong advice of his aids.

Soviet Premier Khrushchev then proved to the world, by producing Powers and photographs of his plane, that the U.S. Government had lied.

Apparently the incident still nettles Eisenhower, and perhaps helps to explain the strong views he expressed on the danger of tampering with a flow of honest news in a free society. It is so easy to misuse power. Government should never fool the people for the sake of fooling the people, he said.

## Msgr. Franklyn J. Kennedy and Catholic Herald Citizen Lead Fight Against Racial Prejudice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, America's position in the world today requires that we remove from our shores all traces of prejudice, discrimination, and segregation. One of the most important leaders in this fight is Msgr. Franklyn J. Kennedy, editorial manager of the Catholic Herald Citizen, of Milwaukee.

The Herald Citizen recently covered the National Conference on Religion and Race in Chicago. This conference was attended by 700 Catholic, Protestant, Orthodox, and Jewish leaders from all over the country. I include an article from the Catholic Herald Citizen covering this conference. I also include the final statement which the conference issued, "An Appeal to the Conscience of America." Monsignor Kennedy has said of this document that it "is not only a stirring reminder of the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation, it is a call to action":

RACIAL PREJUDICE IS AN INSULT TO GOD; IT MUST GO NOW, CONFERENCE STATES

CHICAGO.—More than 700 representatives of the Nation's major faiths met for 4 days here last week in a National Conference on Religion and Race. Because they agreed unanimously that "racial discrimination and segregation are an insult to God," they issued "An Appeal to the Conscience of the American People."

Catholic, Orthodox, Protestant, and Jewish clergymen confessed that their churches had done little in focusing their peoples' attention on the immorality of racial prejudice. Frequent references were made to the possibilities that if the churches had spoken out in a united voice more than 100 years ago the Civil War might have been avoided.

The conference did more than lament the failure of the churches and issue a statement. It decided to set up 10 pilot projects to provide religious leadership in an attack on racial bias on an interreligious basis. These cities were selected on a regional basis: Chicago, Detroit, New Orleans, Oakland, San Francisco, St. Louis, San Antonio, Seattle, and Pittsburgh. There is a possibility that other cities—including Milwaukee, Washington, and New York—will undertake the project at a later date.

The conference was convened by the social action department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference (its chairman is Archbishop Cousins); the Department of Racial and Cultural Relations of the National Council of Churches; and the Social Action Commission of the Synagogue Council of America.

At the plenary session on Monday evening, Cardinal Meyer was the Catholic spokesman on the subject: "Interracial Justice and Love: Challenge to a Religious America." Archbishop Cousins was chairman of this meeting. In addition to these members of the American hierarchy, there were 2 more archbishops and 19 bishops present. At the various workshops and forums, they shared the platform with rabbis and ministers and lay people from the 68 participating religious groups.

More than one speaker from each of the religious faiths commented publicly that the conference was an outgrowth of the Ecumenical Council called by Pope John XXIII.

Archbishop Cousins said: "He has shown us all the way to work together. In the past, misgivings and misunderstandings have hampered cooperative effort. Now, following our Holy Father's example, we meet as brethren in the fullest Christian sense."

AN APPEAL TO THE CONSCIENCE OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

We have met as members of the great Jewish and Christian faiths held by the majority of the American people, to counsel together concerning the tragic fact of racial prejudice, discrimination and segregation in our society. Coming as we do out of various religious backgrounds, each of us has more to say than can be said here. But this statement is what we as religious people are moved to say together.

I

Racism is our most serious domestic evil. We must eradicate it with all diligence and speed. For this purpose we appeal to the consciences of the American people.

This evil has deep roots; it will not be easily eradicated. While the Declaration of Independence did declare "that all men are created equal" and "are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights," slavery was permitted for almost a century. Even after the Emancipation Proclamation, compulsory racial segregation and its degrading badge of racial inequality received judicial sanction until our own time.

We rejoice in such recent evidences of greater wisdom and courage in our national life as the Supreme Court decisions against segregation and the heroic, nonviolent protests of thousands of Americans. However, we mourn the fact that patterns of segregation remain entrenched everywhere—north and south, east and west. The spirit and the letter of our laws are mocked and violated.

Our primary concern is for the laws of God. We, Americans of all religious faiths, have been slow to recognize that racial discrimination and segregation are an insult to God, the Giver of human dignity and human rights. Even worse, we all have participated in perpetuating racial discrimination and segregation in civil, political, industrial, social, and private life. And worse still, in our houses of worship, our religious schools, hospitals, welfare institutions, and fraternal organizations we have often failed our own religious commitments. With few exceptions we have evaded the mandates and rejected the promises of the faiths we represent.

We repent our failures and ask the forgiveness of God. We ask also the forgiveness of our brothers, whose rights we have ignored and whose dignity we have offended. We call for a renewed religious conscience on this basically moral evil.

II

Our appeal to the American people is this:

Seek a reign of justice in which voting rights and equal protection of the law will everywhere be enjoyed; public facilities and private ones serving a public purpose will be accessible to all; equal education and cultural opportunities, hiring and promotion, medical and hospital care, open occupancy in housing will be available to all.

Seek a reign of love in which the wounds of past injustices will not be used as excuses for new ones; racial barriers will be eliminated; the stranger will be sought and welcomed; any man will be received as brother—his rights, your rights; his pain, your pain; his prison, your prison.

Seek a reign of courage in which the people of God will make their faith their binding commitment; in which men willingly suffer for justice and love; in which churches and synagogues lead, not follow.

Seek a reign of prayer in which God is praised and worshiped as the Lord of the universe, before whom all racial idols fall, who makes us one family and to whom we are all responsible.

In making this appeal we affirm our common religious commitment to the essential dignity and equality of all men under God. We dedicate ourselves to work together to make this commitment a vital factor in our total life.

We call upon all the American people to work, to pray, and to act courageously in the cause of human equality and dignity while there is still time, to eliminate racism permanently and decisively, to seize the historic opportunity the Lord has given us for healing an ancient rupture in the human family, to do this for the glory of God.

## Part 4: Let's Keep the Record Straight—A Selected Chronology of Cuba and Castro, March 12, 1962–September 13, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I now offer part 4 of my chronology of Cuba and Castro, as my continuing effort to refresh the memories of the Congress and of the American people on the course of events taking place between Cuba and the

United States and which now are a part of our modern history.

We find detailed here the desperation of Premier Fidel Castro in his efforts to cope with economic chaos in Cuba. We find the Cuban youth being urged to develop a more intense "Marxist spirit, a more Communist spirit," and their Premier promising them the glories of a "more advanced stage, not socialism, but communism."

Then we find on March 28, 1962, the first U.S. State Department reports of Soviet bloc military aid to Cuba.

We find $62 million in ransom demanded for Cuban prisoners taken during the abortive uprising of the exiles.

And we find the odd spectacle of President Kennedy announcing that these Cuban prisoners are really a responsibility of the United States because they were "trained and armed for this invasion by the Eisenhower administration" and given the "signal to let them go by the Kennedy administration." However, he states the U.S. Government will not negotiate with Cuba to ransom the prisoners. And the thought occurs to us that the American public then must pick up the pieces and be responsible for Government actions of which they were never really officially informed—and at this late date still have not been—if we analyze the President's thinking correctly. And our thoughts further turn to the four Americans known to be imprisoned in Red China: Hugh F. Redmond, Richard G. Fechteau, John T. Downey, and Bishop James E. Walsh. These men are known to be political hostages and our State Department declares their release and return to this country to be an issue of utmost importance.

We remember, too, the 21 prisoners of war who first refused repatriation after the Korean war was ended. Ten finally became disillusioned with dialectical materialism and returned to this country. One died in Red China. And 10 still remain there.

We think of the 389 American soldiers still officially regarded as missing out of the original figure of 944—and of whom no trace, report, or record has been found—since the Korean war.

And we finally think of the eight American prisoners—one being held in the Soviet Union, three held in the Soviet Zone of Germany, one held in Czechoslovakia, and another still thought to be held in Czechoslovakia.

And we wonder how the families and friends of these American prisoners feel and if perhaps the American public should not be reminded that these men, too, were caught in a Communist trap and deserve to be considered a national responsibility by the public and the American Government.

In this portion of the chronology we find reports of weapons, ammunition, and propaganda in the form of a Communist-authored book on how to wage guerrilla warfare are being sent to nine Latin American countries from Cuba. Then we learn of 20 Soviet ships carrying from 3,000 to 5,000 Communist-bloc technicians, goods and weapons, arriving in Cuba—with an acknowledgement 2 days later by the President that this was indeed true.

This recalls to mind the press conference on November 29, 1961, in which President Kennedy declared that the United States would be "most concerned" if the Castro regime in Cuba attempted to overthrow the existing government in the Dominican Republic or in any other Latin American state. And that prior to the news report of the shipments to Latin American countries of weapons and propaganda, the Guatemalan Government—on March 20, 1962—formally accused Cuba in a note to the Organization of American States of aiding an uprising in Guatemala.

The chronology details our military callup of 150,000 members of the Reserves to active duty and that three of our Republican Senators proposed amendments to the Presidential request for authority for the callup, which would give him added authority to prevent violation of the Monroe Doctrine and to intervene in Cuba, if it became necessary.

The American public, along about this time, was admonished by the President to "keep both their nerve and their heads." This brings to mind Plutarch, who in commenting on a man being praised for his foolhardy bravery, stated:

> There is a wide difference between true courage and a mere contempt of life.

And this quotation—in a nutshell—describes the difference in the attitude of a truly republican form of government—and the Communist form of government—toward human life.

The chronology follows:

A SELECTED CHRONOLOGY ON CUBA, MARCH 12 TO OCTOBER 24, 1962, BY THE LEGISLATIVE SERVICE, THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

March 12, 1962: Premier Fidel Castro announces nationwide food and soap rationing to become effective March 19. He links shortages of food and consumer goods to a "brutal economic blockade" against Cuba. He denounces "Yankee imperialism" for making "desperate efforts" to destroy the Cuban revolution. He also says that "we have the shame of not being able to fulfill promises because we made subjective analyses" and because many of Cuba's most skilled workers were either "taken away by imperialism" or "driven away by our mistrust although they could have been won over."

March 14, 1962: Premier Castro (at a University of Havana rally) urges Cuban youth to develop a more intense "Marxist spirit, a more Communist spirit," and says that the young in Cuba will some day live "in another more advanced stage, not socialism, but communism."

March 17, 1962: Premier Castro (in a television broadcast) declares that "the revolution needs to revise all the revolutionary nuclei and all the political apparatus * * * to do away with the errors and abuses and to gain good performance." He singles out those "who think they are more revolutionary than anybody and have the right to mistreat and humiliate others." He also criticizes the watchdog defense committees set up to guard against counterrevolution (which exist in every big city and throughout the countryside) as having committed injustices. "Observers linked Premier Castro's statements to the advancement of Communist Party assumption of authority in the Castro regime at Havana" (New York Times, Mar. 17, 1962).

March 20, 1962: Guatemala formally accuses Cuba of aiding an uprising in Guatemala: the charge is made in a note to the President of the Council of the Organization of American States.

March 22, 1962: House Government Operations Committee urges the U.S. Government to press a $99.4 million claim against Cuba for seizure of the Nicaro nickel plant in Oriente Province, because the plant had been operated by the U.S. Government.

March 23, 1962: U.N. Security Council rejects by a vote of 7 to 2 a Cuban charge that the Organization of American States violated the U.N. Charter in barring Cuba from the inter-American system. The Security Council also rejects by a vote of 7 to 4 a Cuban request that the question of the legality of the OAS action be submitted to the World Court.

On the same day, Fidel Castro and his brother Raul are named to the two top posts in the Secretariat of the Integrated Revolutionary Organization, the 25-man directorate which is to set up a single political party in Cuba. The Premier is named the organization's first secretary and Armed Forces Minister Raul Castro is named second secretary.

March 26, 1962: Premier Castro (in a radio-television broadcast) denounces Anibal Escalante, a long-time Cuban Communist leader, for having brought "real chaos to all the country" and having "tried to create an apparatus to pursue personal ends." He adds that Ecsalante has been "separated" and that he had much to do with inspiring a spirit of "sectarianism," leading many to believe that the only ones who could be given important posts "were the old and militant revolutionaries."

March 28, 1962: U.S. State Department issues report of Soviet bloc military aid to Cuba; it estimates that Cuba has received $100 million of military aid to train several hundred Cuban pilots in Czechoslovakia and provide 50 to 75 MIG jet fighters, and provide modern weapons for Cuba's ground forces of 300,000 men. These weapons include: 150 to 250 heavy and medium tanks, 50 to 100 assault guns, 500 to 1,000 field artillery pieces, 500 to 1,000 antiaircraft artillery guns, 500 mortars, 200,000 small arms, and some patrol vessels and torpedo boats.

March 29, 1962: Government begins trial (at Principe prison, in a suburb of Havana) of 1,182 prisoners captured after the unsuccessful invasion last April.

On the same day, the Council of the Organization of American States votes by 16 to 0, with 3 abstentions, to express a firm hope that the rebel prisoners will have every legal guarantee of their trial.

April 3, 1962: Ecuador severs diplomatic relations with Cuba, and becomes the 15th nation of the Americas to do so.

April 8, 1962: Military tribunal sentences each of the prisoners to 30 years imprisonment, but offers to free them on the payment of a total of $62 million in ransom. The ransom is set at $500,000 each for the 3 leaders of the invasion force, $100,000 for 221 others, and $50,000 or $25,000 for the remaining 995 men.

April 11, 1962: Pravda (official newspaper of the Soviet Communist Party) endorses the expulsion of Escalante by Premier Castro for trying to further his personal ambitions.

The Cuban exiles report from Havana that Cuba will release 54 sick and wounded prisoners, in return for ransom payment.

On the same day, President Kennedy (at a news conference) declares that the U.S. Government will not negotiate with Cuba to ransom the prisoners. "[These men] were

trained and armed for this invasion by the Eisenhower administration. The signal to let them go and the means to get them there were given by the Kennedy administration * * *. Can the U.S. Government * * * wash its hands of them? We think not. Though the idea of bartering with Castro for human lives is deeply repulsive, the United States still has a responsibility for those lives."

April 28, 1962: Premier Castro demands that the committee pay the $2.5 million ransom within 1 week; if not, he states that the remaining prisoners will be sent to the Isle of Pines to begin serving terms of 30 years imprisonment.

May 14, 1962: Tass (Soviet news agency) reports that the Soviet-Cuban trade agreement for 1962 is to be increased to about $750 million under an agreement signed in Moscow, a level of trade almost 40 percent higher than in 1961. The supplementary agreement calls for the supply of considerable quantities of wheat, corn, beans, fats, canned meat, and milk.

June 3, 1962: New York Herald Tribune states that President Kennedy has been given an intelligence report of clandestine movements of rifles, automatic weapons and ammunition from four dispersal centers in Cuba to nine Latin American countries: Nicaragua, Honduras, Venezuela, Brazil, Colombia, Peru, Ecuador, Paraguay and Bolivia. The report asserts that the arms have been accompanied by hundreds of copies of Maj. Ernesto Guevara's book, "Guerrilla Warfare."

June 16, 1962: Government parades tanks, troops, and artillery through the streets of Cardenas, a port 90 miles east of Havana, in response to popular demonstrations over food scarcities. President Osvaldo Dorticos Torrado denounces (at a political rally in Cardenas) "wretched counterrevolutionary provocations."

July 26, 1962: Premier Castro (in a speech at a celebration in Santiago de Cuba of the 9th anniversary of his 26th of July Movement) declares that President Kennedy "is set on launching an attack against our country." He announces to thousands of workers that rationing will be extended from food to shoes and clothing.

August 6, 1962: James Donovan, the U.S. lawyer representing the Cuban Families Committee, announces the opening of a public drive to raise the $62 million ransom required to free the 1,180 Cuban rebel prisoners. (Donovan is the American who arranged for the exchange of U–2 pilot Francis Gary Powers for convicted Soviet spy Rudolf Abel.)

August 20, 1962: Press reports state that between July 27 and July 31, 20 Soviet ships arrived at 4 ports in Cuba—3,000 to 5,000 Communist-bloc technicians and large quantities of goods and weapons are said to have been landed. "The equipment may include ground-to-air missiles, largely defense weapons. There apparently is transportation, electrical and construction equipment, radar vans and mobile generators. These appear to be going into coastal and air defense."

August 22, 1962: President Kennedy acknowledges, at a press conference, that Communist "supplies and technicians of rather intensive quantity in recent weeks" have been landing in Cuba.

August 24, 1962: Several buildings in Havana are damaged by shellfire from two small powerboats sent from Miami by the Student Revolutionary Directory, an exile group of former University of Havana students. The U.S. State Department states that the U.S. Government was not involved in the raid and had no prior knowledge of it.

August 28, 1962: Tass, the Soviet press agency, reports that the volume of shipments from the Soviet Union to Cuba in 1962 will be double that of 1961, and that 10 Soviet ships and 5 ships of West German, Norwegian, Greek and Italian registry are on the way to Cuba.

August 29, 1962: President Kennedy (at a press conference) states that United States has no intention of invading Cuba "at this time." He adds that "the words do not have some secondary meaning. I think it would be a mistake to invade Cuba." He declares that the United States has already been in consultation with NATO nations whose shipping firms have chartered vessels to the Soviet Union to haul military goods to Cuba.—"Even to consider [blockade or invasion] as possibilities requires far greater Latin American sympathy for Washington's attitude than now exists."

August 31, 1962: U.S. Navy plane on a training flight over international waters near Cuba is fired on by two naval vessels. The White House announces that the ships are believed to be Cuban, and that U.S. aircraft and ships have been authorized to use "all means necessary" to protect themselves against any similar attack in the future.

September 2, 1962: Soviet Union announces (in a communique issued on the talks between Minister of Industries Ernesto Guevara and Premier Khrushchev and other Soviet leaders) that it has agreed to supply arms to Cuba and to provide specialists to train Cuba's armed forces. The communique states that the arms are intended to meet the "threats" of "aggressive imperialist quarters," a watershed in hemispheric history. It was a power move in the cold war by the Soviet Union, as if a pawn had been advanced on a global chessboard. It was also a daring and defiant gambit by Premier Castro to strengthen his regime and his revolution. Cuba now cannot be invaded * * * without killing Russians. The added dangers of an invasion are clear. Far more than Cuba and Fidel Castro are involved. The wrecked Cuban economy will take a long time to rebuild—4 or 5 years at least, if the revolution lasts that long * * *. No direct move on our part could succeed unless the other Latin American powers went along with us.

"It took 50 years to create the OAS, and only the most extreme emergency would justify breaking it up" (New York Times, Sept. 9, 1962).

On the same day, a U.S. State Department spokesman declares that the Moscow announcement "merely confirms what has been going on in recent months."

September 4, 1962: President Kennedy declares (in a statement issued after consultation with congressional leaders) that the United States would use "whatever means may be necessary" to prevent Cuba from exporting "its aggressive purposes by force or the threat of force" against "any part of the Western Hemisphere." The President adds that "there is no evidence of any organized combat force from any Soviet-bloc country: of military bases provided to Russia * * * of the presence of offensive ground-to-ground missiles * * *. Were it to be otherwise the gravest issues would arise." He states that the Cuban question must be dealt with as part of the worldwide Communist challenge and in the context of the "special relationships which have characterized the inter-American system."

On the same day, the Latin American Free Trade Association (in its second conference in Mexico City of the nine members who have signed the association's charter so far) votes by 7 to 0, with Mexico and Brazil abstaining over juridical procedure, to reject Cuba's application for membership of the association, declaring that a Communist economy is incompatible with the market principles of free enterprise and free competition.

September 5, 1962: U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk holds a meeting with 19 Latin American Ambassadors in Washington and informs them of the U.S. determination to prevent the export of communism from Cuba. Press reports state that there was "full unanimity" with President Kennedy's "containment policy" that the United States would use "whatever means may be necessary" to prevent aggression by Cuba against any part of the Western Hemisphere.

September 7, 1962: President Kennedy asks Congress for authority to order 150,000 members of the military Reserves to active duty for a year, if necessary, "to permit prompt and effective responses * * * to challenge * * * in any part of the free world."

September 11, 1962: Soviet Union (in a statement issued by Tass, Soviet press agency) warns that any attack by the United States on Cuba or upon Soviet ships bound for Cuba would mean war. It asserts that Soviet arms in Cuba are for defensive purposes only. It adds that the Soviet Defense Ministry is taking "all measures to raise our armed forces to peak military preparedness."

On the same day, Premier Castro (in a speech to an educators' convention in Havana) declares that the United States is "playing with fire and with war," and adds that "we do not want imperialism to commit suicide on our coast."

Also on the same day, the Havana radio reports that a "pirate vessel" entered a harbor in north-central Cuba and fired more than 60 shots into a British freighter and a Cuban ship. An exile organization in Miami known as Alpha 66 acknowledges responsibility for the attack.

September 12, 1962: Three Republican Senators propose amendments to President Kennedy's reserve mobilization bill that would authorize the President to take "such action as is necessary" to prevent violation of the Monroe Doctrine and to intervene in Cuba.

On the same day, Moscow newspapers publish the statement of the Soviet Government warning of war if the United States interferes with Cuba.

The effect on Soviet policy of the Russian people's reactions toward Cuba: "There is considerable sympathy for the Cubans among the Russian people. However, there was an adverse public reaction in July 1960, when Premier Khrushchev implied that Soviet rockets would be launched if the United States attacked Cuba. The Premier later qualified this remark as symbolic. Experienced Western observers [in Moscow] believe that a large section of Soviet public opinion will feel unhappy about Soviet involvement in the Caribbean. Fear of war is often the dominant motivating factor in the reaction of the Soviet people to international crises. The defensive tone of the Soviet statement in describing the nature of military aid to Cuba lent support to this theory * * *. Mr. Khrushchev has barred world wars and * * * 'imperialist local wars' as instruments of policy * * *. However, he has appended two stipulations to this rule, both of which fit the case of Cuba * * *. First, Communists must support without reservation wars of 'national liberation.' Then, once such a war has been consolidated internally, as in the instance of the Castro revolution, it must be shielded by the Soviet Union under the slogan 'no export of counterrevolution.' In the Soviet statement this thesis was translated into the warning to the United States * * *. Western observers interpreted [the Soviet warning to the United States] as an indication that Soviet leaders were worried over the possibility that the United States might confront them with the necessity of intervening militarily in the Caribbean or retreating from their doctrine of "no export of counterrevolution.' They believe that Premier Khrushchev, well aware of the attitude of his people, will go to great lengths to avoid a conflict with the United States. But few were willing to predict what the Soviet leader would do if a [rebel] motorboat * * * suddenly put a torpedo into a Soviet ship in Caribbean waters." (Seymour Topping, New York Times, Sept. 13, 1962.)

September 13, 1962: President Kennedy asserts (at his weekly news conference) that

the United States would move swiftly against Cuba if the military buildup there threatened U.S. security in any way, "including our base at Guantanamo, our passage to the Panama Canal, our missile and space activities at Cape Canaveral, or the lives of American citizens in this country, or if Cuba should ever attempt to export its aggressive purposes by force or the threat of force against any nation in this hemisphere, or become an offensive military base of significant capacity for the Soviet Union." He says that if the United States should ever find it necessary to take military action against the Castro regime, the Communist-supplied weapons and technicians "would not change the result or significantly extend the time required to achieve the result." The President adds that the Cuban economy is crumbling as a result of Premier Castro's "own monumental economic mismanagement" and the economic boycott by the United States. He criticizes loose talk in the United States which serves "to give a thin color of legitimacy to the Communist pretense that such a threat [of an American invasion] exists." He expresses the hope that "the American people, defending as we do so much of the free world, will in this nuclear age, keep both their nerve and their heads."

## Cuban GI Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted to extend my remarks, I am including a letter which was sent to the President of the United States, by two Senators and me.

I feel that this letter from one of my constituents echoes the belief of may people in this country in regard to the conscience money which is being spent as a result of the Cuban fiasco.

The letter follows:

LOUISVILLE, KY., *January 28, 1963.*
His Excellency, JOHN F. KENNEDY,
*The President of the United States.*
Hon. THRUSTON MORTON,
*U.S. Senator.*
Hon. JOHN S. COOPER,
*U.S. Senator.*
Hon. GENE SNYDER,
*U.S. Representative.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT AND SIRS: Enclosed is an article from our local paper, the Louisville Times, dated January 26, 1963. The title of the artile, "Cuban GI Bill Due," is enough to make George Washington and the rest of this country's great past leaders turn over in their graves. Since when does the Government of the United States give veterans of other countries college and vocational training when it doesn't even give it to its own veterans who pay the taxes for such things. I am referring to the GI bill which was killed by Congress for the veterans of the cold war not so long ago. I ask you to tell me that these Cubans deserve such rights when Americans don't.

I spent 4 years on active duty and over a year in the Active Reserve. I received nothing for my time except the satisfaction that I was doing my duty for my country. I ask nothing in return as I feel I have been receiving my reward in the form of freedom that I enjoy every day. Thousands upon thousands of other men did the same. Why all of a sudden do we now have to give such rewards to the veterans of the Cuban invasion. They are not citizens of the United States and they were not fighting for the United States. Why do we have to reward the Cubans, we did not reward the Chinese when they were driven from the mainland, nor many others.

Why, if the U.S. Government wants to educate someone, doesn't it retrain the coal miners who are fast losing their jobs because of machines, and this is just one of a dozen or more fields where men are becoming obsolete if they don't receive special training. I think our first responsibility is to the American people. Perhaps the American people should have something to say about this proposed bill, after all we will be paying for it. I think they would rather send their sons and daughters to college with those taxes than send someone they don't know. I feel we should help those who helped us in the past, namely the ex GI out of work, the fathers and mothers who gave sons to die for our country, etc. If we make this a business of wholesale giveaway, then it will lose it's prestige to those who worked hard to earn it.

Not only are these men of the brigade being considered for such payments for fighting for their country, Cuba, but they are receiving well over a $100 a month for living expenses. Do the unemployed in our country receive that much money when they are out of work, I think not. Even those Cubans who are at present in the armed services of the United States are receiving special treatment. Not long ago they were removed from Fort Knox, Ky., to the south because of the severe weather. If these men cannot stand all climates of weather what good will they be to the United States if we have to fight a future war in Russia. Our GI's have fought all over the world in all extremes of weather. Are these men going to be able to rest out their days in the sunny south. What would have happened if George Washington, that winter in Valley Forge, had taken his army and run off to Mexico or someplace else. I think Americans learned long ago that nothing is won by running, so why do the Cubans leave their homeland by the thousands. Perhaps if these men want lessons, they should take a course in American history. It could teach them many things. I could continue on and on, such as why the brigade leaders called the President of the United States a liar concerning the air cover story. Possibly they never heard the old saying, "don't look a gift horse in the mouth."

Let me state here that I don't dislike the Cuban people, nor am I criticizing my Government or it's elected officials. I only want to know why the Cuban people are receiving preferential treatment when, I feel, that there are more deserving Americans. I think we should help these people to a reasonable extent. But I think the benefits mentioned are beyond reason. Our country is open to all peoples of the world as it should be, but why can't the Cuban people wait their turn as other peoples of other countries are doing. I don't feel we owe the people of Cuba anymore than the people of other countries.

I feel this matter should be taken before the American people. Abe Lincoln once said the Government was for the people and by the people. How are you going to know what the people want unless you ask them.

I would appreciate hearing an opinion from each of you gentlemen. Thank you for your time, and hoping to hear from you soon, I remain,

Sincerely,

DON L. THOMPSON.

## New Civil Rights Organization Formed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the field of civil rights is a vast one, and it requires a great deal of original work and study. Up to now, the American Civil Liberties Union of New York, with local branches in many States, has pretty much had this field to itself. During the past years, I have often had the occasion both to defend and to criticize this organization and its work. I have done this in the spirit of caring a great deal about the men and women whose fates hang upon the work done by American Civil Liberties Union and its opponents. I have had numerous RECORD items about American Civil Liberties Union and its projects. Last year I was honored to meet with the board of directors of American Civil Liberties Union, to share some rather frank thoughts with them. A new organization has sprung up called the Defenders of American Liberties. It will seek to handle cases which American Civil Liberties Union for its own reasons does not want to work with, or where limited funds allow only one organization to be active. Clearly the makeup of both organizations and their personnel is very different. This should not disturb people. Competition between a more conservative and liberal point of view in the civil rights field should help bring out new issues and assist thoughtful citizens in doing more in this field. The Newhouse newspapers story—St. Louis Globe-Democrat—and the Christian Science Monitor report of December 31, 1962, and January 2, 1963, respectively, follow:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Dec. 31, 1962]

MORRIS OUTLINES CIVIL RIGHTS FIGHT FOR CONSERVATIVES

DALLAS.—Two sparsely furnished rooms in a Dallas skyscraper are headquarters for an organization whose president says it is fighting for the civil rights of conservative Americans—and filling a vacuum by doing so.

The new organization is Defenders of American Liberties. Its president is Robert Morris, attorney, former New York City judge, former counsel to congressional investigating committees, and former president of the University of Dallas.

In 1960, Morris, then a Point Pleasant attorney, ran for the Republican Senate nomination in the New Jersey primary, but was defeated by Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE.

LIMIT CASES

Morris said the organization will not take any case in which a meritorious civil rights issue is not involved, and in any such case it limits its action to the cause of civil rights.

He said Defenders of American Liberties is looking for this kind of man in trouble: "A poor guy who is not a member of any particular organization, has no pressure group behind him—and, say, he's losing his farm because of a tax debt."

In fact, Defenders believes just such a man is L. R. Gajewski, a Mitchell, N. Dak., farmer.

Morris said Gajewski may lose all his land and buildings on an income tax lien, and on January 8 he is to go on trial on criminal charges growing out of the same circumstances. Defenders thinks his case has merit and will try to help.

NOT ALL OBSCURE

Not all cases taken on by Defenders are this obscure. Its most widely publicized case was that of retired Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker after his arrest following integration riots at the University of Mississippi last fall.

The officers of Defenders of American Liberties were convinced Walker was being railroaded into a mental hospital—and being denied his constitutional right to a speedy, public trial—through improper psychiatric evidence. Morris acted as Walker's civil rights counsel. As soon as the general's mental fitness was established, Morris removed himself and Defenders from the case. Morris has had no connection with Walker in any other legal capacity.

The organization is now preparing to defend seven New Yorkers charged with malicious mischief after they held a card party in a Yonkers store. In this kind of party, printed cards are hidden in merchandise to point out to purchasers that the store is dealing in Communist goods.

PREPARE BRIEFS

And Defenders is preparing briefs and hopes to intervene as a friend of the court in two cases involving public school prayers scheduled for hearing before the Supreme Court.

"The American Civil Liberties Union defends those who want to eliminate prayers and delete the word 'God' from public school," Morris said. "We are intervening on the side of those who would retain the word 'God.' Until now, those people had no group organized to help them. That's what I mean when I say we are filling a vacuum."

Defenders of American Liberties was founded in Chicago last June. Three of the founders—Morris J. Nelson, publisher of community newspapers in the Chicago area, attorney J. F. Schlafly, Jr., and Mrs. Carl Zeiss, widow of a vice president and general counsel of the Northern Trust Co.—asked Morris to join them and serve as president. He took over the job on August 15.

---

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 2, 1963]

GROUP DEFENDS U.S. TRADITIONALISTS

DALLAS.—Two sparsely furnished rooms in a Dallas skyscraper are headquarters for an organization whose president says it is fighting for the civil rights of conservative Americans—and filling a vacuum by doing so.

The new organization is Defenders of American Liberties. Its president is Robert Morris, attorney, former New York City judge, former counsel to congressional investigating committees, and former president of the University of Dallas, a Roman Catholic school.

Mr. Morris said the organization will not take any case in which a meritorious civil-rights issue is not involved, and in any such case it limits its action to the cause of civil rights.

He said Defenders of American Liberties is looking for this kind of man in trouble: "A poor guy who is not a member of any particular organization, has no pressure group behind him—and, say, he's losing his farm because of a tax debt."

EXAMPLES GIVEN

In fact, Defenders believes just such a man is L. R. Gajewski, a Matchell, N. Dak., farmer. Mr. Morris said Mr. Gajewski may lose all his land and buildings on an income tax lien, and on January 8 he is to go on trial on criminal charges growing out of the same circumstances. Defenders thinks his case has merit and will try to help.

Not all cases taken on by Defenders are this obscure. Its most widely publicized case was that of retired Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker after his arrest following integration riots at the University of Mississippi last fall.

The officers of Defenders of American Liberties were convinced General Walker was being railroaded into a mental hospital—and being denied his constitutional right to a speedy, public trial—through improper psychiatric evidence.

Mr. Morris acted as General Walker's civil rights counsel. As soon as the general's mental fitness was established, Mr. Morris removed himself and Defenders from the case. Mr. Morris has had no connection with General Walker in any other legal capacity.

The organization now is preparing to defend seven New Yorkers charged with malicious mischief after they held a card party in a Yonkers store. In this kind of party, printed cards are hidden in merchandise to point out to purchasers that the store is dealing in Communist goods.

And Defenders is preparing briefs and hopes to intervene as a friend of the court in two cases involving public school prayers scheduled for hearing before the Supreme Court of the United States.

"The American Civil Liberties Union defends those who want to eliminate prayers and delete the word 'God' from public school," Mr. Morris said. "We are intervening on the side of those who would retain the word 'God.' Until now, those people had no group organized to help them. That's what I mean when I say we are filling a vacuum."

PRECOURT ACTION

Defenders of American Liberties was founded in Chicago last June. Three of the founders—Morris J. Nelson, publisher of community newspapers in the Chicago area; J. F. Schlafly, Jr., an attorney; and Mrs. Carl Zeiss, widow of a vice president of the Northern Trust Co.—asked Mr. Morris to join them and serve as president. He took over the job on August 15.

Mr. Morris said he modeled the charter after that of the American Civil Liberties Union. However, Defenders of American Liberties, unlike the American Civil Liberties Union, has no members except for its officers and directors.

That, Mr. Morris said, is so the new organization cannot be labeled an extremist outfit, as it might be if "some wildeyed characters joined and made indiscreet remarks in public."

So instead of election by a general membership vote, the directors will elect their own successors and may choose any Americans they want and can get to accept.

NO MEMBERS

Since Mr. Morris became president and counsel, Defenders has acted in about 30 cases and only a few of these have gotten as far as a courtroom.

Mr. Morris said he receives about five requests a day for help, about one in six is worth investigating and perhaps one-third of these will reach the stage of action.

In each case, Defenders has acted from the viewpoint generally labeled conservative. It is a label Mr. Morris does not particularly like. He prefers "traditional." He contends that as the U.S. Government becomes more international in viewpoint through its foreign aid commitments and support of the United Nations, the big civil rights battles in the years to come will have to be waged in behalf of conservative—or traditional—Americans.

## Federal Mine Safety Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 21, 1963*

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, those of us who come from areas where coal mining has been a major industry have been seriously concerned with the lack of adequate protection of the workers in the coal mines of America.

I have been privileged to be the sponsor of legislation bringing to the small mines added protections afforded by Federal Government inspection. Unfortunately, after unanimous approval by our Committee on Labor and Education the Rules Committee failed to grant a rule for this legislation during the last term. I have again introduced this legislation and respectfully urge all Members to read the attached resolution and transmittal letter from the United Mine Workers of America, which calls attention to a recent mine disaster in southwestern Pennsylvania. Many large holdings in the coal industry are being subdivided into small contracts which enable the operators to qualify for small mine exemptions under the Federal inspection law. More and more this is becoming the rule rather than the exception. The very nature of this operation, which some claim to be a subterfuge, has increased the dangers to the men who work for a living in this industry.

I am hoping that during this session Members of Congress will give more attention to the seriousness of this situation and that we may be able to pass legislation that will give each miner, regardless of the size of operation in which he is employed, a reasonable protection against the loss of life and serious injury.

The United Mine Worker's covering letter and resolution follows:

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
*Washington, D.C., January 11, 1963.*
*To the Members of the 88th Congress.*

DEAR SIR: The terrible tragedy occurring on December 6, 1962, at the Frosty Run shaft, Robena No. 3 mine, of the United States Steel Corp., Carmichaels, Pa., in which 37 coal miners lost their lives, was before the international executive board of the United Mine Workers of America during its meeting in Washington, D.C., December 12–15, 1962.

During this meeting, the board adopted the enclosed resolution, which is self-explanatory.

We again urge earnest consideration by the Members of the 88th Congress to enact enforcement legislation to bring all employees in the coal industry under the provisions of the Federal Mine Safety Act.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. LEWIS,
*President Emeritus.*
THOMAS KENNEDY,
*President.*
W. A. BOYLE,
*Acting President.*
JOHN OWENS,
*Secretary-Treasurer.*

RESOLUTION, UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA

Whereas this board is horrified and appalled at the explosion which occurred December 6 at the Frosty Run Shaft, Robena No. 3 mine, United States Steel Corp., Carmichaels, Pa., in which 37 coal miners were killed violently; and

Whereas 31 of those who died were members of United Mine Workers of America, Local Union 6321, district 4, Masontown, Pa.; and

Whereas this pre-Christmas tragedy also symoblizes a growing trend in the industry toward placing production of coal ahead of human lives; and

Whereas many American coal miners who work in small underground mines do not now receive full protection under Federal law because of an arbritrary exemption granted their employers by the Congress: Therefore be it

*Resolved,* That this international executive board and all officers of this organization including local union officers and mine safety committeemen press with renewed vigor for strict compliance by coal operators with all Federal and State mine safety laws and with the Federal Mine Safety Code which is written into the national bituminous coal wage agreement; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the U.S. Bureau of Mines and mining departments in the various States be informed that that organization will insist on their strict and to-the-letter enforcement of existing mine safety regulations; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the international union, Labor's Nonpartisan League, and district officers urge with renewed vigor that the 88th Congress pass an amendment to the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act that would extend enforcement provisions of that act to all employess of underground coal mines regardless of size; and be it further

*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Local Union 6321, each Member of the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate, the Director of the U.S. Bureau of Mines, and directors of mining departments in coal-mining States, and that it be printed in the United Mine Workers Journal.

Unanimously adopted by the international executive board, United Mine Workers of America, this 14th Day of December 1962.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. LEWIS,
*President Emeritus.*
THOMAS KENNEDY,
*President.*
W. A. BOYLE,
*Acting President.*
JOHN OWENS,
*Secretary-Treasurer.*

(International executive board: John T. Kmetz, John Ghizzoni, Ewing Watt, W. J. Hynes, Joseph Yablonski, Peter Phillippi, Mart F. Brennan, Wilbert Killion, Joseph T. Kershetsky, Sam Nicholls, Louis Austin, Joseph Shannon, John A. Hupton, Henry Allal, John L. Mayo, R. O. Lewis, Edward Boyd, James W. Ridings, William Mitch, David Fowler, Arthur Biggs, John H. Delaney, R. J. Boyle, Carson Hibbitts, George J. Titler, C. J. Urbaniak.)

## Block Back-Door Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANK J. HORTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 21, 1963*

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, on January 24, I introduced a resolution—House Resolution 174—to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives so that bills authorizing loans or advance contractual obligations against the Treasury could not receive House consideration unless reported by the Appropriations Committee.

The resolution, if adopted, would provide conformity with the Constitution's clearly stated limitation:

No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of an appropriation made by law.

This provision was intended to assure that all expenditures from the public treasury would be carefully weighed in terms of necessity, available revenue and fiscal soundness.

However, because of an interpretation of the House Rules in 1949, legislative scrutiny and control of billions of dollars annually expended were eliminated. Consequently, whenever an administration becomes impatient with the tried-and-true method of financing projects, it merely seeks authority to borrow from Treasury trust funds—in some cases amounting to many billions—without bothering to get a legislative appropriation.

At a time when our country is challenged to fight against inflation and for a stable economy, the power and ability to control the public purse must be restored to Congress. At stake is national solvency and public confidence in our economy, both here and abroad.

Further back-door drains on the Treasury will occur until Government agencies are compelled to go before the Appropriations Committee and justify their expenditures of the taxpayers' money.

In offering this resolution, I joined with more than 120 other Members who introduced similar measures or announced their support of this bipartisan effort to oppose back-door spending.

## Hon. John J. Bell

SPEECH
OF
### HON. RAY ROBERTS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. ROBERTS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the passing of a former Member of the House, the Honorable John J. Bell, of Texas, has been a great loss not only to the State of Texas, but to the entire Nation.

John Bell was one of those rare men whose great ability led him to success in every field he entered. It was a great privilege for me to have been a fellow student with John in the University of Texas Law School. John Bell's brilliant career on the campus, both in student politics and scholastics, left little doubt as to his future success.

In the following years I watched his climb to the top in business and politics. In the Texas Legislature, in the Second World War, and ultimately in the Congress of the United States he served with honor and distinction.

That a man of John Bell's stature should pass on so early in life is a great misfortune. To his devoted wife and family, I extend my deepest and heartfelt sympathy.

## Great Progress in Civil Rights in 1962 Reported by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 29, 1963*

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, 1962 was "a year of great progress in civil rights" and we are pleased to hear these words of reassurance from Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy in his report on the "Progress of Civil Rights" to the President.

Under unanimous-consent agreement, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post, Monday, January 28, 1963, on the Attorney General's report, together with the complete report:

CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRESS

The civil rights report which Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy has presented to the President has the especial value of putting into perspective the gains that were largely eclipsed by the spectacular events at Oxford, Miss.

Notwithstanding this untoward incident, it is plain that the year was one of achievement and one, moreover, in which the most notable progress was in the changing spirit of the South. The catalog of interventions to enforce voting rights, transportation rights, and education rights makes reading of which the country has reason to be proud. If there still remains a great deal of discrimination in the land, it is discrimination about which the Government continues a persistent and serious effort to do something. There must be no slacking in this effort, for as the Attorney General points out: "Substantial numbers of American citizens are being deprived of their right to vote because of race."

While progress sometimes seems slow, it is cheering to note, in the language of the report, that "there are no segregated airport facilities in the Nation" and that there is only one city in the Nation in which there still is segregation at interstate rail and bus facilities.

Prince Edward County, Va., continues to have the dubious distinction of being the only county in the Nation where there are no public schools. That nearly 1,500 of the 1,800 schoolchildren of that county have had no education in 3 years is, as the Attorney General puts it, "a disgrace to our country." It is to be hoped that the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit will order the schools there opened, in accordance with the plea of the Justice Department.

The Attorney General has been wise to acknowledge that difficult racial problems remain throughout the country. He also has been wise to point out that they exist not only in the South "but throughout the country where Negroes are victims of school 'resegregation,' bias in housing, or employment or other facets of society."

The report will unnecessarily offend many objective people by an excessive effort to exhibit this administration's comparatively

greater zeal in the civil rights fields. This repetition of comparative statistics on suits filed and actions undertaken introduces into the report a political note that might better have been omitted. If it had to be included, it would have been considerate and generous if the Attorney General had acknowledged that the Department of Justice under the administration of his predecessor pushed through to enactment in the face of great opposition the legislative foundation for many of the actions of this administration. Whatever progress that has been made is the result of the efforts of public men in all parts of the country and both parties.

---

A REPORT ON THE PROGRESS IN THE FIELD OF CIVIL RIGHTS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL ROBERT F. KENNEDY TO THE PRESIDENT, JANUARY 24, 1963

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: For those only interested in headlines, rioting and violence at the University of Mississippi overshadowed the civil rights field and painted 1962 as a year of resistance by the South to law and the orders of our courts. The historian, however, will find, on the contrary, that 1962 was a year of great progress in civil rights, in large measures because of the responsibility and respect for law displayed by the great majority of the citizens of the South. In 1962, the United States took major steps toward equal opportunities and equal rights for all our citizens and in every area of civil rights—whether voting, transportation, education, employment, or housing.

There were outstanding efforts throughout the administration on behalf of the full and free exercise of civil rights. Let me take particular note of the successes of the Vice President and your Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity; the work of the Commission on Civil Rights; the impetus provided by the Executive order against segregation in housing; the impact area school efforts of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and improved hiring practices and other activity by all parts of the executive branch.

This report, however, is limited to the work of the Department of Justice and here is a summary of our efforts in this field during the past year.

VOTING

The most significant civil rights problem is voting. Each citizen's right to vote is fundamental to all the other rights of citizenship and the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960 make it the responsibility of the Department of Justice to protect that right.

It has been the sustained policy of this administration—in all areas of civil rights—to consult with local officials and seek voluntary, peaceful compliance with the commands of our courts and our laws. Under this policy, legal action is brought only after such efforts fail. While we have secured cooperation and compliance in all civil rights areas, this policy has met with particular success in the voting field.

During this administration, officials in 29 counties in Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana have voluntarily made voting records available to the Department in our investigations of voting complaints, without the need for court action.

In four southern counties we have been able to avoid bringing lawsuits because officials abandoned discriminatory registration or voting practices, and scores of other counties and cities, notably in Georgia, have abandoned segregated balloting at our request, in voluntary conformance with a court decision in one county.

There have, however, been a number of areas where voluntary local compliance was not forthcoming and where we were required to bring legal action. Between the passage of the 1957 Civil Rights Act and the change of administration, 10 voting suits were filed in southern counties and 7 were tried.

In this administration, 23 more voting suits have been filed, including 1 this week. A total of 17 suits have been tried, including the 3 pending January 20, 1961. Thus, of a total of 33 voting cases filed in both administrations, 24 have been tried so far. Satisfactory results have been achieved in 16 of these. Three cases have been tried but are not yet decided and the other five are on appeal.

There also has been an acceleration in voting records inspections. In the previous administration, records were inspected in 20 counties and photographed in 12 of these. In this administration, 62 voting records inspections have been undertaken, including photographing of records in 53 counties.

In short, the total number of counties in which the Department has taken action, ranging from records inspection to lawsuits, has increased from 30 at the beginning of this administration to 115 at present.

Each of the lawsuits filed has required extremely detailed preparation. In the suit brought against Montgomery County, Ala., for example, it was necessary to analyze 36,000 pages of voter applications and to subpena 185 witnesses at the trial. Such suits require the total attention of from 4 to 6 of the 40 attorneys in Assistant Attorney General Burke Marshall's Civil Rights Division for several months.

In some instances, we have had to take action even after obtaining court orders forbidding further discrimination against Negro registration applicants. In one of our suits, the registrar of Forrest County, Miss., was ordered by the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit to register all qualified Negroes. He nevertheless rejected as unqualified 94 of the first 103 Negroes to apply after the judgment, including a National Science Foundation graduate student and a high-school science teacher with a master's degree. The Department prosecuted him in the first contempt case stemming from a court voter registration order. The case is awaiting decision.

In East Carroll Parish, La., the voting referee provisions of the 1960 act were used for the first time in 1962, with the Federal judge himself hearing registration applications. Although he approved the application of 26 Negroes, the State of Louisiana attempted to block their registration through a State court injunction. We acted to set aside the State injunction and obtained an order forbidding further interference. On July 28, 5 days later, Negroes voted in East Carroll Parish for the first time since Reconstruction.

The Department's total voting rights effort, from records inspections to law suits to followup activity, has produced significant results. In a number of counties such as East Carroll Parish, Madison Parish, La., and Clarke and Tallahatchie Counties, Miss., where no Negroes had been registered in decades, Negroes are now beginning to be registered.

In Macon County, Ala., Negro registration has risen from 1,100 to more than 3,000 since an end to discriminatory registration practices was ordered by the court in March 1961. Negro registration in Bullock County, Ala., has risen from 5 in September 1961 to more than 1,000. In Montgomery, Ala., the Department's suit was decided November 20, 1962, and 1,100 previously rejected Negroes were ordered registered immediately. All have now been registered.

Two particularly significant voting suits were filed in the past year. While our voting suits generally challenge discriminatory application of voter qualification laws in specific counties, we filed suits in both Louisiana and Mississippi challenging the constitutionality of the State voter qualification laws themselves. Both cases are in pretrial stages.

In addition to suits challenging general discrimination against Negro registration applicants, we also have sought to guard against specific attempts to frighten, intimidate, or penalize Negroes who seek to register or vote. Of the 33 voting suits filed so far, 7 have been directed against such attempts at intimidation, verbal, economic, and physical.

The importance of these cases exceeds their specific circumstances. Negroes' fear of attempting to register is, perhaps, as great a problem as their being prevented from registering. These suits, like our followup actions in such cases as Forrest County and East Carroll Parish, have helped eliminate the fear by making it clear that the Government will meet its responsibility to guarantee not only the right to register and vote, but also the right to do so without intimidation or coercion.

A vivid example is provided by Haywood and Fayette Counties, Tenn., where intimidation actions were filed in the previous administration and successfully concluded in this administration. Last summer, we secured assurances, by consent decrees, against economic intimidation. Between late 1960, when the cases were filed, and the present, the number of Negroes registered has increased from none to more than 2,000 in Haywood County and from 58 to more than 3,000 in Fayette County.

Last summer, four Georgia churches used as centers for Negro registration efforts were burned and burnings were attempted at two others. In another illustration of our efforts against intimidation, the FBI investigated immediately. In one case, the FBI turned its findings over to local authorities, who arrested four men in connection with one burning. They were convicted in State court and sentenced to prison terms. In the second case, two men were arrested and face Federal charges. Our investigations of the other burnings continue.

In the field of voting, then, we have been able to make progress through both negotiation and litigation. The fact remains, however, that the heavy burden of effort lies ahead. Substantial numbers of American citizens are being deprived of their right to vote because of race, and we continue to believe that additional legislation in this field is necessary.

In 1962, Congress adopted the anti-poll-tax constitutional amendment, but did not enact legislation forbidding the discriminatory use of voting qualification tests. Even where we have brought suit, we often have been confronted with considerable delays between the time of filing and the time of trial.

We believe that additional legislation is necessary to insure prompt relief in such instances—where the facts indicate that substantial numbers of Negroes are being deprived of the right to register and vote because of race.

TRANSPORATION

As the result of action taken by the Department and the Interstate Commerce Commission last year, I can report to you that in the past year, segregation in interstate transportation has ceased to exist.

The majority of segregated bus and rail stations were desegregated in 1961 in accordance with new ICC regulations. Others followed in 1962. During 1962, we surveyed 165 airports in 14 States and found 15 airports in 6 of those States which were still segregated. All of these desegregated during the year, 13 voluntarily and 2 after the Department brought legal action.

At present, then, there are no segregated airport facilities in the Nation. There is only one city in the Nation, Jackson, Miss., in which systematic segregation at interstate

rail and bus facilities—as exemplified by signs directing the use of separate facilities—is still atempted. Even in this case we have taken legal action, now on appeal.

There have been isolated instances of discrimination against Negroes in this field and there will no doubt be other such instances in the future. But systematic segregation of Negroes in interstate transportation has disappeared.

Again, I would like to emphasize that in the great majority of cases, this is the result of voluntary compliance with law and regulations by citizens and officials.

SCHOOLS

In the past year, the number of desegregated southern school districts increased 60, from 912 to 972. In a number of these districts the Department continued its policy of consulting informally with school officials to help assure peaceful and orderly desegregation. As in 1961, public schools in each of these districts were desegregated without incident.

Efforts also were made to secure peaceful compliance with a series of court orders requiring the admission of James Meredith to the University of Mississippi, before his scheduled enrollment. We appeared as a friend of the court in the case before the Supreme Court and the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and the Department sought continuously to induce Mississippi officials to fulfill their responsibilities to law and to order.

These efforts were unsuccessful, but the Federal Government's responsibility to enforce the laws and the orders of the courts remained. The responsibility was met.

In another area, the Department in the past year initiated action concerning impact area school funds. Various local school systems receive Federal funds because they educate children of Federal employees who may not be permanent residents. In the 12 years of this program, nearly $2.5 billion has been paid to school districts across the country.

Again, we have sought abandonment of segregation through negotiation first. The Department of Justice and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have succeeded in obtaining voluntary desegregation, without going to court, in several districts and other negotiations or field surveys are underway in approximately 120 districts. Additional inquiries are scheduled for the coming months.

Negotiating efforts failed, however, in Prince George County, Va., which educates children of defense personnel stationed at nearby Fort Lee, and we filed suit. Four similar suits were filed last week regarding segregation in Huntsville and Mobile, Ala.; Gulfport and Biloxi, Miss.; and Bossier Parish, La.

In another kind of school case, also in Louisiana, the Department brought a contempt action against State education officials for failing to desegregate a State trade school, as had been ordered by a Federal court in a private suit. When the State board of education passed a formal resolution stating there would be no racial discrimination as to race, the Department agreed to dismissal of the case, but withheld the right to inspect the school records.

The Department also took action in Prince Edward County, Va.—the only county in the Nation where there are no public schools. They have been closed since fall, 1959, in order to avoid court desegregation orders. That nearly 1,500 of the 1,800 school-age Negro children in the county should have had no education in more than 3 years is a disgrace to our country. Last month, we asked the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, as a friend of the court, to order the schools opened promptly without racial segregation.

EMPLOYMENT

The Department has continued its policy of seeking out qualified personnel on the basis of ability and irrespective of race. Negroes are not denied employment because of their race. Neither are they hired because of their race. They, like all our employees, are selected on the basis of ability and merit. This policy has resulted in notable gains for Negroes in the offices of U.S. attorneys and marshals in the Nation's 92 judicial districts.

Of the approximately 350 assistant U.S. attorneys appointed in this administration, 32 are Negroes. Of these 32, 16 were appointed in 1962. Approximately 35 Negro assistant U.S. attorneys are now in service. Two Negro U.S. attorneys were appointed last year. This year, the first Negro assistant U.S. attorneys were appointed in at least seven States, including Southern and border States.

Of the 114 deputy U.S. marshals appointed in this administration, 14 are Negroes. Of these, 11 were appointed in 1962. Approximately 30 Negro deputy marshals are now in service. Luke C. Moore was appointed U.S. marshal for the District of Columbia in the past year, the first Negro to hold that position in a century. As with assistant U.S. attorneys, appointments of Negro deputy marshals were made in several Southern and border States, where no one of their race had ever before served.

The effort to assure that qualified Negroes are properly considered for these positions is continuing and Negroes are among the candidates for vacancies in several districts.

Improved hiring practices within the Department as a whole have resulted in continued gains for Negro attorneys. There were 10 Negro attorneys in the Department at the beginning of this administration. Now there are more than 70, out of approximately 1,900 in the Department.

There have, as well, continued to be a number of Negroes appointed to distinguished positions in the Government, such as Homer L. Benson, appointed to the Board of Parole.

OTHER AREAS

Albany, Ga.: The Department acted to the limit of its authority in Albany, where a series of mass protests by Negroes against segregation resulted in numerous arrests and civil rights complaints. All such complaints were speedily investigated by the FBI. Although no violation of Federal law was found in most cases, prosecutive steps were taken where appropriate. In August, the Department filed a voting intimidation suit against 16 officials of nearby Sumter and Terrell Counties and also filed a friend of the court brief in a suit brought in Albany. The brief asked the court to ignore the city's request for an injunction against demonstrations until the city first complied with the law and abandoned segregation. The two sets of arrests for church burnings in the area previously referred to were the result of FBI action. Throughout the Albany difficulties, the Department consulted with leaders on both sides in an effort to encourage an amicable resolution of the racial difficulties. All matters of dispute have now been brought before the Federal court in Albany, and I have no doubt that the constitutional rights of all citizens of that city will be protected.

Sit-ins: In a friend of the court brief filed in October, the Department asked the Supreme Court of the United States to reverse convictions of more than 30 Negroes for sit-in violations in four States. The Department argued that States cannot arrest Negroes for trespass when the States themselves, by law and policies, foster the discrimination which led to the sit-ins.

Hospitals: In May, the Department sought to intervene in a private suit seeking the desegregation of two North Carolina hospitals which were built with Federal Hill-Burton Act financial assistance. The Department asked the court to declare unconstitutional the separate-but-equal provision of the act. While the Department was permitted to intervene, the court subsequenty dismissed the suit, filed by Negro doctors, dentists, and patients. An appeal appears likely.

Employment suit: Problems of racial discrimination are by no means peculiar to the South. The Department appeared as a friend of the court in an appeal to the Colorado Supreme Court by a Negro pilot who charged he was denied employment with an airline in violation of a State antidiscrimination law. The Colorado court denied the appeal, but the Supreme Court of the United States has agreed to review the case.

Police brutality: During 1962, the Department brought 18 police brutality prosecutions, many of them in Northern States. These cases included one in Indiana where two Negro detectives were convicted of brutally beating a Negro defendant to coerce him to confess several crimes.

In summary, 1962 was a year of progress for the United States in the field of civil rights. This is not to say the problems are disappearing. They remain, and they remain difficult—not only in the South, with open discrimination, but throughout the country where Negroes are the victims of school "resegregation," bias in housing, or employment, or other facets of society. Ugly incidents like the Mississippi riot may occur again.

But we are accelerating our progress. Again, let me say this acceleration occurs in large measure because of the emerging spirit of the South. In 1962 this spirit was not the brutal one of rioting and violence at the University of Mississippi. The spirit was that exemplified in Georgia last week by Gov. Carl E. Sanders, in his inaugural address.

"We revere the past," he said. "We adhere to the values of respectability and responsibility which constitute our tradition." Then he added, "We believe in law and order and in the principle that all laws apply equally to all citizens."

Sincerely,

ROBERT KENNEDY,
*Attorney General.*

## Private Enterprise Making Most Progress in Latin America—Alliance for Progress Could Learn From It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 14, 1963*

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in the constant refrain and discussion as to why the Alliance for Progress, much over-press-released and ballyhooed by the Kennedy administration, is not working as well as expected, one item is all too often forgotten. American companies and loyal, dedicated American business men and women, have been doing a good job in South America in their own quiet way long before the massive Government spending programs began.

As one who was impressed personally last year while in South America as a member of the House-Senate Joint Economic Committee, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the fact the there are many success stories which do not involve Government, but mainly private American initiative. Rereading the February 1962 issue of Fortune devoted to Latin America recently, I was struck by the number of men in private enterprise who are seldom discussed with all this emphasis on the Alliance for Progress.

The Fortune article follows:

PRIVATE ALLIES FOR PROGRESS

The inscription on a photograph in the Chicago office of a Sears, Roebuck vice president reads: "To John Gallagher, who has lived with us and understood and cared for Venezuela." It is signed by Venezuelan President Romulo Betancourt. Gallagher is one of many Americans who have lived in Latin America and made significant practical contributions to its economy. Long before President Kennedy proposed his Alliance for Progress these men were already engaged in private alliances with individuals, business firms, and government agencies in Latin America. They brought down the skills and experience of the U.S. economy and planted them in the local environment. These Americans do not preach or propagandize the American way of life. They offer practical guidance in such matters as mass marketing, credit unions, capital investments, housing, and farming. And most of them are making a profit for themselves or their companies at the same time. On these pages are portraits of 12 men who exemplify this personal diplomacy for free enterprise:

Richard O. Provost, 38, has introduced modern merchandising techniques in 18 supermarkets in Venezuela, enabling them to sell foodstuffs as much as 20 percent under the local markets. He is the general manager of CADA (C. A. Distribuitora de Alimentos), owned 51 percent by the Rockefellers' I.B.E.C. (International Basic Economy Corp.) and 49 percent by Venezuelan investors. The company's supermarkets buy most of their wares from local suppliers, whom Provost has trained in mass production, sanitation, packaging, and marketing. Ninety percent of the employees are recruited in Venezuela, and he has had to teach them how to stock supermarkets shelves, keep up the inventory, and run the checkout counters.

John F. Gallagher, 43, uses his position as Sears, Roebuck's vice president in charge of Latin-American operations to help build a consumer-goods industry. Local manufacturers in nine Latin-American countries now supply Sears with 80 percent of the merchandise it sells in those countries. Under Gallagher's direction, Sears' buyers advise manufacturers on what and how much to make, and when to make it. Recently, for instance, Sears helped a Peruvian businessman to go into the manufacture of refrigerators. And 50 percent of Sears' Latin-American profits are reinvested in the countries where the stores operate. Before taking his present job in Chicago headquarters in 1960, Gallagher was Sears' local manager in Venezuela for 5 years.

Father Daniel M. McLellan, 45, is a Maryknoll missionary who fortifies his spiritual guidance with practical assistance. When he first arrived in the Peruvian mountains in 1950, he realized that he could best overcome the Indians' distrust by helping to alleviate their poverty. He spent 5 years gaining their confidence and then, in 1955, started a credit union to help his parishioners build houses and schools, start farms, and buy livestock. His first credit union had 23 members and capital of $32. The system has since spread throughout Peru, now has over 750,000 members and capital of over $2 million. The borrowers, who previously had paid up to 50 percent a month to usurers, are charged 12 percent a year on their unpaid balance.

Clarence J. Dauphinot Jr., 49, pioneered in raising investment capital from South Americans who had never thought of owning a share of stock before. Founder (in 1946) and president of Deltec, S.A., in Brazil, Dauphinot sent his crew of salesmen by jeep to villages in the mountains and jungles in a door-to-door campaign to raise capital for such companies as Willys-Overland do Brasil and American & Foreign Power. He later extended operations, with a network of companies, into Argentina, Venezuela, Chile, and Peru. In such risky new ventures things don't always turn out successfully: investors claim they have lost over $1 million in a Deltec-financed housing development in Venezula that never got off the ground.

Thomas Jefferson Williams, 67, practices philanthropy in the U.S. style, where the giver carefully organizes the uses of his money. In 1943 he and his wife started the Williams Foundation to promote cultural and sicentific exchanges between the United States and Argentina. ("We owe loyalty and gratitude to both countries.") A resident of Buenos Aires since 1914, Williams is one of the richest men in South America; his enterprises include textiles, chemicals, mining, and automobile manufacturing. His foundation sends young men to U.S. colleges, gives subsidies and scholarships for research, donates chemical laboratories to universities, and has recently established a cytology center, a cardiovascular laboratory, and a laboratory for plastic surgery.

William Max Pearce and James F. McCloud have been encouraging the growth of an automobile industry in Brazil and Argentina respectively. Pearce, 48, is managing director of Willys-Overland do Brasil, and McCloud, 43, is president of Industrias Kaiser Argentina. Both companies were started by Kaiser Industries, but the majority of the stock is now owned by Latin Americans and all but a handful of the employees are local nationals. Pearce and McCloud have sought out local industries to produce parts for the cars they manufacture (less than 10 percent of the cars' components are brought in from overseas). And they have established educational programs to train skilled technicians and send bright young men abroad for further training. McCloud has recently spent almost $3 million on a new training center. He has also set up an acceptance corporation to finance sales of Industrias Kaiser Argentina's cars, plans to branch out into cement and aluminum, and is studying the feasibility of building a steel plant in Argentina.

John D. J. Moore, 51, is vice president of W. R. Grace & Co., the great shipping and industrial firm, which has old and deep roots in South America. Nowadays Moore spends much of his time working with Latin American businessmen and government officials on noncompany projects to improve economic and social conditions. A regular commuter between New York and South America, he is chairman of the United States Inter-American Council, an organization of U.S. firms and business associations "dedicated to the defense of free enterprise in the Americas." He is a firm believer in helping Latin Americans to help themselves—but within their own traditional framework. Says he: "We're not trying to Yankify them."

William F. Coles, 54, has helped give the Venezuelan economy better balance by bringing in U.S. capital and technical skills. Coles, who has been in Caracas for more than 20 years, started as a lawyer for Compañia de Fomento, a Rockefeller-sponsored development agency that was among the first companies in Caracas to offer stock to the public. He is counsel for I.B.E.C. and a director of several Venezuelan finance and investment companies as well as of the Caracas Daily Journal. Through I.B.E.C., Coles started a dairy company, an improved cattle-breeding ranch, and a supermarket chain. He believes that the influence of U.S. businessmen in the country has firmly established Venezuelan private enterprise in the U.S. pattern.

Angus C. Littlejohn, 45, channels U.S. corporate money into the Brazilian economy. He acts, on the one hand, as adviser and representative for foreign business investors in Brazil and, on the other hand, as director of more than a dozen important Brazilian firms. A wartime assistant U.S. naval attaché in Rio, Littlejohn started a one-man consultant firm there in 1946. Today he operates in fast-growing São Paulo—more or less out of his hat; his office staff consists of three Brazilian associates and two secretaries. But there is nothing small about his clients—among them are Pittsburgh Plate Glass, Koppers, Quaker Oats, and Container Corp. With his advice, offered after extensive research and study, they have invested millions in Brazilian enterprises.

Harry A. Jarvis, 52, is seeking ways to put U.S. oil profits to work stimulating Venezuelan industrial growth. As president of Creole Petroleum Corp., a subsidiary of Jersey Standard, Jarvis recently set up Creole Investment Corp. with initial capital of $10 million to be invested in diversified enterprises. Creole's interest is "never more than 49 percent," says Jarvis. "We want Venezuelans to put up their own money and have control." Creole has helped finance three ventures: a firm to make starch and glucose from yucca plants, a company to make fiberboard from bagasse, and a fish-meal plant. Seventy-five other projects are under review. The scheme is not a philanthropic gesture, says Jarvis. "We expect it to show a profit."

Serafino Romualdi, 61, has been stumping Latin America for 15 years to promote "a constructive type of nonpolitical trade unionism." Romualdi, an Italian-born veteran of the U.S. labor movement (he was in the publicity division of the ILGWU), is now the AFL–CIO's inter-American representative. The most important result of his efforts is ORIT (Inter-American Regional Organization of Workers), which he helped found in 1951 to fight communism in organized labor. Now Inter-American Regional Organization of Workers has some 15 million Latin American affiliated members as against 2 million in Communist-dominated unions. Inter-American Regional Organization of Workers, says Romualdi, is "based not on the concept of the class struggle, but aimed at rapprochement with free enterprise—as a partner."

## The President's Fiscal 1964 Budget Message

SPEECH

OF

## HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy has called his estimated fiscal 1964 budget deficit of $11.9 billion a "temporary deficit" and an "investment in the future." A look at the recent past gives us little confidence that under this administration our deficits will be either temporary or serve as a useful investment in the future.

The history of the Kennedy administration is a history of persistent and ever-increasing Federal expenditures

and budget deficits. From fiscal 1962 through the estimates for fiscal 1964, deficits will total about $27 billion, or about $5 billion over the total net deficit of the 8 fiscal years of the Eisenhower administration.

In spite of the theories about the beneficial effects of budget deficits, experience shows that this kind of investment has failed to bring about the Kennedy administration's goal of a faster rate of economic growth.

Based upon the pattern of recent years, it would be surprising if the $11.9 billion estimated deficit were not considerably higher by the end of the fiscal year. The President's estimated deficit is based upon highly favorable and "iffy" assumptions, both as to the stimulative effects of the tax cut and to new legislation, particularly in agriculture, which the administration intends to request.

The administration's excuse for its rising expenditure level—which next year will exceed spending at the peak of World War II—is that a large part of the increased spending has been devoted to our defense and space efforts. This raises the question whether we can build a sound defense and meet our other obligations as a great power on the basis of a policy of dangerous fiscal irresponsibility. Defense and space should not become sacred cows. The very rapidly rising level of expenditures in these areas should be subjected to the closest examination in order to insure that we get the most from our defense and space dollars. Unless this is done, programs may expand too fast and result in waste, which in the final analysis may slow our progress in space and impair our national security.

The President's claim that civilian expenditures next year will be below this year's level is somewhat misleading. Agricultural expenditures are shown dropping by about $1 billion next year, a hoped-for decrease which will permit increases in almost all other civilian programs. Although spending on agriculture is supposed to decline, the administration will be asking for a sharp jump of $1.4 billion in new obligational authority for agricultural programs—or slightly more than new obligational authority being asked for the Department of Defense. Health, Education, and Welfare is asking $1.7 billion in new obligational authority. This is the real test of the Kennedy administration's budget, since new obligational authority is an indication of what future expenditures will be. The fact is that the administration is not holding the line on civilian expenditures, but is steadily increasing them, even while asking for a tax cut which will reduce Federal revenues.

Under unanimous consent, I include an article from the Wall Street Journal of Monday, January 21, discussing the trends in spending as indicated in the 1964 budget, in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks:

SMALL INITIAL OUTLAYS PROMISE STEEP RISE IN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S FUTURE SPENDING

(By Lindley H. Clark)

WASHINGTON.—Once the economy really gets rolling, the administration believes, it will generate big increases in revenue, even at reduced tax rates. And, the argument continues, spending won't be allowed to rise as fast as revenue, so at some point—perhaps as early as fiscal 1966—the deficit will be eliminated.

But if this is to happen, according to many people here, the tax take will have to climb sharply if it is ever to overtake the spending envisioned by the administration.

The evidence of this comes in part from comments of officials who've had a hand in preparing the budget for fiscal 1964. In putting together that bulky document, says Budget Director Kermit Gordon, a large number of worthwhile projects were canceled or deferred, so that the spending requests of the various agencies were scaled down by $7 or $8 billion. But past history suggests that the deferred projects will be back on the tracks before long.

COSTS ARE CLIMBING

The bulk of the evidence is in the budget figures themselves. Consider first some of the projects that have been around for a while. Whatever the worth of many of these programs, there's no doubt that costs are climbing fast.

Outlays for the activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1964, for instance, are estimated at $4.2 billion, more than triple the figure for the year ended last June 30, and no slowdown is even remotely in sight. For the year begining next July the administration wants congressional permission to commit the Government for $5.7 billion of future outlays.

Some of this new obligational authority—NOA in Federal lingo—will be used in fiscal 1964, but a lot of it is for spending beyond that year. In some cases, the NOA figures point to trends quite different from those shown by spending estimates.

Foreign aid is one example. Actual outlays under this program, which has been coming under increasing congressional fire, are estimated at $3.7 billion for fiscal 1964, down $100 million from the year ending next June 30. But the NOA figure heads upward. For next fiscal year it comes to $4.9 billion, up more than $1 billion from the amount for the 12-month period.

The statistics on Federal spending on agriculture paint a similar picture. Outlays in the fiscal year just ahead are estimated at $5.7 billion, surely a sharp drop from the anticipated total of $6.7 billion for the current year.

Although the saving may be illusory—the Government hopes to sell off next year a lot of cotton it expects to take into the price support shelter this year—economy advocates may still find some comfort in the bare figures. At least there may be a bit less money going out. But the NOA figure tells a quite different story: For fiscal 1964 it's $7.2 billion, up more than $1.5 billion from the current year.

TOTAL REQUESTS RISE

Nor are these activities the exceptions. Throughout the Government, agencies are seeking Congressional go-aheads for sharply increased amounts of spending. Total new obligational authority sought for fiscal 1964 adds up to $107.9 billion, $4.7 billion above the current year and around $15 billion over the figure for the year ended last June 30.

Another good gage of future spending trends is the figure for new commitments under Government credit programs. These commitments result when the Government either agrees to make direct loans or to insure or guarantee repayment of loans advanced by private lenders. The budget document declares that "new commitments are the best single measure of the trends in most Federal credit programs."

With that in mind, perhaps we shouldn't pay much attention to the fact that actual budget outlays under Federal credit programs are expected to drop to $1.2 billion next year, down from $2.7 billion in the current year. For one thing, that drop would result partly from the Commodity Credit Corporation's hoped-for sell off of cotton. For another, it would stem to some extent from expected sales to private lenders of loans now held by the Export-Import Bank, the Federal National Mortgage Association and some other agencies. Nobody in Government seems to worry for a moment that the private lenders may not be eager to buy.

Most important, however, is that figure on new commitments. For fiscal 1964 it's expected to be $27.5 billion, up $1.4 billion from the year ending June 30. And lest anyone console himself with the thought that the Government may not have to make good on loan insurance and guarantees, it is perhaps worth noting that well over half of the projected increase is in direct loans.

Moving on from current programs into those that exist now only on paper, the portents are equally clear.

It may be, as President Kennedy says, that all the proposals for new programs have been culled carefully to set aside all but those which "represent a necessary payment on future progress and should not be postponed." But it is clear that all of the things which wound up in this select category will be expensive.

They will not be so expensive in fiscal 1964, of course, Government programs have a way of starting slowly, however big they eventually may turn out to be. But both the broad scope of these programs and, in some cases, the spending authority already being requested show that bigger outlays are expected.

Perhaps the most striking example is Mr. Kennedy's projected new program in education for which he says, "The Federal Government can provide only a small part of the funds."

As Government figures go, it's true that the proposed 1964 outlays for the new education program look fairly small—only $144 million. But for the same fiscal year the administration is seeking new obligational authority totaling $1.2 billion.

A BROAD PROGRAM

And though the details of the program remain to be spelled out in a forthcoming special message, there's nothing small or temporary-sounding about the general aims outlined in the budget. The program, the budget says, will seek "the (a) buttressing of research in education and improvement, of course content, (b) expansion and improvement of teacher training programs, (c) improvement of community library services for people of all ages, (d) and strengthening of public elementary and secondary education. Very little, it would seem, is being overlooked.

The President is also proposing again a program to "revitalize" urban mass transportation. The projected outlay for fiscal 1964 looks modest: A scant $10 million. But the administration also is asking the right to spend $500 million on the program over the ensuing 3 years.

Though the figures on public housing spending already show a steady rise, the budget suggests more may be coming. It talks of studies under way and studies yet to come on how to "improve" Federal housing programs. Whatever "improve" may mean to anybody else, to a Government man it's likely to mean more money.

The list could be stretched onward a great deal further. Proposed legislation for hospital construction calls for 1964 outlays of only $5 million but new obligational authority of $35 million. A proposal for medical education assistance lists 1964 spending at $9 million but asks for a go-ahead on a total of $34 million. The pattern elsewhere is much the same.

What the pattern shows is not necessarily that we won't ever achieve a balanced budget. Someday we perhaps will. But few readers of Mr. Kennedy's new budget would see it as a guidebook on how to get there.

# *Appendix*

## Industrial Growth in the City of Laramie, Wyo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. GALE W. McGEE**
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the State which I represent has one of the greatest potentials for growth and development in the Nation and it has been my continued effort to bring realization to that potential of natural resource, dynamic population, and efficient transportation and communication. The job has not always been easy but progress is being made. The most recent indication of the progress we have been working for is the development of a new industry in my home town, Laramie, Wyo.

This vigorous, dynamic city has attracted a new industry that bodes well for the future industrial growth of the city. The new industry is a $500,000 low temperature bulk storage warehouse which will hold frozen foods and other commodities in transit across the Nation.

A recent article in the Laramie Boomerang gives many details on the new storage facility and also illustrates the many attractions Laramie has for industries seeking new homes. An editorial in that same newspaper further spells out why Laramie has a future of growth and greatness. I ask unanimous consent that the article and the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PACKERS' COLD STORAGE TO BUILD $500,000 WAREHOUSE—LARAMIE TO GET NEW INDUSTRY

(By Vern Shelton)

Laramine has been selected as the site for a $500,000 low-temperature bulk storage warehouse, according to Tom Henry, president of Packers' Cold Storage, Inc., of Fullerton, Calif.

The plant, located at the west end of Clark Street north of the Spiegelberg Lumber Co., will be in operation June 30 with completion scheduled 15 days earlier.

Construction on the new facility will start by the end of March.

Present plans call for construction of one 50,000-square-foot storage warehouse with the possibility of seven similar units in the future, boosting the eventual overall investment to approximately $4 million.

Richard Wagner, Packers' Cold Storage vice president, estimated it will cost approximately $10 per square foot to put the low-temperature warehouse and equipment in full operation.

The California company has leased a 20-acre site from the Union Pacific Railroad near the old Hahns-Peak depot, although only 10 acres will be used initially. If additional units are constructed, the warehousing operation could eventually have as much as 400,000 square feet of storage under roof.

The warehouse will be for frozen, instransit storage on a contractural basis only and will not be open for public storage. Principal contractor at present is Safeway, Inc. Safeway officials in Oakland, Calif., Friday emphasized the facility will be used for storing frozen products enroute to other shipping points outside the State. The warehouse will provide a storage and distribution point for 43 production plants west of Laramie in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho.

The warehouse manager will be transferred to Laramie from southern California. All other labor will be employed locally. The warehouse payroll will list 10 to 12 persons on a permanent basis with other jobs becoming available as the operation expands.

Although the warehouse will be involved only in low-temperature storage, there is a strong possibility other industries might be attracted to Laramie. "Where you have this sort of facility, other manufacturing or packing operations generally come into the area," Henry said when in Laramie recently.

"The warehouse is probably one of the cleanest industries it's possible to have," he added. "We palletize all of our storage. There are no fumes or noxious gases. The building will be modern and well-maintained. The type of business doesn't attract undesirable people as employees. I feel it will be a very sound industry for the city to have."

Henry added, "Our biggest demand will be for power. This has been pretty well resolved. We'll have a need for water and we'll have to know the fire zone rating in the area."

A sewer line is already located in close proximity to the building site. An existing 3-inch water main in Clark Street is being relocated as part of the viaduct construction program and could be enlarged.

Packers' Cold Storage officials pointed out the warehouse could have been located anywhere between Laramie and Evanston but the Gem City was chosen because of its tax advantages and because of the city's location as a transportation center. Goods stored in Wyoming are not subject to tax until they have been in the State 9 months.

Other factors leading to the selection, in order of importance were Laramie's distribution potential, the University of Wyoming, the new viaduct which will provide quick access from the plant to the downtown area, Laramie's reputation as a progressive and clean city, a young and aggressive city council and the availability of part-time help.

The California corporation completed an 18-month survey of the city before making the decision to move here, company officials pointed out.

"This is an industry breakthrough for Laramie," Harold Flater and Floyd Harmston, president and first vice president of the Laramie Area Industrial Development Corp., said Friday night.

"We feel that the factors that caused the Packers' Cold Storage Co. to come to Laramie are the same factors that will attract other industries. These could be connected with the cold storage plant, with other distributive industries, with the university, or with the resources of the area."

The two men continued, "We have plenty of potential resources for expansion such as available land sites, utilities, transportation, and all of the things which appealed to these people.

"It would pay for any industry looking for room for expansion or for new plants to take a good hard look at Laramie. This is the first time we've had an industrialist look at our city and tell us what he likes about it. We know that Laramie has these advantages and it is good to hear it confirmed by someone willing to back his feelings with action.

"The water needs of this industry indicate the wisdom and farsightedness of the voters when they voted for the $3,300,000 water bond issue in November.

"We are pleased to notice that Mr. Henry has emphasized the importance of research facilities at the University of Wyoming. We feel this will be a big factor, appealing to other industrialists who might wish to come to Laramie.

"This is probably the first time anyone has selected Laramie in relation to markets and this is highly significant. It's indicative of the growth of markets in the western area.

"Laramie AID officers and directors will continue to stand ready to assist Packers' Cold Storage and any other industrialists in locating their plant and facilities in Laramie. The selection of Laramie by Packers' Cold Storage is indeed an honor."

AT LAST A BREAKTHROUGH

The announcement of a new industry for Laramie in yesterday morning's paper was a welcome piece of news for Laramie residents, and particularly for those men who have been working with the Laramie Area Industrial Development Corp.

In deciding on Laramie for location of its storage warehouse, Packers' Cold Storage cited tax advantages and the city's location as a transportation center. Both of these factors could have a heavy influence on any other type warehouse industry seeking a good location.

The distribution potential of the city was another factor, along with the University of Wyoming. Also a deciding factor was Laramie's reputation as a progressive and clean city and a young and aggressive city council.

Another factor that might be overlooked except for Packers' mention of it as a deciding factor is the availability of part-time help and the use of the university in research work.

Packers' decision on Laramie was no quick move. The company studied the area for 18 months before making its decision. The fact that a plentiful power supply and water supply was available also helped in reaching the decision to locate in Laramie.

The coming of one new industry to Laramie can very well be the steppingstone to new industry. New industry is more likely to look over the area to see why Packers' chose this particular spot. A close look at the area can very well develop into an invitation to other industry.

Laramie's position as a transportation center is well established. The city is served by main line Union Pacific, by Frontier Airlines with connections possible to any airline a few short miles away in Denver, located on a main highway east to west and a good highway south to Denver, and served by two bus lines with a good schedule.

The city has plenty of power available and water will present no problem since passage of the water bond issue last November. Other factors include good fire protection and a mild climate with good recreation facilities.

Laramie has a lot to offer industry. We're not surprised that at least one industry has recognized that. We feel sure that more and more will study Laramie carefully before making a selection for a site for a new plant, particularly when Laramie AID is available to offer help and at the same time to supply adequate information on the town for any prospective industry.

## Tribute to Richard Kunz, Hoosier Peace Corps Volunteer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in view of the outstanding accomplishments of Peace Corps volunteers in an ever-growing number of countries and areas of activity, I believe the following article, printed December 21, 1962, in the Washington Daily News under the byline of one of our country's finest reporters, Dan Kidney, should be brought to the attention of all Americans in view of its content concerning the activities of one Peace Corps volunteer, 21-year-old Richard Kunz of Indianapolis, Ind. The example set by this young Peace Corps volunteer should serve as a challenge to all of us to strive for improved international relations.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BRIDGE TO FRIENDSHIP—PEACE CORPSMAN IS NOW "THE MAN WHO KNOWS"

(By Dan Kidney)

When President Kennedy established his Alliance for Progress in Latin America, he had in mind how successful was the good neighbor policy of President Roosevelt, in building friendships there.

Now a Hoosier Peace Corpsman has changed that idea from a symbol to a reality by building a bridge and other much-needed facilities where he is stationed with the Peace Corps in Colombia, South America.

He is Richard L. Kunz, 21, of Indianapolis. A glowing report on his accomplishments has been received by Senator VANCE HARTKE, Democrat, of Indiana.

The Indiana Senator considers the report on Mr. Kunz's Colombian service, compiled by CARE, one of the best from the Corps, as it points up how in the last year his "technical know-how, combined with individual initiative, has resulted in building two aqueducts, as well as the bridge and other projects."

Here are excerpts from the report given Senator HARTKE:

"One of the aqueducts is bringing fresh water to a cluster of mountain villages in the Santander del Norte area and the other, now under construction, will serve the little town of Rosaria. The bridge has been built over a mountain stream near the village of Santa Teresita.

"Young Kunz, who was majoring in engineering and industrial management at Purdue University when he volunteered for the Peace Corps, also has guided construction of a road connecting the hamlet of Villa Nueva with the main highway of the Province."

Senator HARTKE, who always has supported Peace Corps legislation, said CARE, Inc., officials have told him that none of these projects, or smaller improvements introduced by Mr. Kunz, would have been carried out without the use of CARE tools and equipment and the voluntary labor of the villagers. The tools and other equipment being used by Mr. Kunz and others were donated by American contributors to CARE, Senator HARTKE said.

The report continues: "Mr. Kunz is working with a group of farmers banded together to improve their living conditions. Mr. Kunz reports it wasn't always easy to overcome the hesitancy of the farmers to accept an outsider.

"He uses the bridge at Santa Teresita as an example of what he means. He said that for years the people had done a great deal of wishful thinking about a bridge. It would provide a short cut, he explained, because the old road approached the town in a roundabout way.

"Mr. Kunz surveyed the site he helped residents of the area to select for the bridge, then planned the structure. Mr. Kunz reported he foresaw no great engineering problems and then reported this conclusion to the farmers' committee. Meanwhile, he asked the CARE mission in Bogotá for the necesary carpenter, mason, and brush-clearing tools.

"But the farmers' committee failed to make a decision on whether to accept Mr. Kunz' recommendation to go ahead with the project.

"Finally, Mr. Kunz won the support of a young priest, Padre Moras, who headed the local parish. The 23-year-old priest gently insisted that Mr. Kunz' proposal be accepted. The villagers and farmers responded, gathering seasoned timber, stones, and cement for the bridge project. Once the Peace Corps volunteer removed the indecision, construction of the bridge was completed in 3 days.

"Mr. Kunz reports the Colombians he assisted in construction of the bridge showed their appreciation by scratching into wet concrete of an abutment that the span had been built by the Peace Corps with CARE tools."

Senator HARTKE said Peace Corps officials report Mr. Kunz' persuasiveness and winning ways with the villagers and farmers of Colombia have earned him the title of "Don Ricardo—El Hombre Que Sabe." That is, "The Man Who Knows."

A Peace Corps spokesman said Mr. Kunz is being sought out by Colombian farmers and villagers of the district to which he's assigned. They want his opinion and advice on construction of housing, schools, and other buildings.

He is becoming a familiar sight on backroads and village streets as he tours the district on mule-back, assisting the people of Colombia in their efforts to improve their living standards.

## Small Is Big

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the Rocky Mountain News of January 27, 1963:

SMALL IS BIG

In 1931, when the country was hobbled with one of its worst depressions, the Government created a banking agency, called the Reconstruction Finance Corp. (RFC).

It was to be a temporary agency, 2 years. It was just to tide over hard-hit businesses until they could get on their feet.

Thirty years later, after loans of $50 billion, the RFC was liquidated, its still outstanding loans shifted to other agencies. Meanwhile, its lending, which had got so out of hand it became a scandal, had been shut off by a shocked Congress.

Another Congress in 1954 set up the Small Business Administration (SBA). There was no depression, lending money was plentiful from private banks. But a group in Congress had built up a belief that small business wasn't getting all it had coming, so the Government should help, with cutrate loans on projects turned down by the banks as bad risks.

This, too, was to be a "temporary" agency. It began with a revolving fund of $55 million and 600 employees.

Now, 10 years later, the "temporary" has become permanent. Today SBA has a revolving fund of nearly $1.3 billion, and 3,200 employees. By 1967, the SBA expects, and hopes, it will have outstanding loans of $2.5 billion. Big business, indeed. One of the biggest.

This is what happens to Government agencies. When they run out of one excuse for being, they dream up two more. The "small" businesses eligible for SBA loans get bigger and more diversified. Now the loans include bowling alleys, dude ranches, amusement parks, even offices for doctors and lawyers. It is easy to borrow from SBA.

Scripps-Howard Writer Dickson Preston reported on the situation in Saturday's business pages. Just remember, it is the taxpayers who keep this small business banker in business by paying its losses.

## Goals for the Electric Power Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on October 19, 1962, Chairman Joseph C. Swidler, of the Federal Power Commission, delivered before the Electric Council of New England, at Boston, Mass., a very good speech on the power situation in New England. I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOALS FOR THE ELECTRIC POWER INDUSTRY

(By Joseph C. Swidler, Chairman, Federal Power Commission)

I am delighted to be here today to talk to the members of the Electric Council of New England. Your program demonstrates the lively interest of your members in the improvement of New England power systems and in the developing technology of the industry, including not only the conventional power technology but the so-called exotic developments as well. It is gratifying to participate in a program of such broad intellectual interest.

You may be surprised to know that this is my first talk to an organization representing the investor-owned electric companies. I have made a good many talks since I became a member of the Federal Power Commission some 15 months ago, but most of them have been on natural gas problems. My experience has not been unique; so far as I can find out, in recent years the members of the Federal Power Commission have spoken rarely to electric utility groups although speaking engagements before natural gas industry organizations have been relatively frequent. This difference probably reflects the fact that the Commission has spent most of its time since World War II in attempting to master the deluge of natural gas cases brought on by the postwar development of the natural gas industry. However that may be, my own background is in the electric power field and I am glad to have this opportunity to talk about electric power problems, particularly in an area of the country which has pioneered in electric power technology, both steam and hydro.

I want to take the occasion of this first talk to the executives of the regulated power companies to emphasize that the Commission is now aware of the urgency and importance of its responsibilities in the electric power field and allocation of funds and manpower are being made toward the objective of fully discharging those responsibilities. Your invitation to speak here today is, I believe, evidence of the industry's awareness of this revitalization in the Commission's administration of its responsibilities under the Federal Power Act.

The Federal Power Commission has a variety of responsibilities in the electric power field, some of them regulatory in the strict sense, that is, relating to the regulation of rates, license proceedings and the like, and others which involve Commission programs for the encouragement of the optimum development of this country's system of power supply. I believe that the present Commission takes both kinds of responsibilities with equal seriousness and proposes to give great emphasis, in the words of the statute, to "assuring an abundant supply of electric energy throughout the United States with the greatest possible economy and with regard to the proper utilization and conservation of natural resources."

The resurgence of the Federal Power Commission's electric power activities comes at a most appropriate time in the technological development of the industry. In the last decade the industry has witnessed changes so drastic as to amount almost to a revolution in its technological base. In 1950, the largest steamplant unit on order was 225 megawatts, while today units ranging up to 1,000 to 1,100 megawatts are being manufactured. In the same period we have moved from pioneering at the 345-kilovolt level of transmission to the 500-kilovolt level, which represents more than a doubling in line capacity. The new developments in power generation, particularly in the construction of large units with their vastly improved economy in the use of fuel, labor, and capital, combined with the great improvements which are taking place in the transmission field, have changed the basis for evaluation of generating plant location. In some parts of the Nation these technological advances have substantially altered the balance of advantage away from sites close to load and in favor of sites which are located close to fuel sources and to the networks of neighboring utilities with which the new plants can be integrated for power pooling purposes. Inevitably these advances in the technology of the industry will lead to much more important movements of power in interstate commerce under the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission. It follows that the wise and effective exercise of the Commission's authority is a matter of growing importance to the industry and its customers.

The major utilities of New England have operated for a long time on an interstate basis, and were among the first in this country to recognize the advantages of interconnections among individual companies. Some of your outstanding members have been working closely with the Commission in recent months in our efforts to bring a national perspective to the industry's interconnection and coordination plans through the Commission's Coordinated National Power Survey. The Commission is indebted in particular to William Webster and Bob Brandt of the New England Electric System, Howard Cadwell of Western Massachusetts Electric Co., Thomas J. Galligan of Boston Edison, E. C. Brown of the Hartford Electric Light Co., not to mention Eugene S. Loughlin, that outstanding member of the Connecticut Public Utilities Commission and leader in the field of utility regulation. Their assistance in the National Power Survey has been indispensable.

The New England region has always provided leadership in science and technology. Its magnificent schools and laboratories are among the best in the world. In this region there is a scientific ferment and excitement so sharp as to be almost palpable. Here there is taking place much of the pioneering in the newest frontiers of knowledge, including electronics and space. From this area, too, come some of the most advanced equipment used in the power industry.

There is evidence of great activity in New England to improve the efficiency and economy of the area's power systems and to restore New England to its former place as a leader in the electric power field. For example, the Yankee Atomic Power Plant built here in Massachusetts by a group of New England companies is probably the nation's closest approach to conventional thermal plants in terms of cost and dependability. Indeed, its success has stimulated plans for a larger sister plant at Haddam Neck, Conn. It may well be that we are witnessing here one of the great economic breakthroughs in the nuclear reactor program.

In the transmission field 230-kilovolt lines are now bringing lower cost hydro power into New England from the Niagara and St. Lawrence projects and are strengthening the interties among many of the New England utilities. Plans have been announced for a 345-kilovolt line which will tie New England with New York City.

In recent years, some relatively large generating units have been installed in New England. A unit of 340 megawatt capacity is on order for the L Street station of the Boston Edison Co. Two units of 250 megawatts each are scheduled for the new Brayton Point powerplant of the New England Power Co. and a 235-megawatt unit is being planned for the Middletown plant of the Hartford Electric Light Co.

There are steps in the right direction and I have no doubt that in normal course units of 500-megawatts and higher will be in use in the next decade. On the utilization side there are some New England companies which are leaders in promoting electric space heating and I know of one company in this region which is setting an enviable pace in load promotion by capturing one-third of the new homes in its service area for electric space heating—a record not matched by many companies operating under climatic conditions much more favorable to the promotion of electric house heating.

These are all important achievements and I do not mean to minimize them in pointing out that New England still has far to go in taking advantage of its opportunities to reduce the cost of producing and selling electric power. From the point of view of use, New England is still an underdeveloped power market, even giving consideration to the fact that the housing pattern in New England is not as favorable to load growth as in some other areas. The average annual residential use has of course steadily increased from year to year in New England as in the rest of the country, but the pace of growth in this region has not matched the national average despite the fact that per capita income in New England is 11 percent above the national average. In 1961, the annual use of the average residential customer in New England had grown to 3,113 kilowatt-hours but this was 23 percent below the national average of 4,019 kilowatt-hours. These figures raise sharply the question whether consumers in New England are achieving the full benefits of electrical living.

Of course there are many reasons why per capita electric consumption in New England is below the national average and many of these reasons are beyond the control of the management of the New England electric companies. However, I should like to dwell for a moment on some factors that are within your control.

The low level of use in New England is accompanied by a relatively high level of rates. The average charge for 3,000 kilowatt-hours, which is close to the average annual use in New England in 1961 is 3.47 cents per kilowatt-hour, which is more than 15 percent above the national average. New England industry similarly paid approximately the same percentage over the national average for its power supply. True, the national average includes areas of low-cost fuel and of Federal power operations, but even if these are excluded, the retail rates in New England are still well above average. In fact, in 1961 the highest charges in the continental United States for residential use at prevailing levels were found in New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Maine, and Rhode Island, in that order.

As you all know, the electric power industry is a conspicuous example of an industry in which greater utilization of plant investment results in lower unit costs and in which low rates encourage greater utilization. Conversely, high rates discourage broader utilization which in turn leads to higher costs. The low level of use in New England therefore not only reflects the existing higher costs, but helps to keep the unit costs at a high level.

I realize that New England operates under handicaps in its efforts to reduce power costs. Fuel costs are higher in New England than in most of the rest of the country, and in all fairness this factor must be given full weight in comparisons among regions. The average fuel costs of New England steamplants in 1961 was 36.9 cents per million B.t.u.'s as compared to a national average of 26.7 cents. However, fuel accounted for only 15 percent of each dollar of revenue for the New England utilities in 1961 and if the fuel prices had been brought down to the national average and the whole benefit passed on to consumers, the bills to the ultimate consumer would have been reduced by less than 5 percent, leaving New England rates still well above the national average.

No one can blame the New England power systems because their area does not have large deposits of low-cost fuel, but with fuel costs high, it would be natural to expect the New England utilities to concentrate their efforts on the development and installation of highly efficient generating units which would make the best possible use of the expensive fuel supply. The more costly the fuel the greater should be the incentive toward efficiency in its use. Progress is now being made in New England toward installing larger and more efficient units, but there is still a long way to go to rectify past failure

to keep New England's power systems abreast of the industry technology in efficient use of fuel.

Not since 1953 has a generating unit installed in New England been included among the first 20 in the country in efficiency in the use of fuel as measured by the so-called heat rate. In 1953, New England attained an average heat rate of 13,317 British thermal units per kilowatt-hour, an average which had been reached in the United States a year earlier. In 1961, however, New England was 4 years behind. Its average heat rate in 1961 of 11,331 British thermal units per kilowatt-hour was reached in the United States as a whole by 1957, and is 7 percent higher than the national average today of 10,552 British thermal units per kilowatt-hour. I want to give full credit for the large progress which the New England companies have made in recent years in improving their average heat rate, but if New England had merely kept up with the national average in the efficiency with which it uses the fuel it imports, it could have reduced its fuel bill by more than $7.5 million a year on the average in each of the last 5 years.

One of the basic reasons for New England's relatively less efficient use of fuel becomes apparent from an examination of the generating stations which make up the bulk of the power supply sources of New England. In brief, New England in the past has built and still relies on too many small and inefficient generating units and on too few of the large, low-cost units.

As of January 1, 1962, the total investor-owned steam-electric generating capacity in New England, that is to say in FPC power supply areas 1 and 2, was about 6,400 megawatts. Of this total, 88 units with an aggregate capacity of over 350 megawatts were of a size of 10 megawatts or smaller. Thirty-eight of these units were more than 40 years old, well past the age of honorable retirement by any standard. Equally surprising, five of these expensive small units have been added since World War II.

More significant than the figures on these small units, which account for only a small proportion of total capacity, are the figures with respect to units below 50 megawatts in size. Here we are talking not only of peaking units but of base load units as well. These small units total almost 3,500 megawatts or 53 percent of installed capacity in New England at the beginning of 1962. By modern standards, a 50-megawatt unit is not an efficient unit and an area which relies on units of this size for base load is not getting the benefit of modern power technology. Power from a 50-megawatt unit costs 30 percent more than from a 500-megawatt unit, some of which are in operation in the United States and others of which are on order. As a matter of fact, the calculations of our engineers show that power from such large units could be produced in New England, at existing higher fuel charges, at less cost than from 50-megawatt units at points where fuel could be bought at the national average price. Here, indeed, by realization of the benefits of present-day technology, is the path for New England to offset its fuel disadvantage.

Let me say a word about the small old units of which New England has so many. It is not uncommon to hear utility operators justify their continued existence on the ground that their cost has been written off and that they are adequate for reserve. However, many of them still have high taxes and other fixed charges and extremely high operating costs which penalize average costs. Their continued operation is justified only if they are held for emergencies of a high order of improbability of occurrence. If they are used to any substantial degree their operating costs become prohibitive. New England utilities should look and work toward the day when their reserves for load growth will be in units with operating costs low enough to encourage load building.

The evidence suggests that New England's electrical progress is restrained by the chain of high costs, which in turn leads to high rates, which delays growth of energy use and thus tends to keep costs high. The challenge to New England power leadership is to break away from this chain to what I might call the wheel of progress—low costs which make possible low rates and high use and thus contribute to further cost reductions.

There is no sovereign road for achieving this transition. I cannot suggest to you any one step you could take which would transform the New England power economy because if there were an easy solution I am sure you would long ago have put it into effect. However, I am sure the transition can be made by pursuing progress along many paths. In not too many years, if the men in this room determine that New England shall again assert its leadership in the electric power field, it can make an increased contribution to New England's and the Nation's economy.

Specifically, I suggest to you the following paths of progress:

First, greater integration of facilities and operations. The modern concept of an intercompany power pool originated in New England and large advances have been made in the direction of interconnected system operations. However the New England companies have not taken full advantage as yet of the benefits of coordinated planning, construction and operation of the overall power supply system required to serve most economically and reliably the growing loads of this region. The direction of the future is toward a pooling of the programs of all the systems in the area, both publicly and privately owned, in the interest of the greatest possible economy. A look beyond the area itself is also required, in order to appraise the possible benefits of coordinated planning for adding capacity in joint ventures with neighboring systems. Distance is no longer as important a factor as it once was. Extra-high-voltage transmission will make the pool which New England could tap an ever growing one with rich potential rewards in savings from lower fuel costs, lower costs per kilowatt of installed capacity and reduced requirements for reserves.

Second, power pooling for the region as a whole and in cooperation with neighboring regions will also justify a review of the economic feasibility of many of the area's undeveloped hydropower sources for additional blocks of capacity. These hydro sources hold promise of greater rewards to the utilities of New England when explored and developed by an integrated regional and interregional power pool, than when considered only as a part of a single company system.

Third, I have already referred at length to the special need in New England to accelerate the movement from small to large generating units, and to make the most efficient possible use of the fuel which New England must import at high cost.

Fourth, greater use of power. The electric power industry in New England must plan on a greater utilization of its plants by building up average use at least to the national level. Since the rest of the country will not stand still during the next 10 years, the industry in New England is aiming at a moving target. Rate reductions should not be delayed until new plants are completed. On the contrary, every stimulus should be given to load development now by all known promotional means. For example, it costs very little to offer substantial rate inducements for usages which are still largely nonexistent. Any increment above out-of-pocket costs for these new loads will make some contribution to net income, and as more efficient capacity is added to the system, these loads will become increasingly profitable.

In the residential field, in particular, there is strong evidence of great elasticity of demand, of many unsatisfied wants for electrical equipment in the home which would be satisfied if rates were lower. When you know that new and cheaper generating capacity and low cost power imports are coming in, you should anticipate the savings and insure heavy and economical loading of your own equipment by load-building rate reductions.

The difference involved in attaining in New England a level of use equal to the national average would give a tremendous impetus to the whole economy of New England. Hundreds of millions of dollars of new investment would be required not only in generating and transmission facilities but also in the strengthening and improving of distribution networks, the rewiring and modernization of homes and places of business, and the sale and installation of hundreds of thousands of electric appliances.

My study of industry statistics suggested no way of reconciling the differences in rates of growth among various companies except in terms of people. Some companies do a much better job of selling electricity than other companies. This simple fact suggests a great opportunity for New England. It is evident from comparing the records of the various companies in New England that if all could increase their sales to the level of the best, the electric power industry in New England as a whole would show great progress and achieve approximately the level of the national average.

In urging upon you this aggressive program for building loads, I know that I shall not add to the tranquility of my job as chairman of an agency which regulates not only the interstate transactions of power companies, but of natural gas companies as well. Perhaps I should say that I regard it a part of my job to give them comparable advice. When both the natural gas companies and the electric power companies exert their greatest efforts to make low-cost energy available to the American consumer, both industries as well as their customers and the Nation will receive maximum benefits.

Coming back to the subject of system integration, I should like to say another word about the Commisison's national power survey. Its purpose is to explore the full benefit potential to the country of integrating the planning and operation of the Nation's power systems. The survey assumes no changes in ownership or in utility responsibilities, but only carrying through in much greater degree and with greater completeness the strong trend which already exists toward system interconnection and integration. The results of the survey should be useful to the New England systems in planning their future. However, the emphasis will be on the requirements of the 1970's. We hope that the studies which are now being carried on throughout the industry as part of the survey will lead the industry to accelerate their own interconnection and integration programs, hopefully in ways which will lend themselves to future strengthening of interties and integrated operation to reflect long-term power survey recommendations.

From the long-term point of view, the future for New England power systems is bright. The technological progress in recent years in conventional equipment is constantly minimizing the importance of New England's distance from cheap fuel sources. Of course a continuation of the progress in the atomic reactor program should further narrow the gap in energy costs. The existing power sources in New England in the course of little more than a decade will be but half of the electric plant then in service,

and the opportunity for the addition and replacement of facilities offers enormous opportunities for improvement in average unit costs by supplanting equipment of low efficiency with the best units that the manufacturers can make available. I am confident that in the next decade the enterprise of the electric power industry in New England will find a way to bring power to New England consumers in amounts which are greater and at rates which are lower than those in the rest of the country. The Commission for its part will do everything it can to facilitate your efforts to meet this goal, which has great importance to the future growth of New England and to the Nation as well.

## Postmaster General Farley Comments on Closing of Starkey (N.Y.) Post Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, early this month the post office at Starkey, N.Y., in my congressional district, was closed down after a continued existence of 143 years. I am sorry that this center of Government service on the banks of Seneca Lake has ceased to function.

As a boy, on a canoe trip from the Rochester Boy Scout camp on Seneca Lake, I can still remember the long, hot climb up the road from the lake to the small community of Starkey and its post office.

To commemorate the passing of this historic landmark the other day former Postmaster General Farley, a man who has always had the "human touch" in abundance took the time out of his busy schedule to pen a note to the retiring postmaster at Starkey, Raymond Brewer, Jr., which I read with profound interest.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a story from the Geneva Times of January 25, which quotes the letter of that great American, Jim Farley.

The article follows:

IN LETTER TO STARKEY POSTMASTER—FARLEY RECALLS CLOSING HOMETOWN POST OFFICE

STARKEY.—Raymond Brewer, Jr., who was postmaster of the Starkey post office which closed January 4, has received the following letter from James A. Farley, a former Postmaster General.

DEAR POSTMASTER BREWER: When reading the National Observer several days ago I noted with interest the story about the closing of the post office there after 143 years of existence and that your grandfather also served as postmaster during that period.

I understand full well how you feel about the office being closed as I had a similar experience when I was Postmaster General. It was necessary for me to close the office at Grassy Point, N.Y., where I was born and raised, and placed it on a rural route about a mile and a half from the Grassy Point site. I received the last letter canceled and I sent it with my stamp collection and other material to the Smithsonian Institute in Washington.

The post office was as old as could remember and was run by the Ossman family in their general store. I used to go down there every afternoon after the 5 o'clock train came in from New York with the mail. As a matter of fact, all the boys made that daily trip to the office.

When I became old enough to be interested in baseball I went down about a hundred yards from the post office to read the scores in the old New York Herald.

I think mine was the only instance of where a Postmaster General closed the post office in his old home town. It wasn't an easy task as there was, of course, much sentiment connected with the office. However, the rise in population and the rapid transit of the mail has caused many hundreds of small post offices to be closed since I was Postmaster General. I hope you won't misunderstand my writing you at such length but the story of your office brought back memories of Grassy Point office.

I have always felt rather close to the postmasters and the postal employees because of their loyalty and assistance during my tenure as Postmaster General. Whatever success any Postmaster General achieves is due to their loyalty and efficient performance of their duties.

Inasmuch as you and your father no doubt served during my time as Postmaster General, I thought you might like to have the attached autographed photograph.

With my very kind regards and best wishes to you and yours for success, good health and happiness during the new year.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES A. FARLEY.

JANUARY 16, 1963.

## Declaration of American Principles by Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a "Declaration of American Principles of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks."

There being no objection, the declaration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DECLARATION OF AMERICAN PRINCIPLES OF THE BENEVOLENT AND PROTECTIVE ORDER OF ELKS

The Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks is dedicated to the welfare of the United States of America. One of our order's purposes is to quicken the spirit of American patriotism. To that end our order has striven to advance the principles that guide our Nation, and has opposed all attacks upon them from whatever quarter.

Freedom, the historic goal of mankind, is our Nation's basic principle. Freedom has been under steady attack by international communism for many years. Now, freedom and communism are engaged in a struggle for survival. This struggle is not of our choosing but has been forced upon us. Freemen have no choice but to accept the challenge.

The Americanism Committee of the Grand Lodge of Elks believes that freedom too long has stood on the defensive. The time has come for us who believe in freedom to take the initiative; fight for what we believe in and stand against those who are against us until freedom has defeated those who would destroy it. To rely on military power alone in this ideological struggle would be illusory and fatal. Our paramount necessity is internal strength which can come only from unity of understanding and purpose and a willingness to place our Nation's safety and welfare above personal interest.

Appealing, as did our Founding Fathers, to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, we submit to our brothers this declaration of American principles on which we shall challenge the enemies of freedom, and to which we invite our fellow citizens to subscribe:

1. Moral values are the basis of our society, and the responsibility of each citizen to live by these moral values is fundamental to the welfare and progress of our society. These moral values include honesty of word, deed, and purpose; brotherly love that requires us to be fair with our fellow men and just in our relations with them; faithful performance of our labor in every honorable calling; and a recognition that each of us has the duty to contribute to the best of his ability to the advancement of the general welfare.

2. Freedom has made America. Not just political freedom, but the whole environment of freedom is responsible for the tremendous progress of our Nation since its Revolutionary birth in 1776. Freedom encourages initiative, experiment, invention, enterprise. Freedom lets citizens choose their work, encourages individuals to discover their talents, and make the most of them. In consequence we have a standard of living higher than any nation has enjoyed, a material abundance more widely shared among all our people than ever before, and a high level of intellectual and cultural attainment. Every citizen is the beneficiary of the freedom that has unleashed the abilities of the American people and provided the incentive for their maximum use.

3. Inherent in the American concept of freedom is the integrity of the individual. Individualism makes each person primarily responsible for himself, his welfare, his success or failure. Freedom lays upon each person the individual responsibility and duty of citizenship. A free society will emphasize individualism and individual responsibility as the sure way to produce democratic leadership and preserve freedom.

4. Self-government presupposes the duty of every citizen to obey the established government and to employ only those lawful methods of reason and persuasion that are open to all of us to achieve political action.

It follows that government by the majority must be reasonable in the exercise of its authority and protect the rights and interests of the minority.

5. Our ability to change our institutions and practices, through orderly process of law, to accommodate to changing needs has helped our Nation to develop, as it will in the future. All proposals for change in our institutions should be weighed carefully by all citizens to determine whether such change will reduce or add to our freedom. Our goal should be more freedom, not less. We must guard against the growth of governmental power through surrender of civil right and individual freedom for contemporary gain at the expense of future generations.

6. The tendency of groups to seek preferential treatment from government breeds rivalries dangerous to political stability, is harmful to genuine economic growth and leads to fragmentation of society rather than to unity and strength. All groups of citizens ought to measure political and economic proposals advanced in their own interest against their effect on the whole Nation.

7. We believe that the time has come when all citizens who believe in these principles

should speak up for them and set an example by applying them fully in their daily lives. We urge those in positions of leadership and influence—clergymen, educators, business executives, holders of public office, leaders of labor, intellectuals, editors, radio and television producers, motion picture producers and all others—to assume a greater responsibility for the wider understanding of these principles and their practical application in the day-to-day lives of the people.

## Employment Trends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I attempted to point out to my colleagues some of the fallacies contained in the budget message of the President.

As time goes on I am more and more convinced that the economic gains and advantages claimed in the President's tax program sound more and more specious. I base this conclusion on the inevitable truth that under the program proposed an individual's taxes are going up as well as down.

In my humble opinion an effective tax program must contain two elements. One, we must better control and reduce expenditures and; two, we must set up a more simple tax structure.

Instead of following these simple steps toward improvement we are hastening toward larger and larger deficits, creating more tax inequities, and becoming lost in a maze of fiscal redtape. If the present trend continues our Federal deficit could well reach $50 billion by the end of the President's 4-year term of office.

Last week I also endeavored to point up the growing increase of Government employees. I believe the following excerpt from the Wall Street Journal of January 28 bears me out.

Under unanimous consent, I insert the following article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THIRTY-SIX THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED MORE

Now that Members of Congress and interested taxpayers have had time to read the fine print in the administration's budget for fiscal 1964, it's dawned on them what the President really was saying in his budget message about management improvement and cost reduction in Government employment.

What President Kennedy said was that his budget had been prepared "with special attention to employment trends in the Federal Government." And that "requests for additional jobs have been reduced or denied wherever possible." The key phrase there is "requests * * * have been reduced." For the President certainly did not say that the number of Federal employees is going to be reduced. Or even that he proposed to hold the line on Federal jobs. That fine print discloses that the President gave "special attention to employment trends," all right. And those trends, as usual, are ever upward.

For instance, the President asked for an increase of 5,315 employees in the Agriculture Department, which would raise the total to 121,583. For the Commerce Department, where Secretary Hodges has been making such stirring pare-the-payroll talks, an increase of 3,497 is being asked.

Indeed, in only two places is a decrease in the number of employees apparent, and these two cuts total only 78.

Altogether, the President is asking Congress for almost 36,500 more Government employees. It certainly makes for an interesting approach to management improvement and cost reduction.

## J.F.K.'s Vigorous Double Standard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, ever since the President disclosed his budget plans to the Congress, people have been puzzled, at first, then indignant by the obvious contradiction of principles. Only last year Mr. Kennedy "lectured" the steel industry that any inflationary act would rob widows and ruin foreign trade, undermine the struggle for human freedom, and retard the economy. Now his spenders have convinced him that inflationary action by the Government is going to be good for us. As we review the budget line by line noting how each agency has hiked its estimate and left open the door for supplemental requests, we think that another "lecture" would be most appropriate—this time to the Cabinet. I believe that the following editorial from the Peoria Journal Star of January 23, 1963, expresses this need most effectively:

J.F.K.'s VIGOROUS DOUBLE STANDARD

It occurs to us that President Kennedy is a very forceful speaker. You might say in the language of these days that he speaks out with great vigor.

But we can't help wishing sometimes he would use the same logic in different places.

We think it would be interesting if he had lectured the Department heads who brought in a budget that forecasts something over a $10 billion deficit, who knows how much? The last balanced budget forecast he made missed by several billions the same way he lectured the steel industry on a $6-a-ton price hike.

We wish he had told them, and the post office with its 20- to 50-percent raise in rates, and the Defense Department with its 14½-percent increase in pay for all hands what he told Roger Blough about the effects of inflation.

Didn't he then say with great indignation that any inflationary act was an act to rob widows and orphans and the elderly?

Didn't he say that any such inflationary move would be a move to ruin our foreign trade? To sabotage our country in the great struggle for human freedom, the cold war, that is, to hold back our economy?

Ah, yes. We wish he had played that speech back to his henchmen grabbing with both hands at the Treasury moneys these days. But the tune has changed. Inflationary action by the Government is going to be good for us, now.

We wish he might have said, also to the State Department's million-dollar booze budget, and all like budgets for the Government's entertainment activities, the same rules apply to spending this as we have now applied under the income tax laws to entertainment expense of private business.

And there must be a thousand places in this budget where he could usefully offer that good, old line from the inauguration: "Ask not what your country can do for you."

No such luck. The New Frontier is progressive. They only look ahead. They never look back, not even to yesterday's speeches, and certainly not to yesterday's promises.

"Don't look back." That's the progressive watchword.

Of course. They are scared to death to look back. Especially at their record.

## John Y. Yoshino Honored as Roosevelt University's Alumnus of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, last October 27, Mr. John Y. Yoshino was honored by his alma mater, Chicago's Roosevelt University, as its alumnus of the year and received the Eleanor Roosevelt Key.

Mr. Yoshino is the Deputy Director of Field Services for the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity and has a fine record of leadership in the overcoming of racial discrimination.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement in connection with the honor bestowed on Mr. Yoshino be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN Y. YOSHINO HONORED AS ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY'S ALUMNUS OF THE YEAR

A White House aid and Roosevelt University graduate, Mr. John Y. Yoshino, was honored as Roosevelt University's 1962 Alumnus of the Year at the university's 7th annual homecoming banquet, Saturday, October 27, in the Knickerbocker Hotel here in Chicago.

Deputy Director of Field Services for the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, this Japanese-American, a 1948 graduate of Roosevelt University, was presented with the Eleanor Roosevelt key, the highest honor this university can bestow on an alumnus, by the university's president, Dr. Edward J. Sparling, acting on behalf of the alumni association.

Working with the U.S. State Department and the Maryland Commission on Interracial Problems, Mr. Yoshino in 1961 helped to end the discrimination against Afro-Asian diplomats in public eating places along the stretch of U.S. 40 that leads from Washington to New York.

Prior to his government service, Mr. Yoshino was Chicago director of the job opportunities program of the American Friends Service Committee, a Quaker organization with the purpose of ending discrimination in employment.

Presented annually to a distinguished Roosevelt alumnus, the Eleanor Roosevelt key was presented to Mr. Yoshino for his "courageous efforts to end segregation" and for his "long, noble, and patient struggle for equal employment opportunities." The citation reads as follows:

"To you, John Y. Yoshino, alumni honoree, faithful public servant, for your long, noble, and patient struggle for equal employment opportunities for all Americans—a struggle which began in our very city and which has led you to the White House itself; for your especially courageous efforts to end segregation in public eating places along U.S. Route 40, a route which so many diplomats travel on their way from New York to Washington; for your constant and never swerving devotion to the promotion of sound inter-group relations through equal opportunity and through the recognition of the good deeds of all men; and for the singularly dignified, humble, yet truly courageous way in which you bore the burdens of all Japanese-Americans after Pearl Harbor and yet served your government and its cause with honor and with all your heart; for such meritorious achievement and for the high standard of moral courage you have shown, the Roosevelt University Alumni Assocation is proud to present you with its 1962 Eleanor Roosevelt Key Award."

A native of Alameda, Calif., Roosevelt's alumnus of the year was evacuated to a relocation camp in Utah following the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. Shortly thereafter, he joined the U.S. Army and served with a military intelligence unit in the South Pacific.

Coming to Chicago at the war's end, Mr. Yoshino obtained a bachelor of arts degree in labor relations from Roosevelt. In 1953 he received a master's degree in social and industrial relations from Loyola University (Chicago).

From 1956 to 1961, he was contract compliance adviser for the President's Committee on Government Contracts.

Mr. Yoshino has served two terms as President of the Capital's chapter of the Japanese-American Citizens' League. He is currently chairman of the league's eastern district council.

The award winner was a delegate to the recent White House conferences on youth and the problems of aging.

Accompanied to Chicago by Mrs. Yoshino, the homecoming guest of honor lives with his wife and son in Silver Spring, Md.

Roosevelt University was founded in 1945 to provide opportunity for learning and teaching in conditions of freedom and equality. The university's educational purpose is to produce well-informed, thoughtful individuals capable not only of adapting themselves to the world as they find it, but also of thinking critically and constructively about that world, so that they may act effectively for the betterment of human institutions. The University seeks to provide this opportunity and achieve its purpose by:

Admitting to its membership both teachers and students on the basis of individual merit and without regard to race, color, or creed;

Maintaining full freedom of inquiry, teaching, and expressions of opinion in the spirit of the Constitution and laws of the United States and the State of Illinois;

Providing to an unprecedented degree for participation by teachers and students in the government of the university, under conditions which ensure that those who have rights also share responsibilities;

Setting a goal of excellence in its teaching and research programs in the liberal arts, the sciences, and the professions, and expecting that teachers and students alike will strive toward this goal to the maximum of their powers;

Insuring that, from the standpoint of location, time, and cost, its educational facilities are made as accessible as possible to all qualified students.

## Reduced Rates on Grain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, one of the most interesting and controversial cases to come before the Interstate Commerce Commission in recent years involves the reduced rates on grain transported in the Southern Railway System's "Big John" hopper cars.

This case, and its ultimate resolution by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the courts, may have a considerable influence, not just on the transportation practices of the Nation, but also on the various legislative proposals dealing with the regulation of freight rates.

A three-member panel of the ICC, consisting of Commissioners Howard G. Freas, Abe McGregor Goff, and John W. Bush, recently unanimously approved the reduced rates sought by the Southern Railway System in this case. The 81-page decision of Division 2 of the ICC is too lengthy for insertion in the RECORD, but because of its importance and interest, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD a press release from the ICC announcing the decision, together with an article about it by John P. MacKenzie published in the Washington Post of January 26, 1963.

There being no objection, the press release and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIVISION 2 APPROVES SOUTHERN'S MULTIPLE-CAR GRAIN RATES

Division 2 of the Interstate Commerce Commission today unanimously approved Southern Railway system multiple-car rates (except for a minor tariff provision concerning substitution of cars), minimum 450 tons in 5 jumbo cars, on grain from Mississippi and Ohio River crossings to destinations in the South and Southeast.

The proceeding in Investigation and Suspension Docket No. 7656, "Grain in Multiple-Car Shipments—River Crossings to the South," involved reduced rates on grain transported in Southern's "Big John" aluminum covered hopper cars of large loading capacity.

In a report by Commissioner Howard Freas, the division stated that "progress is achieved not by condemnation of innovation but by its encouragement" and noted that "technological efficiencies and managerial initiative constitute elements to be promoted under the national transportation policy rather than to be stultified." The division found the proposal to be "an effort by the Southern to obtain revenue, which has bypassed it over the years, to enable it, under honest, economical, and efficient management, to provide railway service at the lowest cost consistent with the furnishing of such service."

The rates were filed to become effective August 10, 1961. Upon protest of numerous interests the Commission, in accordance with provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act, suspended the operation of the rates for a 7-month period ending March 9, 1962, and their effective date was voluntarily further postponed through August 7, 1962. The Supreme Court, however, extended lower Federal court orders preventing the rates from becoming effecive pending its determination as to whether Federal courts have jurisdiction to enjoin or suspend rates published by common carriers before entry of a final order of the Commission.

The proceeding was one of the most sharply fought cases in the Commission's history. Some 140 days of public hearings concluded August 29, 1962. The voluminous record which was compiled included 15,815 pages and 766 exhibits. Briefs were filed by the parties on November 5, 1962.

The division noted that the proposal was designed to meet unregulated truck competition which has already upset the railroad grain rate structure and distorted relationships among markets, commodities, and shippers.

In dealing with numerous Interstate Commerce Act violations alleged by many protesting parties, the division declared that the Southern made a prima facie case of lawfulness, and that protestants failed to overcome it.

The proceeding marked the first instance wherein a formnal determination was made as to "public costs" of barge transportation, i.e., what, if any, portion of public investment and maintenance costs must properly be assignable to barge transportation on the various rivers. The division indicated that "it is manifest that in competitive ratemaking where one mode does assert the inherent advantage of low cost in performing a service, sound economics plainly require that all costs, including 'public costs,' which go to make up the asserted inherent advantage must, in all justice, be considered."

Other rates of the Southern subject to minima of 900 tons in 10 cars and 1,800 tons in 20 cars were found not justified as were the proposed rates of other railroad respondents not utilizing jumbo-car equipment.

The Interstate Commerce Commission determined that the proceeding involves an issue of general transportation importance.

ICC STUDY HAILS RAIL EFFICIENCY

(By John P. MacKenzie)

If the ratemaking division of the Interstate Commerce Commission has its way, rewards in transportation will go to the resourceful, aggressive innovators in a rough-and-tumble competitive world.

The Commissioners' 81-page decision approving the Southern Railway system's proposal for drastic reductions in grain-hauling rates is full of language praising the virtues of rugged competition.

"Progress," the Commissioners declared, "is achieved not by condemnation of innovation but by its encouragement."

Southern's solution to growing truck competition, a solution which involved millions of dollars invested in new ways to haul grain, displayed "technological efficiencies and managerial initiative," they added, "elements to be promoted under the national transportation policy rather than to be stultified."

While striking a blow for rugged individualism, however, the Commissioners also took some of the steam out of the drive by the railroads to repeal the ICC's powers to set minimum rates. If upheld by the full 11-member ICC, the ratemaking Commissioners' ruling will be a strong counterpunch for regulation.

Railroads complain, and President Kennedy has backed them up, that they should

be placed on a more equal footing with the unregulated barges and trucks which are taking away much of their business.

In his transportation message last year, the President proposed an end to the ICC's power to suspend and outlaw minimum freight rates found to be too low to bring a profit and destructive of other modes of transportation. As an alternative, the President said Congress might decide to extend regulation to barges and trucks.

Either way, Mr. Kennedy said, the different forms of transportation should be treated alike. He made clear that he preferred his main proposal. The ICC, however, backed the alternative.

Among the chief spokesmen for "the dead hand of Government regulation" line of criticism has been D. W. Brosnan, president of Southern and beneficiary of Thursday's decision. What Brosnan did not say in his statement hailing the decision was that the ICC has demonstrated that it can use its regulatory powers to offer incentives to railroads.

Brosnan did say he was "gratified" by the ICC action. But he added he would be still more gratified if the ICC granted more of what he asked for.

The Commissioners approved Southern's bid to lower rates an average of 62 percent on grain shipments of 450-ton minimum as long as the shipments are in radically new "Big John" aluminum-covered cars specially designed to regain grain traffic. The Commissioners rejected lower rates for still larger volume shipments, and Brosnan said he would press for those rates also.

Barge lines, which haul grain and charge rates not subject to ICC jurisdiction, contested the Southern proposals bitterly in yearlong hearings. They said Southern was determined to drive the barges out of business.

The bargemen contended that Southern's rates actually were below cost. They claimed an inherent advantage over trains in their cheap operation and pointed to the Interstate Commerce Act's admonition to foster those inherent advantages.

But the Commissioners replied that, in weighing natural advantages, the barges could not utilize the "public costs" of Government expenditures to improve the waterways. These expenses, the Commissioners declared in a precedent-setting ruling, must be added to the cost of barge transportation.

Turning to the motor carriers, the Commissioners declared that unregulated trucking "has already upset the rail grain structure and distorted relationships among markets, commodities, and shippers.

"While Congress has exempted such carriers from the licensing and rate regulation," the Commissioners added, "we do not view such action as indicating any intent to isolate them from competition."

And competition is just what the Commissioners have ordered.

## The Late John J. Bell

SPEECH
OF
## HON. BOB CASEY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 28, 1963*

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues from Texas in paying tribute to the late Honorable John J. Bell, a man who served his State and his Nation ably and well.

I knew John Bell when he served in the Texas Legislature, where I had the privilege to serve. I knew him personally and by the distinguished reputation he left as a Member of the House of Representatives and a member of the Texas Senate, prior to his service in this body.

John Bell's untimely death saddens me, as I know it does all his friends. At a time like this, words are of little consolation to the family of such a great man. But the thought that we share this deep loss with them, may perhaps help ease the burden of sorrow they carry.

My deepest sympathy goes to this great American's devoted wife, and to the people of Texas, who lost a valued and proven public servant.

## Tribute to Eleanor Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, Baltimore was one of the many cities in which memorial services were held for Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. The service was held on December 9 with prominent Baltimoreans participating. Among them were the Reverend Robert T. Newbold, Jr., the Reverend Don Frank Fenn, Rabbi Morris Lieberman, Father James B. O'Hara, and the Edmondson High School choir under the direction of Mrs. Georgeanna Chester, accompanied by Mr. Edward Roberts. Music was furnished by the Winterbourne Quartet.

I believe that the type of organizations sponsoring the memorial is a tribute to the high regard and esteem in which Mrs. Roosevelt was held by all of our citizens. They were the American Civil Liberties Union, Maryland branch; American Jewish Congress, Maryland chapter; Baltimore Council, AFL–CIO; B'nai B'rith; Baltimore Teachers Union; Baltimore Urban League; Congress on Racial Equality; International Ladies' Garment Workers Union; Maryland Council of Churches; Maryland League of Women's Clubs; National Association for Advancement of Colored People; National Council of Jewish Women, Baltimore section; National Council of Negro Women; United Nations Association of Maryland; United World Federalists; Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

The assembly was fortunate in having as its speaker the former mayor of Baltimore and Governor of Maryland, Theodore R. McKeldin. In the belief that this tribute to Mrs. Roosevelt will be of interest to all Members, I am inserting his remarks in the RECORD:

MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR ELEANOR ROOSEVELT, MERGENTHALER HIGH SCHOOL, SUNDAY, DECEMBER 9, 1962

Nearly 25 centuries have passed since Pericles, the Athenian, noted that in his day it was already a time-honored custom of civilized men to gather at an appointed time to pay formal tribute to the dead who were held in honor by the survivors. It is for that purpose we are gathered here today. A memorial service is a response to a human impulse as old as history; and nothing lasts so long unless it meets a deep-felt human need.

Perhaps in the dim, distant past men may have cherished the superstitution that by word or act they could add somewhat to the honor of the dead, but we have long outgrown that delusion. Our need is not to contribute anything to the past, but to clear ourselves for the future of any suspicion that we were too blind, too dull of soul to recognize and respond to greatness in our own time.

Nothing said or done in this place at this time can add in the slightest degree luster to the name of Eleanor Roosevelt; but the fact of our presence here does acquit us of suspicion, in time to come, that we were too stolid, too lumpish to feel a lift of the spirit when we are touched by the splendor that radiates from a great heart and a noble mind.

It will be years, it may be a generation before history will be able to set in true perspective the contribution that this woman made to the advancement of American civilization. It is not my purpose or my desire to attempt that task. This is not the occasion for laborious documentation and careful analysis, even if it were practical. I take, instead, the Psalmist's view that, "We spend our years as a tale that is told," and from that point of view I tell you a tale of one woman's life, not for its historical significance, which is still to be assessed, but for its sheer beauty, which is before our eyes.

Every reader of Eleanor Roosevelt's autobiography has noted the persistence with which she insists upon her own insignificance in her early years. Most of us, I think, refuse to take that at face value, believing that she was overmodest, but she does convince us that she honestly regarded herself as lacking any of the qualities that the world most values in a woman—beauty, grace, sparkle, the power of fascination, all that goes to make up what in an earlier day was called a heartbreaker. Her own half-joking, half-rueful description of herself was "an ugly duckling."

At first, we may reject that as shocking, but if we stop to think it over perhaps we may change our minds. The "Ugly Duckling" in Hans Christian Andersen's story, you remember, was not a duckling at all, but a cygnet, a newly hatched swan; and in the course of time the cygnet developed the beauty and the grace of the swan, that put all the other birds to shame.

We usually classify the tale as a fairy story for children, but it is not, properly speaking, a fairy story; it is an allegory, a fictional presentation of a great literary artist's view of one aspect of human life. So understood, it is one of the most charming tales in literature, fascinating to children, but a help and comfort to many a grown man and woman.

For the cygnet, you remember, was not transformed into a swan by the touch of a fairy godmother's magic wand. It was the slow emergence of an inner grace, an inner beauty that had always been there. Time, the enemy of most of us, was a friend of the ugly duckling, for the swan, according to the old tradition, increases in beauty with the passage of time, and with the swansong, ends in music.

With this in mind, I am quite willing to accept Eleanor Roosevelt's description of herself, for while Anderson wrote, she lived the story of the "Ugly Duckling." The creation of art she brought into everyday life, high fantasy she transformed into plain fact. Any man or woman who can convert human life into art, who can make real what to the storyteller was only a lovely dream, has achieved a wonder; and this woman did it.

To say that she was well born is true, but she was not born to great wealth or to great happiness. Her childhood, indeed, was bleak to an extent unknown to many poorer children in obscure families, and her young womanhood was touched by tragedy more than once. She was early acquainted with grief and sorrow was more familiar to her than pleasure. She did achieve the happiness of marriage to a man she sincerely loved, but even that did not last long, because her husband while still a young man, was stricken by a crippling malady, which gave her, first, weeks of mortal terror and then years of incessant care. But the more crushing her burdens became, the more she developed that inner strength, that spiritual power that alone can endow mortal beings with beauty and grace that last throughout their lives. Her husband rose to fame and more than imperial power, but at the very moment when he seemed in the way of achieving his greatest work, the hand of death intervened, and the woman who had richly earned the right to wear the purple had instead to put on widow's weeds.

It is hard to think of a more bitter demonstration of the irony of history, but if the bitterness entered the heart of this woman no word of it escaped her lips. Her response to the crushing burden that fate had laid upon her was to take on new burdens. Instead of being engrossed in her own sorrows she became more attentive than ever to the sorrows of others. Instead of wailing over her losses she heard ever more clearly the cry of the oppressed.

Even if time permitted it would be useless for me to try to catalog her achievements, and I doubt that any human being knows them all, for much of her noblest work was done secretly. But we are all aware that Eleanor Roosevelt was known to the poor and distressed in New York City long before she was known to the Nation. In schools, and studios, and workshops, she brought sympathetic understanding to the problems of young people before she brought them to the problems of statesmen. Prisoners and outcasts knew her before she had entered any royal palace. She disdained the boundaries of race and creed; her hatred of injustice inflicted upon the children of Israel, or the children of Africa was as strong and relentless as her hatred of injustice inflicted upon her own household.

To the self-centered this was folly for which they upbraided her. But out of this seemingly folly she distilled, as the years passed, such wisdom that many of the wisest statesmen of her time sought her counsel on problems that baffled them. I do not believe that any other woman in American history was listened to respectfully by so many of earth's greatest and most powerful; and few, if any, have been so beloved by the poor and weak.

Well, the tale is finished. The story that Andersen wrote has been lived before our eyes. It has gone through all its phases, through grace to beauty, through beauty to splendor, through splendor to music, for it can be said of her as confidently as it was said of Mr. Valiant-for-Truth that "all the trumpets sounded for her on the other side."

Eleanor Roosevelt is done with us, but are we done with her? If we must answer, yes, then this is a vain assembly without purpose or effect. But we cannot answer yes, for the influence on humanity of a great life is never ended by the death of the great man or woman. Frequently it is at the moment of death that its most powerful influence begins; for once the great person is removed, envy, detraction and prejudice cease to obscure the splendor of fine deeds.

This life is certain to be remembered long because of its extraordinary effectiveness in offering strength and encouragement to others. For it is not a story of Fortune's darling, who achieved without effort and conquered without pain; but a story of one who, like the rest of us, knew labor and sorrow, but who was not crushed by burdens nor dismayed by grief. It is a story reminding us that while not all of us can achieve greatness, the least of us can achieve growth; and that the grace and beauty that are everlasting are not those that are given by capricious Fortune, but those that are developed from within. Thinking on these things, who does not take heart of hope? Who is not encouraged by hearing such a story, who is not spurred to higher achievement by it?

This is the legacy that Eleanor Roosevelt has left the world. Destiny called her to high places, where she walked among princes and potentates, but all men know that it was not her great position, but her great heart that made her memorable. Because that memory remains with us, to cheer and inspire as long as human hearts respond to greatness, her death is no more than a punctuation mark, the period set at the end of a golden story. Death's stroke served only to give her a place among the honored dead of whom it is written—

Men from tears refrain,
Honor, and praise, but mourn them not.

A distinguished American, a great statesman and an ambassador of genuine ability and integrity by the name of Adlai Stevenson spoke for us all when he said:

"She lit candles instead of cursing the darkness, and their glow has warmed the world."

May God make us worthy of her memory.

## Israel: A Real Friend of America and the Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I know we have all watched with pride and pleasure as the State of Israel has grown in strength over the years, and has extended its influence in the troubled Middle East as a genuine friend of the United States and of the same principles of freedom on which our own country was built.

I hope our foreign policy will always recognize this close tie which binds us with Israel and that we never let ourselves be diverted for transient objectives to any course that might even indirectly provide aid or comfort to those who are committed to the destruction of Israel and all she stands for.

One of Israel's latest achievements was recently paid tribute to in the pages of the Washington Post. Under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial from the Post's issue of January 28:

The editorial follows:

ASSIST FROM ISRAEL

Israel is increasingly playing a unique role as a workshop for developing countries. Although pressed for funds for its own development, Israel has nevertheless undertaken technical assistance programs in a host of Afro-Asian countries. Doubtless there is a political incentive, but Israel's way of extending here influence is commendable, successful and popular. It is welcome news that Israel is now expanding its technical assistance program in this hemisphere and plans to train about 200 Latin American students in agricultural techniques.

The special value of Israel's initiative is that the country is small and its problems akin to those in developing nations. What is especially important is that few can ascribe imperialistic designs to its aid programs. An increasing exchange between Israel and Latin America can be an effective supplement to the Alliance for Progress; it is good that it has already begun.

## Catholic War Veterans Honor Max Steiner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, at a recent meeting in Chicago, Edward F. McElroy, national commander of the Catholic War Veterans of the United States bestowed upon Max S. Steiner, of Chicago the Distinguished Service Medal of the Catholic War Veterans. The presentation address of Commander McElroy so clearly typifies the spirit of cooperation and togetherness which has helped to build the strength of this great Republic that I ask unanimous consent that the statement by Mr. McElroy be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY COMDR. EDWARD F. MCELROY

I stand before you as the national commander of the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America to present an award to a most charitable man and a dedicated American. I can honestly say that I am experiencing one of the greatest moments of my life in making this presentation.

The highest medal that we of the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America may present is the Distinguished Service Medal. That is the award that I am about to present to Max S. Steiner, president of the Clifford Peterson Tool Co., of the great city of Chicago.

Before this highlight of the day, I would like to tell you a little about this kind, considerate, loving, charitable man.

Max Steiner is a self-made man. As a boy, he came from little. But through his own dynamic wit, personality and congenial attitude, he became a topflight salesman. Almost a quarter of a century ago he came to Peterson Tool Co., and rose to be its distinguished and loving president.

Anyone in his employ feels as though he were working for Santa Claus 365 days of the year. Max S. Steiner's many charitable deeds are not limited to just those of the Jewish faith, of which he is a member, but to all faiths and denominations. He has assisted boys in becoming rabbis and Catholic priests. He has mended marital problems and has helped the young, struggling boys and girls get married. Max S. Steiner has helped develop and make leaders of our city, county, and State government. May I proudly and humbly say he played

an important role in my successful election as the National Commander of the Catholic War Veterans of this great country of ours. My family, my good Irish, Catholic mother and yours truly are eternally grateful.

There you have just a part of the life of a dedicated American and most charitable man of all causes. Max, I know you feel thrilled about receiving our Distinguished Service Medal, but I sincerely feel that it is more of a thrill for me to be able to do something for you. God bless you and good health to you for many years to come.

## Tribute to Colin F. Stam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Tax Foundation, Inc., one of the finest independent institutions for research on governmental affairs in the United States, observed its 25th anniversary at the Plaza Hotel, New York, on December 4, 1962.

On that occasion the foundation's annual award for distinguished public service was presented to Colin F. Stam, Chief of Staff for the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. The presentation was made by the Hon. Rosewell Magill, chairman of the foundation's board of trustees.

It was my privilege to be Chairman of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation at that time. I wish to say that Colin Stam richly deserves recognition of his service to his country and the Congress, and such recognition by Tax Foundation is an honor indeed.

I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks by Chairman Magill as he presented the award to Mr. Stam.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESENTATION OF AWARD TO COLIN STAM BY ROSEWELL MAGILL, CHAIRMAN, TAX FOUNDATION, INC.

The man the Tax Foundation has chosen to honor this year with its annual Award for Distinguished Public Service has been chief of staff for the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation for 24 years; he has been a member of the committee staff for 35 years.

The committee for which he has worked so long and so diligently was created by statute in 1926. Its purpose is to study the operation and effects of the Federal system of internal revenue taxes and the administration of such taxes. It is composed of the ranking members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives and the Finance Committee of the Senate.

Our award recipient tonight was born in Chestertown, Md., was educated at Washington College and Georgetown University. He received a law degree in 1922 and began his career as an attorney for the Bureau of Internal Revenue in that year. Four years later he was named attorney in the office of the general counsel of the Bureau. He began his work with the joint committee in 1927 when he was named assistant counsel. He served as the committee's counsel from 1929 to 1938 when he was named chief of staff.

By nature, the man we honor in this presentation is a retiring man. His eminence is based on his ability and the quality of his work. He is a dedicated public servand in the very best sense of the words.

Senator BYRD of Virginia, who has been a member of the joint committee since 1949 and has alternated as its chairman and ranking member since 1955 recently made this observation about our guest:

"I regard him as the best authority in the field of Federal tax law, in all of its aspects, in government and perhaps in the country * * * I know he has rejected positions outside of Government which would have been far more remunerative. His public service is invaluable. I know him as a man motivated by devotion to this work and his best endeavor to protect the interests of the Government with all justice to its taxpaying citizens."

The foundation is pleased and honored to give its award this year to a man who has so long and so well served the American people.

The award is represented by this silver plaque on which are inscribed the following words:

"Presented to Colin Ferguson Stam, Chief of Staff, Joint Committee on Internal Taxation, Congress of the United States, for His Distinguished Service to the American People of His Outstanding Contributions to Tax Law and Administration and for His Dedication to the Highest Ideals of Public Service, by the Tax Foundation, New York, December 4, 1962."

## The Agricultural Program—Address by the Secretary of the Interior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on January 22, the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, delivered before the National Limestone Institute an excellent speech relating to certain phases of our agricultural program. I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE FREEMAN BEFORE THE NATIONAL LIMESTONE INSTITUTE, AT ITS BANQUET ON JANUARY 22, 1963

It's a great pleasure and a privilege to be here with you tonight to enjoy this very generous hospitality, and I might add, to have the opportunity to speak to so many Members of the Senate and the House so early in the session; but according to ground rules, I understand they don't have much chance to talk back. I assure you that this is a very desirable situation, particularly for a Secretary of Agriculture. This is a most impressive gathering and it provides a very real opportunity to visit with you a bit about matters of common concern that we share. In agriculture and soil improvement and in the modern roads so vital to rural America and agriculture—the farm-to-market roads—we have very real and common interests to share.

I thought I might direct my remarks this evening to some of the great changes taking place in rural America in this rapidly growing, expanding, and changing land of ours—to the broad subject in which I know we share a very real common interest—conservation. And I'd like to preface my remarks by saying at the outset that I dislike the words "soil bank," "diverted acres," "idle acres," and the whole concept of nonuse that they represent. To me these terms and the practices they describe are the direct opposite of true conservation. For true conservation in a real and meaningful sense means serving people—the use of land and water to meet human needs now and in the future. Unless we use the land and water to satisfy human needs—what purpose does it serve?

So the question is: Are we making the best and wisest use of our land and water to serve our national well-being?

I think we all would agree here this evening. The answer is "No."

But I believe we are moving in the right direction. Your organization, the National Limestone Institute, has contributed mightily to a more rapid movement toward the goal of real conservation. And I believe that in the future you will continue to play a critical role in pointing the way to proper and beneficial land use—true conservation in this great and changing land of ours.

Today and for the foreseeable future, our American family farm agriculture will be able to feed our people at home and to make available increasing amounts of food and fiber for trade and aid and economic development around the world. I make this most significant statement not as conjecture, or even as an estimate, but rather as a simple statement of fact.

From this statement of our very great potential for production flow some other very, very important facts that I think we need to keep in mind as we work together to chart the path to take maximum advantage of the changes, to apply our resources, for the betterment of the lives of our people; and, yes, for the building of a better world, for the road to a peaceful world is surely the building of a better world for people everywhere.

At home, this great miracle of abundance which we enjoy has meant great things to our people.

It has meant that the average farmworker now feeds himself and 26 others—freeing the vast majority of our people for productive work of other kinds.

Food in these United States today is the best bargain we have. A lot of people don't know that. A lot of housewives don't know that. The food budget of the average family accounts for less than 19 percent of the family's income after taxes. In 1952, Americans were spending 23 percent of their income for food—and in 1947 it was 27 percent. The people of this country are getting better food, better packaged, and more of it preprepared—but at less real cost than any people, anywhere in the history of the world.

In the different countries of Western Europe—where living standards are relatively high—consumers spend anywhere from 30 to 45 percent of their after-tax incomes for food. In Russia the proportion is well over 50 percent.

Sometimes I think that the people of other countries have a finer appreciation of America's abundance than we do—because they have food problems. The hungry of the world know about American agricultural abundance because food for peace is supplementing the food resources of more than 100 countries. The Iron Curtain countries know it—and their leaders are struggling to find a formula for a similar success.

Every single country behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains—and the Sugar Cane Curtain too—is having food problems.

Just 4 years ago Fidel Castro assumed power in Cuba. At that time farm production accounted for over one-third of the national income and employed about two-fifths of the labor force. Food supplies were adequate for the country's people, and farm exports brought in most of Cuba's foreign exchange earnings.

The situation today is quite different, I assure you. Cuba is in the midst of an agricultural crisis—and there is no change in sight. There simply is not enough food—and per capita consumption has dropped a fifth since 1958.

Russia is havings its food problems—a failure of communism that even Khrushchev freely admits. Production is far behind the country's goals—especially for grains, meat and dairy products. And in Red China tonight, where agriculture has broken down, millions of people go hungry. East Germany, Hungary, Bulgaria—you name it—every one of the Communist countries has a serious food shortage problem.

There has been no such problem in this generation in the United States because of the productive ability of the American family farm—the most successful agrarian institution ever developed.

But this miracle of abundance of producing more and more on fewer and fewer acres has also meant sharp and very quick changes in the face of rural America. And these changes have brought with them a great deal of hardship.

Farmers and others associated with them in rural America have suffered unfairly as a product of these changes.

In most recent years, American farmers have produced 5 or 6 percent more food than we could consume or give away. And without adjustment programs, overproduction would have much more severe consequences. Individual farmers acting alone can do little to prevent overproduction.

Overproduction in a free enterprise economy means, of course, sharp downward pressure on prices. The result is the cost-price squeeze we are all so familiar with. In the decade of the 1950's, net realized farm income declined more than a tenth at a time when other incomes were rising steadily.

Many family farmers were pushed off the land. In the 5 census years between 1954 and 1959, the total number of farms declined 15 percent.

And it wasn't only farmers who suffered. I know that many of you in this room live in and serve small rural communities. Others of us have revisited the small towns we know. And we see many of these communities have fallen into the backwater of America's economic growth.

In many of them, agriculture was once—but no longer is—an economic mainstay. Many of these towns were once—but no longer are—bustling centers of opportunity in business and agriculture.

There are many ways to measure what has happened.

You can measure it in the changing character of our population. In the decade of the 1950's, our national population increased by 29 million people. Yet, population declined in most towns of fewer than 2,500, and increased only slightly in those of 2,500 to 10,000. The farm population that supports these smaller towns and cities fell off by a third.

You can measure it in the lack of adequate opportunities for education. Urban people over 25 years of age have on the average a fourth more formal schooling than do their farm counterparts.

You can measure it in the lack of job opportunities. Underemployment in rural areas is the equivalent of around 4 million entirely unemployed.

You can measure it in the unwillingness of younger people—especially the more ambitious—to remain and work in their hometowns. For many rural communities, this rapid outmigration of the young is particularly tragic. Opportunity could have been created locally as well as at a distance.

You can measure the rural problem in the incidence of actual poverty. More than half the poverty in the United States today is in rural America—a rural America which has at the same time created a worldwide success story in food production.

Yet these communities, even where economic problems are most acute, all have important resources—both natural and human resources. They deserve the best efforts we can give to their problems—through every public and private source available.

Change is inexorable. We may disagree as to whether or not a particular change is beneficial or otherwise, but we cannot disagree with the fact that change takes place. It is a law of life. Yet the threat to rural America does not lies in scientific and technical change itself. The threat lies in the failure to direct changes growing out of that progress in ways to meet the real needs and wants of all the people. Change must be shaped to work for people—not against them.

And I sincerely believe that if we are alert and willing to act, we can shape these changes so that rural America as well as urban America will prosper and benefit from the production miracle that is American agriculture.

There is no reason for income in rural America to lag—and I think we ought to be challenged as long as the income in rural America lags so significantly behind that in the urban areas. Even though we've seen in these past 2 years an increase of gross income in agricultural of over $2 billion a year, which has reflected itself in a more prosperious business community, in higher bank deposits in rural towns, in farm machinery sales, in the sale of household appliances, and many, many other things we can name. Even so, this $2 billion income increase, or $1.1 billion net increase, still leaves per capita agricultural income only about 60 percent of that in our urban areas. And until we have real parity of income, by that I mean equality of income between rural and urban America, there is work to be done—the kind of work I know this institute seeks to contribute to. It all comes down again to conservation—to proper land use in the most meaningful sense of that word.

We know that we don't need all of our land and water to produce the food and fiber we require. During the past 2 years, we have been using for crop production less than two-thirds of the land we classify as cropland. With acre yields growing more rapidly than population year by year, we know that we can produce all the food and fiber we need with much less cropland than we have available.

At the same time, we do need land and water for other things. We have growing needs for recreation, for timber, for grazing for livestock, for industry. The expanding urban character of our population indicates a growing urgency for the preservation and use of green areas around cities and towns, or simply open spaces to look at, climb on, walk through, or mediate in.

We are a people with a pioneer tradition. Open space is a part of that heritage, and it is essential that we maintain the opportunity for Americans everywhere to make use of space as one of our natural resources.

So now as true conservationists, our challenge is clear—to make the land adjustments needed, we must work not idle, use not bank, apply not divert, our great natural resources of land and water.

We must seek alternative land and water uses that will serve our people in worthwhile ways, now and in the future. This isn't an easy proposition.

It is relatively easy to generalize about, but to do it in a free economy, to do it in an economic manner, that will contribute to the economic well-being and the standard of living of the people in the city and the country alike, is something that taxes our ingenuity, and that will tax our foresight, our thinking and our cooperation. But it is something, I believe, that can be done, and I believe that progress is beginning, or at least we see the glimmerings and the beginning of things that might be.

And as a part of this, we have developed a program in the Department which we call the rural areas development program. You may see more of these words—"rural areas development," "the rural areas development program." The philosophy behind this program is the effective use and adjustment of our great natural resources. Incidentally, as many of you may know, your president, Bob Koch, is a member of the national advisory committee on rural areas development, has been most faithful and attentive, and has contributed significantly as we've attempted to think our way forward and to test and to try and to experiment in terms of trying to move in the direction of real use and meaningful adjustment.

The rural areas development program is a blending and coordination of all available resources—private and public, local, State, and National—toward the common goal of a prosperous rural America.

Let me describe a number of things we have done in the Department. One has been a departmental reorganization. With us here this evening is Assistant Secretary John Baker, the man who directs the rural areas development program. Under him are related programs that contribute to the overall rural areas development purpose, mainly the Forest Service, Farmer Cooperative Service, the Farmers Home Administration, the Rural Electrification Administration, and the Soil Conservation Service. Playing a very vital part in all of this, too, are agencies working closely with him—particularly the Federal Extension Service and the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service. Many of you know the Administrator of that program, whom you honored a year ago, Horace Godfrey and his assistant, Ed Jaenke, and their ladies who are with us here tonight. They work through Assistant Secretary John Duncan, whom many of you know. I mention this because I would like to emphasize that the rural areas development program is a top-priority effort within the Department of Agriculture, and I can assure you that it will continue to command our best energy, our know-how and all our resources.

In this description of rural areas development, I would like to pay tribute to the Members of the Congress here tonight. They have contributed vitally to what was highly significant legislation in the farm bill passed last year. You know the commodity programs—where there is always strong controversy and very heated feelings on occasion, and I am sorry to say sometimes partisanship—tend to attract the most attention. I would hazard a prediction that 10 years from now, or maybe 5, commodity programs will be long since forgotten. But the action in land and water conservation, in programs for credit, in providing cost-sharing and adjustment payments under long-term cropland conversion programs, in the authority to initiate rural renewal projects through technical assistance and loans to local public agencies will mark this act as one of the most significant in the annals of history.

Regardless of what we may do, however, and we're proud of the Department of Agriculture and the dedicated able people in it, and despite what Congress in their wisdom may do, any rural areas development program

rests on local people and local leadership. Happily we have found a great deal of enthusiasm in local communities. Today there are rural development committees in 1,800 counties—and they are preparing thousands of projects that will help create the conditions essential for economic growth.

One of the most encouraging things about the program is the growing evidence that Federal funds can be used to stimulate a many-fold investment from other sources. In other words, Government financing is playing a "seed capital" role by bringing about the investment of much larger sums by private and local sources.

For example, the Rural Electrification Administration surveyed about 400 industrial and commercial projects that REA borrowers had helped to launch. It was found that the 400 projects are being financed by more than $250 million of private capital compared with only about $15 million from Federal sources.

Incidentally, it is anticipated that those 400 projects will directly create some 30,000 new jobs—and indirectly, another 22,000.

Another, much broader survey discloses that throughout the country 133,000 jobs have been created or saved already as a result of rural areas development activity.

A key role in the rural areas development program is being carried out through cost-sharing under the agricultural conservation program. In the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, agricultural conservation program was placed on a permanent basis for the first time—which is quite a landmark for the program. In the past, agricultural conservation program has been known as a "continuing" program that had to be renewed periodically by the Congress. This will no longer be necessary.

The 1962 act also amended the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to provide for long-term agreements under the agricultural conservation program, to help farmers change their cropping systems and land use and to develop soil, water, forest, wildlife and recreational resources. And it authorized USDA to share with local public bodies up to half the cost of land, easements, and rights-of-way for small watershed projects to be dedicated to public recreation.

The Department is already developing pilot projects under this legislation—to help farmers shift unneeded cropland to other uses. Last month, we named 41 counties in 13 States for long-term test programs to shift land out of crops and tame hay. The main idea is to convert this land to grass and forest—although water storage, wildlife habitat, and recreation uses will also be encouraged. In addition, other counties throughout the Nation are eligible to participate in a pilot program to convert cropland to income-producing recreation uses.

In some States, the test program will be tied in with small watershed projects authorized under Public Law 566. Such watershed work is underway or approved in 13 of the 41 counties where conversions to grass and trees are being started.

Farmers who are interested in this cropland conversion program will be helped through adjustment payments, cost sharing on conservation practices, and technical assistance. Farmers can enter into long-range agreements to shift land under plans which they have developed in cooperation with their local soil conservation districts. In addition, farmers or groups of farmers will also be able to obtain credit to help pay their share of the cost of conversion.

As I said, this pilot program, under the leadership of our ASC committees, is limited to this year. Our intention is to expand this cropland conversion program very rapidly and widely.

So far pilot projects in cropland conversion and recreation are limited to an expenditure of $10 million. The extension of the conservation reserve authorized by Congress is for only 1 year. So this is something the Congress will again turn its attention to. The basic legislation and direction is there. The implementation to carry forward the blueprint is something that will be in active consideration in the days ahead as we seek to convert and use land for new purposes which serve the changing needs of all people.

This, then, is a kind of quick recap of an important new thrust and direction in rural America. I do not suggest that this is a complete answer for all problems, but I would suggest to you that it is a meaningful beginning.

May I then conclude this address as I began by repeating: The answer is not to idle land, but rather to use it to meet other needs, and, as we do so, to provide constructive opportunities in areas other than farming for those who remain by choice in the rural community. There is important work to be done by such people. Our challenge is to work out the proper balance—a better word is conservation—the proper use of land and water to serve people.

This is an exciting enterprise—and 1963 is a key year. I invite each of you to look at your own community in terms of these opportunities—and to give your cooperation to these long-term programs for conservation and rural development. The reward will be great and long lasting to rural communities and to the Nation.

## Meaning of the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. NORRIS COTTON
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the Parent-Teachers Association of Amherst, N.H., recently had a speaker who stated that children had little understanding of what they were saying. She used as an example the "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag." One of the Amherst teachers decided to check on this statement and asked the members of her fourth grade class to write the "Pledge of Allegiance" in their own words. Two of these were selected as the best and published in the Milford (N.H.) Cabinet. Because I believe these so well indicate the feeling which the children of New Hampshire have for the United States and its flag, I ask unanimous consent that these statements be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Alexander Buchanan: "I promise to be faithful to the flag of the United States of America and to the country for which it stands; one group of free people under God who work together with freedom and fairness to all."

Martha Gray:

"I promise to be faithful
In my duty
To the people in my country
And to the flag
Of the United States of America!
I shall not part
From these free people
Who give freedom and fairness to all!"

## John Sharp Williams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, nearly 40 years ago the Nation suffered a loss when John Sharp Williams left Congress. His capacity for leadership, his intellect and his wit all helped shape the course of national legislation for 28 years; 16 in the House of Representatives and 12 in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. Robert W. Collins, of Yazoo City, Miss., where John Sharp Williams also made his home, has sent me a reprint of an article which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post under date of March 10, 1923.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the Saturday Evening Post article and the biographical sketch of John Sharp Williams which appears in the Biographical Directory of the American Congress. They follow:

Williams, John Sharp (grandson of Christopher Harris Williams) a Representative and a Senator from Mississippi; born in Memphis, Tenn., July 30, 1854; after the death of his parents moved to the family homestead of his mother in Yazoo County, Miss.; attended private schools, the Kentucky Military Institute near Frankfort, the University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn., the University of Virginia at Charlottesville, and the University of Heidelberg, at Baden, Germany; subsequently studied law at the University of Virginia and in Memphis, Tenn.; was admitted to the bar in Shelby County, Tenn., in 1877; moved to Yazoo City, Miss., in December 1878; engaged in the practice of law and also interested in cotton planting; delegate to the Democratic National Convention at Chicago in 1892; elected as a Democrat to the 53d and to the seven succeeding Congresses (March 4, 1893–March 3, 1909); was not a candidate for renomination in 1908; Democratic minority leader in the 58th, 59th, and 60th Congresses; temporary Chairman of the Democratic National Convention at St. Louis in 1904 which nominated Parker and Davis; elected to the U.S. Senate in 1910; reelected in 1916 and served from March 4, 1911, to March 3, 1923; declined to be a candidate for renomination in 1922; was a delegate to the Democratic National Convention at Baltimore in 1912, which nominated Wilson and Marshall; retired from public life and lived on his plantation, Cedar Grove, near Yazoo City, Miss., until his death there September 27, 1932; interment in the family cemetery on his plantation.

[From the Saturday Evening Post, Mar. 10, 1923]

WHO'S WHO—AND WHY—SERIOUS AND FRIVOLOUS FACTS ABOUT THE GREAT AND THE NEAR GREAT

A SENATOR OF THE OLD SCHOOL

The first families of the South have always been reluctant to apply the phrase "a gentleman and a scholar" to individuals who did not possess certain fundamental qualifications. Among these qualifications may be mentioned the possession of commodious plantations, preferably cotton plantations, an extreme sensitiveness concerning the honor of himself and his kin, an instinctive abhorrence for the Republican Party and all

its works, a marked willingness to fight at any and at all times for any cause that seems good, a large number of ancestors who have made notable contributions to the well-being of the South, a wide acquaintance with the classics and the ability to quote therefrom with precision and fluency, a thorough knowledge of the law of the land, a strong determination publicly to express dislike for offensive persons and measures, a complete command of invective in all its branches, an inexhaustible supply of hospitality, generosity and sentiment, and enough eloquence, religion and card sense to make himself a welcome and honored guest in any circle at all.

In the old days, for one reason or another, it frequently happened that Southern States were prepresented in the U.S. Senate by men who could be called both gentlemen and scholars without starting an argument anywhere in the South. Today the gentleman and scholar of the old school, as measured by the standards of the first families below the Mason and Dixon Line, is vanishing from the U.S. Senate with more vanishing power than that possessed by the American bison, and almost as much as that ascribed to the great auk.

Some people blame this unfortunate state of affairs on the high price of cotton plantations; still others on the direct-primary law, which so often permits demagogs to get further, nowadays, than statesmen. Whatever the reason, there are gentlemen from the South in the Senate, and there are scholars from the South in the Senate; but the last gentleman and scholar of the old school departed from the Senate Chamber on March 4, 1923, when John Sharp Williams, Democrat, of Yazoo County, Miss., voluntarily gave up the desk and chair once occupied by Jefferson Davis and repaired to his home near Yazoo City to devote himself to the varied pursuits of a cotton planter and to the reading of about as many books each day as Henry James used to produce each decade.

ORATOR AND KEEN DEBATER

It has not been the usual thing for gentlemen and scholars to retire voluntarily from the U.S. Senate; but much of the conversation that emerges from senatorial lips in these effete days can scarcely be classed as either stimulating or elevating. Book lovers, therefore, sometimes prefer to read books rather than listen to the sages of the Senate in action. John Sharp Williams is a book lover; and it is that fact, probably, which led him to remark not long since that he would rather be a dog and bay the moon than remain a Member of the U.S. Senate as at present constituted.

The records show that the branch of the Williams family, of which John Sharp Williams is the direct descendant, emerged from the mountains of Wales in a healthy and active state in the year 1678, and arrived in Hanover County, Va., in the same year, thus qualifying in the copper riveted and airtight group sometimes known as the First Families of Virginia.

Being fresh from the mountains, however, the Williams family found itself somewhat oppressed by the muggy climate of Virginia and moved on up to Yadkin County, N.C. At this point appears the first but not the last member of the Williams family to get a national reputation as a fighter, said member being John Williams, who, in addition to being the great-great-grandfather of John Sharp Williams, was captain of the Hillsboro, N.C. Minute Men and subsequently colonel of the Ninth Carolina Line Regiment.

Having duly accounted for the proper number of King George's cohorts, Colonel Williams was appointed by the North Carolina Legislature to the position of surveyor general of western North Carolina lands which were situated in what is now the State of Tennessee. So the Williams family moved over into Tennessee, where its members became even more prominent and wealthy than they had previously been, and where they retained their prominence and wealth with Welsh thoroughness and tenacity. The gentleman who is somewhat loosely referred to by present-day Williamses as Uncle Robert Williams, but who was the uncle of John Sharp Williams' grandfather, was appointed Governor of the Territory of Mississippi before the Territory was divided into Mississippi and Alabama; and in this way the Williams family established connections in Mississippi.

John Sharp Williams was born in Memphis, Tenn., in 1854. His father was colonel of the 27th Tennessee Volunteers, Confederate States Army, and was killed in the Battle of Shiloh. His mother, who had died, was from Mississippi; so when Memphis was threatened with capture by the Federal Army, his family took him to his mother's homestead in Yazoo County, Miss.

Southern boys whose fathers died through the agency of northern bullets were remarkably free from any passionate devotion to the North; and John Sharp Williams was no exception to the rule. When he had absorbed the education that the South afforded through various private schools, the Kentucky Military Institute, the University of the South, and the University of Virginia, he was still bothered by a slightly uneducated feeling. Being an unreconstructed rebel of the most unreconstructed type, it was impossible for him to alleviate this feeling at any northern university; and he therefore set off for the University of Heidelberg, carefully dodging the city of Washington on his way in order that he might not be forced to see the hated symbol of the conqueror floating over the Nation's Capitol.

He spent 2 years at Heidelberg; and then he came back home and studied law at the University of Virginia and with a Memphis law firm. As a result, at the age of 23, he was licensed to practice in the courts of law and chancery of Shelby County, Tenn.

As a further result, he had laid the foundation of his education with such success that while he was a Member of the U.S. Senate he was almost universally regarded as being without a peer in sustained logic and eloquence, in strength in running debate, in his knowledge of the origin of politics, of political science, of the history of nations and of the classics, and in his fund of general and accurate information—and he was so regarded, too, in spite of the presence of that celebrated Massachusetts institution, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, with his accompanying smokescreen of 11 university degrees and 19 bulky books.

At the age of 24 he went back to Yazoo City and practiced his profession and indulged in the various pursuits which are customarily pursued by the wealthy, gentlemanly, and scholarly cotton planter, and otherwise behaved as a gentleman and a scholar should behave; and in November 1892, he was elected to the 53d Congress, following which he was reelected with such persistence and enthusiasm that many southerners—and northerners, too, for that matter—began to think that he would be flowing up to Washington from Mississippi long after the Mississippi River had ceased to flow into the Gulf of Mexico.

He had no sooner entered the House of Representatives than he burst into eloquent speech; and those who sought to oppose this rambunctious youngster from the cotton plantations of the distant South discovered to their pain and chagrin that the keenness of his tongue was sufficient to remove the hide from a Siberian mammoth in long, quivering strips.

THE SENATOR IN ACTION

Since that time many a master of invective in both the House and Senate has confidently entered a battle of tongues with him, only to limp painfully to a first-aid station in the nearest cloakroom and apply poultices to the blisters raised by the stinging Williams attack. In addition to rising to the position of Democratic floor leader in the House, John Sharp Williams was his party's candidate for Speaker of the House in the 58th, 59th, and 60th Congresses—a period when the Speaker of the House was almost as important a figure as the President of the United States. On January 23, 1908, he was elected to the U.S. Senate by the Mississippi Legislature; and on April 4, 1911, he took his seat, the same seat—not by chance or by coincidence, but because of the uproarious and determined demands which he made for it in his most unreconstructed and rebellious manner—that had been occupied by Jefferson Davis when that distinguished gentleman, scholar, and leader of a lost cause was sojourning in the Senate. In 1916 he was renominated and reelected to the Senate without opposition.

John Sharp Williams frequently deceived those awestruck souls from Coot Point, Maine, and Constantinople, N.Y., who entered the Senate gallery expecting to see the Senate floor populated with statesmen 9 feet in height, all busy debating with one another in words four syllables long. They were not greatly impressed by John Sharp Williams when he shambled through the center door opposite the Vice President's rostrum, and stood there in apparent helplessness, with his shock of white hair and his old gray suit that looked as though it had been slept in ever since the Civil War, and as though the pockets had been used as common carriers for dumbbells or other heavy weights since the Cleveland administration. Nor were they particularly thrilled or stirred when John Sharp supporting himself on adjacent desks, wobbled rather wearily over to a Senator who might be witching the other Senators with his own particular brand of oratory, and took up a sitting or a standing position some 3 feet in front of the speaker. Sometimes the galleries could be heard asking who the rude little old man was. Their attitude was more respectful, however, when they heard him make replies to speeches in the wavering drawl that, in conjunction with his white hair and mustache, makes him seem so much like Mark Twain.

In spite of the 2 years that he spent in Germany during an impressionable period of his life, he failed to develop that sympathy for the Germans that early in the war afflicted so many Americans who had spent more than 3 days on the far side of the Rhine. The Germans, he has always complained, haven't enough imagination to interest him.

On April 4, 1917, Senator Robert M. La Follette, of Wisconsin, made a long speech in the Senate against the United States entering the war. John Sharp Williams, who had listened carefully, then rose and delivered a few pointed remarks in the direction of Senator La Follette; and they were pointed so successfully that La Follette has never since acknowledged his existence by either word or sign.

John Sharp Williams was never one of that sturdy group of southern Democrats who believe in putting a protective tariff on nothing except the things that are raised or made in the South. One of his distinguished colleagues was one day ranting and ramping for a high tariff on Sea Island cotton, which is the same sort of cotton that John Sharp raises on his Mississippi plantations; but to his horror the ramper discovered that he did not have John Sharp's support.

"It is a very strange thing," bawled the ramper, "that the Senator opposes this tax when he himself is a raiser of long-staple cotton!"

John Sharp at once remarked in quavering tones, "Well, whenever my plantation can't

produce cotton without imposing a tax on the American consumer, I'll plant every foot of soil to other crops."

Being an idealist himself it was natural for John Sharp Williams to burn incense at the shrine of one whom he regarded as an arch-idealist, the same being Woodrow Wilson.

So he burned incense; and Wilson had a high regard for him, corresponding with him in affectionate terms. When, therefore, Senator James A. Reed, of Missouri, a brother Democrat, developed violent anti-Wilson tendencies, it gave John Sharp great pleasure to r'ar up, as the southern phrase has it, and skin him alive whenever the occasion offered. And, it should be understood that one who wishes to skin James A. Reed alive must be quick on the trigger and handy with the punch, for Reed has the qualifications to do some rather rough and painful skinning on his own account. One of the last occasions when John Sharp attended a skinning party was on September 22, 1922, when Senator Reed had been stalking proudly up and down the Senate Chamber and demanding dramatically and eloquently that the bonus bill be passed over the President's veto.

When Reed had sat down, steaming at every pore, John Sharp wabbled to his feet and replied to his passionate outcry in the following unemotional manner:

"Mister President, if it were true—and it is not—that the bonus bill was for the benefit of those who looked into the mouths of the cannon and who walked up the steeps against the German artillery and infantry, there would be some reason in the attempt at eloquence made during the last 5 minutes of the speech of the Senator from Missouri; but it is not true. This is a bill to give a bonus to something like 4 million men, over one-half of whom never faced a shot, over one-half of whom never went across the seas, about a quarter of whom never served outside of a military camp, about one-tenth of whom, men and women, were serving with shoulder straps in Washington departments, and never got anywhere to illustrate their courage."

WAR HEROISM

"For the man who marches forward facing the cannon's mouth, whether for glory or for self-respect or for his country's welfare, everybody has high respect. Why did they not confine this bonus bill to the men who faced fire, the men who, upon Flanders fields or France's fields, offered their breasts to gunshots? Why did they take in all the clerks around Washington, and all the men in the encampments who never did anything except subject themselves to a new process of being washed every morning and living a more sanitary life than they were accustomed to? Why did you put them all in? Why, you put them all in because you knew you could not carry off the steal without putting them all in. You knew that if you confined it to the 1 million men who went to France, and a little bit over a million, you would not have gotten much consideration from the politicians of America.

"Let us get rid of the pretense of eloquence and oratory and heroism about this bill. If you will confine it to the men who actually entered action in France or in Belgium in American uniforms, you will get my approbation; but if you dare do that, you know you cannot pass the bill.

"I suggest that the Senator from Missouri offer an amendment that nobody shall receive any benefit under this act unless he was actually under fire during the war. I will bet three plantations to two ginger cakes that he dare not offer the amendment, and I will deliver the plantations if I lose, in absolute hopelessness of ever collecting the ginger cakes if I win."

THE NORRIS BILL

The Members of the U.S. Senate who tag themselves Progressive and announce that everything they do or propose to do is Progressive, never aroused much of a thrill in the breast of John Sharp Williams. To those who came to him and urged him to join the Progressive Democrats he gave the hoarse rebel hoot and stated that he was a plain ordinary damn-fool Mississippi Democrat, and would so remain. When the urgers protested in horror that he must be either conservative or progressive, and that it would be better for him to be progressive, he replied baldly that they were crazy; before he could be either conservative or progressive he had to know what it was that he was to be conservative or progressive about, and anybody who said that he was going to be conservative or progressive without knowing what was being contemplated was well worth avoiding. About some things any sane person would have to be conservative; about others he would have to be radical; and about still others he would have to be reactionary. Careful observation over a long term of years had also convinced John Sharp Williams that professional radicals will never be found working along consistent lines, inasmuch as their bent to change everything will always lead each one to want to change the things that the others propose.

His sentiments toward the farm bloc legislators were stated in his remarks against the Norris bill to establish the Farmers' and Consumer's Financing Corporation, with a capital of $100 million.

"Nobody who believes that this is a government of limited powers and delegated powers," he declared, "could vote for the Norris bill, which involves the idea that the Federal Government is to become a commission merchant at a possible percentage to deal in agricultural products, to buy and sell them, and an owner and operator of elevators and a warehouseman—mighty near as bad as the 'bosun tight, the midshipmite, and the crew of the captain's gig.'

"The old Ocala platform which the Populist Party adopted 30 years ago in this country was an angel of light in comparison with the Norris bill. After nearly 30 years of public service I have the honor to say that I still believe the best government in the world is the government which a man exercises over himself. I still have the honor to believe with Thomas Jefferson, and even with George Washington, that the power of government over the individual and over business ought to be restricted; and I still believe with Thomas Jefferson—not to the extent to which he went, but to some extent at any rate—that the least-governed people is the best-governed people.

"I would not want to live in a country where the state government under which I lived, much less the Federal Government should be my commission merchant and my warehouseman and elevator dealer. Government is one thing; individual affairs constitute another thing. To put the Government in the pawnbroking business, to put the Government in the warehousing business, to put the Government in the elevator business, to put the Government out as a competitor against every man in the world engaged in any sort of business, strikes me as an aboslute prostitution of the purposes of all government.

"Mr. President, government was not intended to be you and me. Government was intended to restrain you and me from transgressing against each other. Government was not intended to carry on the business of a nation. Government was to see that in carrying on the business of a nation, justice and fair dealing and honor were maintained.

"So far as I am concerned, I would just as soon live in Prussia as to live in any country, whether my own or any other, that undertook to say that the government had the right to carry on with me every sort of business."

WILLIAMS ON SENTIMENT

On one occasion Senator Reed referred contemptuously to sentiment. This offended John Sharp deeply, and he reared up.

"To say that a man is sentimental," he declared, "is to pay him the highest compliment that one man can pay to another. I belong to a breed of men who for 400 years have been dying on the wrong side. Some of them fought like fools for the Stuarts in England. Some of them died under Tyronne's Roman Catholic insurrection in Ireland. Some of them followed the Stars and Bars until they fell in gloom, although not in disgrace, at Appomattox. We do not recognize that sentiment is to be referred to contemptuously, if it were to be so referred to, the man who died for the Stuarts was simply an infernal fool, and the man who followed Robert E. Lee to Appomattox did not have much sense; but all the same, he had heroism, he had courage, and he had communion with the immortal gods, because they were in his heart; and the very spirit of Jesus Christ was working before him, because Jesus Christ fought for the greatest lost cause that the world ever witnessed."

There are many things to be said of John Sharp Williams; such things, for example, as that he is as idealistic as a poet, and sensitively honest, and wholly conscientious in all things, and generous, and a linguist, and a student, and so on. These things, however, occupy too much space without getting us anywhere. He is a gentleman and a scholar, and a Senator of the old school; and that's as eloquent and as glowing a tribute as any man ought to have.

## Growth of John Birch Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GALE W. McGEE
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, as one who believes that our American way of life, our freedoms and respect for individual liberty can be subverted from the right as well as the left I have long held that the John Birch Society and its extremist fellow travelers are a threat to democracy. In recent months many people who hold similar views have been led to believe that the society is dying on the vine and is no longer an active force seeking to tear down our American house of traditions to protect it from a fire that only the society can see. An article in the Washington Post of January 31 summarizes a report of the B'nai B'rith which points out that the John Birch Society is increasing in strength in many areas. The report also notes other areas where prejudice is still a major force in this country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREATER POLITICAL ACTIVITY FORECAST—B'NAI B'RITH REPORTS BIRCH SOCIETY GROWS STRONGER

(By Morton Mintz)

The John Birch Society is growing stronger and may try to exert real political muscle in congressional, State, and local elections.

This was reported last night to the annual meeting of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith at the Sheraton Park.

Lawrence Peirez, of New York, chairman of the league's factfinding committee, said it would be "superficial and incorrect" to conclude that the society was damaged by the defeat of four Birchers who ran for Congress last year.

The candidates were incumbent Representatives John A. Rousselot and Edgar W. Hiestand, both California Republicans; H. L. (Bill) Richardson, also a California Republican, and Mayor Jack Seale of Amarillo, Tex.

Each of them, Peirez said, ran a strong, well-financed campaign. In a number of States, particularly California, Michigan, Texas, and Wisconsin, the impact of the Birchers on the election campaigns "was far out of proportion to the numerical strength of the Birch members and their fellow travelers."

And, he added, the society's continued existence and growth depends not on election victories, but on extremist forces which are basic in American life.

Peirez presented a detailed report on the society which included these high points:

Founder Robert Welch has been indicated to be "seeking to unify all radical right forces under his own banner."

There are signs that a quiet move may be underway to organize the society around the country for more openly political activity, despite Welch's continuing stress on the society's educational nature.

Only the society's top leadership knows the actual membership, but an educated guess is that it is currently between 50,000 and 60,000, compared with 20,000 to 25,000 in 1961.

In 1961 the society claimed chapters in about 35 States, but Welch now claims chapters in all States but Alaska and Hawaii, 300 chapters in California and members in all 50 States.

Newer areas of reported growth include the Washington region, Long Island, N.Y. and parts of Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Washington, Idaho and Arizona.

The home office staff in Belmont, Mass. numbered 24 in 1960, 41 at the end of 1961 and about 50 at last report. Members are being recruited by 38 paid organizers, 70 parttime paid and volunteer "coordinators" and hundreds of volunteer section leaders. The probable rate of staff payroll and expenses is $750,000 a year.

The society's so-called American opinion libraries, or reading rooms that sell books, remain a top-priority program. At the end of 1961 there were about a dozen; now there are perhaps 45, excluding perhaps 50 in members' homes. Book sales reportedly have become a major source of income.

Towns from California, to Colorado, to Wisconsin, to Texas, to Florida, to New Hampshire have been split down the middle by Birch campaigns against alleged leftist influences in schools, churches, and local libraries, for the impeachment of Chief Justice Earl Warren, and against merchants selling products imported from Iron Curtain countries.

An effort has apparently been undertaken to convey the impression that the society is not being run by Welch alone, but by a group of sound, respectable men of substance and standing, such as the Boston area's Col. Laurence Bunker, and Attorney Robert H. Montgomery, Jr.

Society spokesmen continue to disavow anti-Semitism officially and publicly, but Welch's society still serves as a magnet which attracts anti-Semitic bigots and hatemongers.

If other radical right organizations are declining, the Birch Society is not.

RELIGIOUS PREJUDICE IS SEEN IN TEXT BOOKS

A 3-year analysis of elementary social studies textbooks shows that most favor Protestantism over Catholicism and Christianity over Judaism.

This was reported yesterday by Samuel Dalsimer of New York, an official of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. He said that most of the texts fail to view religious history objectively, have definite sectarian tendencies and are grossly inadequate to the Nation's needs.

The study was conducted for the league by New York educator Judah K. Harris and disclosed at the league's annual meeting at the Sheraton-Park.

Harris reviewed 120 books, most of them in the collection of the Teachers' Central Laboratory of Hunter College in New York City. Here are some of his findings:

On anti-Catholic bias, "Many anti-Protestant acts of persecution are detailed, but no specific acts of anti-Catholic oppression by Protestants are included. Martin Luther is treated in a wholly favorable light, no hint is given of the intolerance he advocated and practiced toward those whom he considered heretics, although, religious intolerance of the 17th and 18th centuries was by no means a Catholic monopoly."

On Jewish history, "Practically all of the information conveyed about the Jews relates to the Biblical period. The little information * * * about Jewish history after the year 70 deals in the main with Jewish tribulations as victims of persecution and exile. Virtually nothing is given about the Jewish population of America. The strong impression is conveyed that the present-day Jew is not distinguished positively by his customs, religion or culture, but negatively by the hatred, contempt and scorn in which he is held by others."

On Hitler and nazism, this is a topic in 11 volumes, of which only 5 refer to persecution of the Jews under Hitlerism. "Of these five, one does not indicate whether Hitler's policy was right or wrong."

On the crusades, "The treatment usually stresses the misdeeds of the Moslems of the period. Only 2 of the 13 textbooks dealing with the crusades say anything about Christian persecution of Moslems."

On the crucifixion, this "delicate subject * * * is often dealt with in a way that tends to stimulate prejudice."

On the importance of religion, although textbooks stress that religion was a motivating force in the past history of mankind, they "treat contemporary religion as being primarily a matter of church going, with a limited role in welfare services and character education."

CAMPUS DEMOCRACY HELD LONG WAY OFF

Continuing discriminations in college fraternities was attributed yesterday principally to old grads who would flunk a course in how not to be prejudiced.

The oldtime defenders of the system are oblivious to contemporary attitudes and trends, according to a report published by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

The study, released at the league's annual meeting at the Sheraton-Park, said that "democracy on the campus" is still a long way off.

"But," said the study, "pressure from undergraduates and college administrators has markedly lessened fraternity bias since the end of World War II."

The conservative old grads are influential because they are contributors to their alma maters and have a say about job opportunities for many new graduates, the survey said.

## Tribute to the Late Warren R. Austin, Former Senator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Mr. Ross Valentine, entitled "Warren R. Austin, a Tribute."

This article appeared in the Richmond Times-Dispatch on December 30, 1962.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WARREN R. AUSTIN, A TRIBUTE

(By Ross Valentine)

Twenty years ago Warren R. Austin's was a name to conjure with; a power in the U.S. Senate, a voice respectfully listened to in disputes involving international and constitutional law.

News of his death on Christmas day, at the age of 85, must have surprised quite a few people who had been under the impression that he had died years ago.

Yet he had served for 6 years as our first ambassador to the newborn United Nations until 1953, when he was succeeded by Henry Cabot Lodge, Mr. Eisenhower's appointee.

So much has happened during the past 9 years that Austin, tending his apple orchard in St. Albans, Vt., had dropped out of sight.

When he wired me immediately after his 1946 appointment by President Truman, I was startled, and a bit flattered; flattered because his message reached me some hours before the news appeared on the Associated Press teletype, startled because of Mr. Truman's unexpected appointment of a Republican leader.

Cynical editorialists speculated that he had been "kicked upstairs"; that he had been "named captain of the *Titanic* after she struck the iceberg." In 1946 very few realists expected the U.N. to survive.

Austin, also a realist, was an exception. He had tremendous faith in the concept of law, as a moral force to weld competitive peoples together, internationally—as well as nationally.

During the lend-lease debate in the Senate, (in 1941) he said in a floor speech:

"Ought we not to ask Britain now to join us in an endeavor to establish something new * * * in the world hereafter (the war)—a new and different sanction of peace? This is not a mere dream. I believe we are in one of the great movements of civilization in which it advances to a higher step after it has slid backward."

This was the first time the idea of a new world peace organization had been suggested in embryonic form, on the floor of the Senate.

When, the day after V–E Day in 1945, others rejoiced, I grimly predicted that Soviet communism would seek to profit from the chaos of a postwar Europe. Some ardent New Dealers condemned me for that. Austin allowed it was a distinct possibility to be considered. I mention this as an example of his independent mind.

He was a realist to the core, but he saw no reason why a man with both feet on the ground should not reach for the stars.

As Arthur Krock said of him (while Austin was still in the Senate) "He is one of those men who, in any legislature, although strong party leaders, are capable of rising above partisanship when national crises arise."

In that respect Vermont's Austin was much like Virginia's Byrd is to this day.

Austin vigorously disapproved of the New Deal and most of its works. He fought Mr. Roosevelt's "Court packing plan" and Senator O'Mahoney's ill-disguised economic proposals with fierce energy, denouncing such schemes as an approach to "a collective system akin to Nazi national socialism."

But he anticipated and later endorsed the Roosevelt foreign policy when he told the Senate:

"It is not his policy, it is not mine or any other person's. It is our traditional policy of siding and upholding democracy."

As early as 1937 he foresaw a militaristic Japan as an aggressor, and urged the United States to apply unilateral sanctions against the Tokyo government, in the event that the League of Nations failed to do so. This won him no love among fellow Republicans.

A week or two before Pearl Harbor GOP isolationists banded together to block Austin from serving as minority leader in the absence of Senator Charles L. McNary. But McNary had grown to respect Austin for his way of voting his convictions, and the revolt collapsed.

There were quite a few issues on which I could not see eye to eye with Austin, such as his bill to draft nonmilitary manpower for war production; but I respected him for the courage of his convictions and for his faith in international law as the only alternative to suicidal war.

When, at the request of Governor Tuck, I invited Austin, in 1947, to attend a dedicatory function in Richmond, I was happy to do so, because—as Governor Gibson of Vermont, who had married a southern girl, had said—"There's not much difference between a Vermont Republican and a Virginia Democrat."

## Indian Wars Veterans Roll of Honor Made Known by Marion, Ind., Publisher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, there is today in our great land a small body of men who, having in their time endured extreme hardships and sacrifices for their country, and are now apparently relegated to obscurity.

I am speaking, Mr. Chairman, of the 26 known surviving veterans of the Indian wars, who, during the period 1865–98, fought the battles that won the West.

The dangers these men faced and their plight today, is told very admirably in a thoughtful story by Mr. Paul L. Hillsamer, in the News-Herald of Marion, Ind. Mr. Hillsamer has also assembled the names and addresses of the survivors in a "roll of honor" accompanying the article.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Hillsamer's article, together with the "roll of honor" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOUGHTS AT 4 A.M.

As far as the editor knows the full list of living veterans of the Indian wars, to the right of this column, is a News-Herald first. We know of no other publication in the country which has published this 1963 list. We hope more papers will. These men deserve honor and recognition in their old age.

An old gentleman named Charley Gibson died at Delphi, Ind., a couple weeks ago. He was 102 years old.

Born in 1860, Mr. Gibson was the oldest living veteran of the Indian wars, the engagements little and big between U.S. Army troops and Indian warriors in the period 1865–98.

The Veterans' Administration, for pension purposes, considers 1898 as the year the Indian wars ended.

Since Mr. Gibson's death, there are 26 living veterans of these wars whose service is recognized by the Veterans' Administration.

The oldest veterans, since Charley Gibson's death, are Charles Creek, of Annapolis, Md., and George Niehaus, of Greencastle, Ind. Both are, or will be, 100 years old, having been born in 1863.

These 26 old heroes are so aged that other deaths may have occurred since News-Herald procured their names, addresses, and years of birth some 6 days ago.

Not much attention has been paid the Indian war veterans by the Nation's press. But they are a part of our national past and now, in their twilight years, deserve honor and esteem.

Theirs was not an easy life, in the 1870's, 1880's, and 1890's. The scores of engagements in which Regular Army troops participated ranged from small local scuffles to greater battles such as Little Big Horn, where George Custer lost his life, and his army.

But the bullets and arrows of those long-ago days killed and wounded just as effectively as the weapons used in our more publicized wars.

A trooper unfortunate enough to be captured could expect scalping or, far worse, torture. Anyone who served in the Regular Army's conflicts with the Indians of the West and Southwest was a brave man.

These 26 surviving veterans were American soldiers. They fought and risked their lives for less than a 14-year-old baby sitter earns today. They lived rough lives in the saddle, on the march or in the primitive Government forts of that era.

They deserve honor now, in their last years. Just as the last survivors of the Civil War deserved, and received, honor.

We have, to date, been unable to obtain the names of living Indians who are veterans of those same wars.

They, too, are Americans. They, too, were soldiers. The wounds of long ago have healed. We are one Nation now.

They too, should be honored in their years of great age.

Indian veterans, as former enemies of the United States, do not receive pensions.

Carroll County Sheriff James Coghill gave the editor considerable information regarding Charley Gibson, in a telephone conversation last Tuesday.

Coghill said that Gibson was a rancher in the West for many years before retiring to Delphi.

The sheriff described Mr. Gibson as "a fine man" and added that his own young son greatly admired the old gentleman.

Mr. Gibson was baptized in the Catholic Church at Delphi at the age of 99. Sheriff Coghill said that the Delphi parish priest "probably knows more about Charles than anyone else" and promised to ask the priest to forward detailed information to News-Herald.

THE ROLL OF HONOR

Surviving veterans of the Indian wars, recognized and being paid compensation by the Veterans' Administration:

Reginald A. Bradley, 2122 Lakeshore Avenue, Oakland, Calif.; born, 1867.

Harry E. Brockman, St. James, Mo.; born, 1874.

Isaac H. Burgess, 506 West Jefferson Street, Springdale, Ark.; born, 1872.

Charles Creek, 63 Spa Road, Annapolis, Md.; born, 1863.

John Crump, 106 H Street, Boston, Mass.; born, 1868.

John Daw, Red Lake Trading Post, Ariz.; born, 1869.

Charles Dickens, Fort McDowell, Scottsdale, Ariz.; born, 1870.

Jerome Faunce, 309 Magnolia Avenue, Hannibal, Mo., born, 1875.

Howard D. Fielding, Little River Station, Post Office Box 472, Miami, Fla., born, 1872.

Frederick W. Fraske, 3746 North Spalding Avenue, Chicago, Ill., born, 1872.

Henry W. Hanft, 666 Short Street, St. Paul, Minn., born, 1887.

Walter C. Harrington, 5622 Tangerine Avenue, Gulfport, Fla., born, 1869.

Frank Heidelberger, V.A. Center, Hot Springs, S. Dak., born, 1867.

Joshua Johnson, 415 Crawford Street, Boone, Iowa, born, 1871.

Charles G. Jones, 2743 Mount Vernon Avenue, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, born, 1873.

G. W. Kinnay, R.D. 1, Box 125, South Webster, Ohio, born, 1869.

Simpson Mann, 2101 Bartlett Street, St. Joseph, Mo., born, 1867.

Hugh McGuiness, Crandon, Wis., born, 1868.

James E. Moorehead, 1203 Robin Road, St. Petersburg, Fla., born, 1864.

George Neihaus, 11 Northeast St., Greenfield, Ind., born, 1863.

Robert Norman, 1002 Harris St., Kelso, Wash., born, 1869.

Walter J. Potter, 1011 Road 20, San Pablo, Calif., born, 1871.

John F. Roberts, 206 Peninsular Avenue S., New Smyrna Beach, Fla., born, 1869.

William Sutphin, Route 1, Box 542, South Boston, Va., born, 1873.

William Wilkinson, 504 Seminole St., Clearwater, Fla., born, 1865.

(EDITOR NOTE.—Mr. Henry Hanft seems very young to have fought before 1898. However, he is definitely listed. It is possible the year of his birth was a typing error in the list we obtained.)

## Singular Demonstration of Heroism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GALE W. McGEE
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the newspapers and newscasts of the past 2 days have been telling the story of a singular piece of heroism that occurred in my State, Monday. I refer to the man who piloted a light plane to a safe landing at Cheyenne, Wyo., after the pilot slumped dead of a heart attack in the air. The man, Lester Peterson, exhibited a cool head in the face of a real emergency. Another man whose ability to face down

panic and provide the necessary guidance in that perilous situation was Lou Domenico of Cheyenne, a flight instructor and air service operator. His coolness and competent instruction provided the key to a safe landing.

Mr. President, I would like to commend these two men for their heroism, presence of mind, and ingenuity and I ask unanimous consent that an article in the Washington Post of January 30, on their exploits be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"NOTHING," SAYS MAN WHO LANDED PILOTLESS PLANE

(By Paul Albright)

CHEYENNE, WYO.—A construction engineer, who guided a small plane in for a safe landing after the pilot collapsed, said there was "nothing to it." He had never flown an aircraft before.

"My worst moment was when we hit down on the runway and bounced a couple of times," said Lester Peterson, 38, assistant project manager for the American Bridge Co., after he and two other passengers had completed the landing.

The pilot, Edgar R. Van Keuren, 56, of Rapid City, S. Dak., was dead on arrival at a hospital. He apparently suffered a heart attack.

Peterson had to grab the controls when Van Keuren was stricken as the craft headed for a landing at an Atlas missile site 45 miles northeast of Cheyenne.

"I grabbed the wheel and pulled it back," Peterson said. "It appeared we were heading straight for the ground. They said we missed the ground about 2 feet."

Peterson climbed the plane, a Cessna 180, to 7,900 feet while his companions, Lester Laun and John Pawlack, also engineers with the American Bridge Co., experimented with the radio.

"I was thinking of landing in a wheat field near the missile site," Peterson said. "But Les Laun suggested we head for Cheyenne where there were facilities for a crash landing."

When they reached Cheyenne they radioed the airport tower and explained the situation. Lou Domenico, a flight instructor, was summoned and talked the plane and its passengers down.

A recording of the conversation between Peterson and Domenico included these comments:

Plane: "You're gonna have an ambulance there for this pilot, aren't you?"

Tower: "Roger. We've got an entire crash crew standing by and don't let 'em bother you. It's an emergency precaution. I think we can talk you in."

Plane: "Aw, I know you can. Over."

Two planes and a helicopter were sent aloft to escort the plane in.

"All I did was steer the thing and follow instructions," said Peterson.

"What about flaps?" questioned the passengers from the cockpit as the plane nosed toward the field.

Tower: "No flaps. No flaps. Just pull back on your throttle and when you are down close to the runway pull the throttle all the way off and fly level to the runway. * * * Just ease back on the stick, get down real close, take all your power off now, throttle clear back let it roll. * * * When it gets on the ground just let it roll. * * * Just hold the stick clear back. * * * Hold it back. * * * You're doing fine."

Plane: "Nothing to it."

The plane landed on the runway, bounced some, blew a tire, and then ran off the strip, doing minor damage to the craft.

"He did a real beautiful job," said Domenico. "He kept his head."

It took 45 minutes from the time Van Keuren was stricken until Peterson landed the plane.

Peterson, formerly from Union City, N.J., said he had never wanted to be a pilot, "but I would like to learn how to land the thing."

## Judges Visit Federal Prisons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. EMANUEL CELLER**
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has from time to time addressed itself to the problem of sentencing disparities in the Federal courts. In 1958, it enacted my bill which authorized the Federal judiciary to convene periodic institutes and seminars to study the problems of sentencing. The bill also gave the Federal courts for the first time the discretion to commit convicted defendants under diagnostic and indeterminate sentencing procedures. It was hoped that through the institutes the judges could work out a more consistent sentencing philosophy and practice and that sentences, therefore, particularly under the new procedures, would more commonly fit both the problems of offenders and the resources available for their treatment.

In the speeches which I have prepared for my own participation in a number of these institutes I have repeatedly urged the Federal judges, as a part of their institute program, to visit our Federal penal and correctional institutions to learn exactly what programs and facilities exist for the treatment of offenders. Without this background information the judges simply cannot do an intelligent job of formulating sentences for offenders whose crimes, backgrounds, and problems vary greatly by individual. Such visits would also enable the judges to see for themselves in selected instances whether the purposes they had in mind at the time they imposed sentence were being carried out. In other words, judges ought to find out what happens to the defendants whom they have sent to prison in order to have a sound basis of experience in sentencing similar cases in the future.

Although the Federal judges are making increased use of the diagnostic and indeterminate sentencing provisions of the 1958 legislation, the problem of disparity remains acute among those terms imposed under the old definite sentencing system. President Kennedy, with great justification I think, has used his powers of clemency to correct several of the more aggravated instances of disparity which the Attorney General has brought to his attention. In the final analysis, however, only the judges themselves can remedy the problem, and a greater knowledge of the implications of their sentences and the programs of our Federal institutions would help them to do so.

Among the Federal judges who have responded to my suggestion for institutional visits and to the standing invitation issued them by Director James V. Bennett of the U.S. Bureau of Prisons have been Chief Judge Thomas M. Madden and his associates in the districts of New Jersey. I have received a copy of the very fine report which this group wrote to Chief Judge John Biggs, Jr., of the third circuit concerning their impressions and recommendations. I hope this report will be widely circulated among the Federal judiciary. It contains a particularly penetrating evaluation of the institutions and programs that these conscientious judges observed. The circulation of the report should also influence other Federal judges, both old and new, to make similar visits. Further, I hope that some action can be taken to fulfill the need for more adequate physical facilities in the Federal prison system as recommended in Judge Madden's report.

The report should also be of great interest to the Members of the Congress.

REPORT TO HON. JOHN BIGGS, JR., CHIEF JUDGE, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, THIRD CIRCUIT

INTRODUCTION

A number of the judges of the district of New Jersey made arrangements with Director James V. Bennett of the U.S. Bureau of Prisons to visit several Federal institutions during the past summer. It was our expectation that in acquainting ourselves with the physical facilities, programs, and staffs of these institutions we would gain a greater measure of understanding of the problems involved in the treatment of offenders committed.

On June 18, 1962, the group that visited the Federal Correctional Institution at Danbury, Conn., included Chief Judge Thomas M. Madden, of Camden; Senior Circuit Judge Phillip Forman, of Trenton; Judge Arthur S. Lane, of Trenton; Judge Anthony T. Augelli, of Newark; Judge Robert Shaw, of Newark; U.S. Attorney David M. Satz, Jr., of Newark, and Mr. Michael Keller, Jr., clerk, U.S. district court, Trenton. In addition, Judges Madden, Lane, and Augelli, accompanied by Mr. Keller, visited the following institutions on the following dates:

July 10: Federal Reformatory for Women, Alderson, W. Va.

July 11: Federal Correctional Institution, Ashland, Ky.

July 12: U.S. Public Health Service Hospital, Lexington, Ky.

July 13: Federal Reformatory, Chillicothe, Ohio.

July 14: U.S. Penitentiary, Lewisburg, Pa.

September 14: Federal Detention Headquarters, New York, N.Y.

*Danbury*

This institution, built with funds made available by the Federal Public Works Administration in 1938, was opened in August 1940. Its buildings are arranged to form a rectangular enclosure about a central compound and recreation yard. It is located in beautiful, rolling, Connecticut countryside. It was originally designed for about 550 inmates, but the population now averages nearly 700. The prisoners are committed from the Federal courts in the New England and New York State area.

The institution has a total personnel complement of 130; 63 of this number comprise the correctional officer force and the

remainder are assigned to such institutional services as administrative, treatment, food, farm, mechanical, medical, and industrial. All are civil service employees, and fully half of them have seen prior service at other Federal institutions. Warden Frank Kenton, for example, is a 20-year veteran of the Federal prison system and was previously assigned as warden of the New York Detention Headquarters, and as associate warden at the Lewisburg Penitentiary and the medical center at Springfield, Mo.

The inmate population is rather heterogeneous. Their ages vary from 16 to 80; the average is about 33. Also, the sentences represent the full range that can be imposed by a judge, from 30 days to life; the average is about 22 months. The offenses involve violations of laws governing narcotics, theft of motor vehicles, income tax evasion, theft from U.S. mail, forgery, and immigration.

The newly committed inmate spends his first month under study and diagnosis in a unit set aside for this purpose. He is examined by a physician, his social history is compiled by a caseworker, and he is given a number of tests to determine his educational and vocational training needs. Also, during this period the inmate is familiarized with the program of the institution. At the end of the month he meets with the classification committee, and he is assigned to the quarters, employment, and training activities that best fit his needs. If the committee determines that he requires treatment services that are not available in the institution, it recommends his transfer to a more suitable institution.

The day for the inmate begins at 6 a.m. After performing his ablutions and cleaning his quarters, he may go to the dining hall for breakfast at any time between 6:30 and 7:30 a.m. At 8 a.m. he reports to his assigned employment in one of the institutional departments or industries. There is a break for luncheon between 11:45 a.m. and 12:45 p.m., and during the afternoon most inmates are again at work. Those inmates who are illiterate or nearly illiterate may be required to attend remedial classes during the afternoon. The evening meal is served between 4:15 p.m. and 5:15 p.m., and from then until 9 p.m. the inmates may engage in recreational activities, visit the library, or attend educational classes. Ten-thirty p.m. is lights-out time in the dormitories and cells.

We were favorably impressed by the general operation of the Danbury institution. The medical facilities were excellent, and the hospital beds were occupied only by those who were ill or required surgery. A new school had just been constructed by inmate labor, and in addition to classrooms, it had a fine library. Good facilities were also available for visiting between inmates and their families. We had lunch in the officers' dining room and the menu was exactly the same as that served in the inmate dining room; the food was nutritious, well-balanced and prepared in an appetizing manner.

Danbury gave us our first glimpse of the factories operated by Federal Prison Industries, Inc. The glove factory and the office machine repair shop employed about 25 percent of the inmate population. The men assigned to these activities earn a small wage, two-thirds of which is usually sent to their dependents and the remainder saved toward the day of their release or spent at the commissary. They are also credited each month with an extra 2 to 5 days extra good time, depending upon how long they have been assigned to industries.

The inmate industrial workers perform their duties with an amazingly high degree of diligence. In our opinion, they worked as rapidly and skillfully as their counterparts in private industry. We talked to a number of inmates in the factories, and although they answered our questions politely and intelligently, they did not slow down in their work. The factories obviously provided an outstanding training situation for inmates. The work habits they gained at Danbury would be valuable assets to them in private industry and should substantially enhance their employability.

*Alderson*

The women's reformatory dates from 1927. Of all the institutions visited it is the least penal in appearance. It is located in the midst of the scenic beauty of the foothills of the Allegheny Mountains and is very much like a university campus with its two-story cottages, which stand on a hillside with groves of trees and mountains as a background. Yet, it is a penal institution and security measures not evident from the "campus" are adequate. After 35 years, some of the cottages are showing the effects of age.

Inasmuch as it is the only fullfledged institution for women in the Federal Prison System, its population consists of women of all ages, sentenced to all types of terms for a wide variety of offenses. The largest group has been convicted of narcotics offenses; it is unfortunate in this respect that nearly one-third the entire inmate population is not eligible for parole, under the terms of the Narcotics Control Act of 1956. The women prisoners come from all sections of the country and differ greatly in their backgrounds and mental, physical, and emotional makeup. The problems of treating such a wide variety of offenders are understandably numerous and complex.

The institution is staffed by approximately 200 personnel, tradesmen and department heads. Warden Gladys V. Bowman is a career civil service employee who entered the prison service in 1946 as a correctional officer and earned successive advancement to her present position. For a number of years she was also in charge of the women's division at the Federal Correctional Institution at Terminal Island, Calif.

The program is basically similar to that which we observed at Danbury, except that it is adapted to the needs of women. The educational program includes elementary and secondary classes as well as all basic subjects taught in accredited public schools; typing, shorthand, and filing receive special emphasis. The women may also receive training as beauticians, and Federal Prison Industries, Inc., operates a garment factory and laundry which provides special training and paid employment. The dressmaking and arts department teaches sewing skills and makes all the inmate clothing, uniforms, hospital gowns, bedspreads, draperies, and other household articles, as well as the clothing and accessories for the women being released. Additional occupational training is afforded by the food service of the institution, where the women may be trained as waitresses, bakers, and cooks. Of particular value in this electronic age is the opportunity to become skilled in machines such as IBM key punch, IBM verifier, Varityper, calculators, et cetera. The State of West Virginia is to be commended for recognizing those inmates who complete the high school courses and for issuing certificates of proficiency in some of the acquired skills.

Discipline is handled in the same manner as it is at the other Federal institutions. Inmates who have been reported for infractions appear before the reformatory's adjustment committee, composed of three staff members representing the custodial, medical, and one additional department. The infraction is discussed with the inmate, and depending upon the nature of the infraction, the attitude of the inmate, and the staff's knowledge of her personality and problems, appropriate action is taken. This usually takes the form of counseling, but may involve a reprimand, a temporary suspension of her privileges or a short period in seclusion. If the violation is serious enough to warrant a forfeiture of earned good time, a special board convenes for this purpose and the inmate may be represented before the board by a staff member of her choice.

We toured the entire institution and received the impression that it was operated on a high level of efficiency. The relative isolation of the institution, however, did present some obvious problems to the institution. It is difficult for the warden to recruit specialized types of personnel, who are typically reluctant to work and live at great distances from metropolitan areas. Also, while the other institutions may draw easily from the local communities for consultant medical services, the isolation of Alderson presents a distinct handicap in this respect. It is occasionally necessary, for example, for the doctors to take a difficult pregnancy case over the mountains a distance of 50 miles to a hospital that is equipped to handle this type of emergency.

We might comment at this point that we were rather surprised to learn that a number of babies are born each year at the reformatory; we were not aware that so many young women were pregnant at the time of their sentencing. While the babies may be born in the prison hosiptal, the reformatory has made arrangements with county authorities to issue birth certificates which bear no evidence that the birth took place in a penal institution. The babies are cared for in the reformatory hospital for a short period of time and then turned over to their father or to the families of the inmate mothers.

Although we were greatly impressed with the medical facilities available at Alderson, the lack of an elevator in the hospital gives rise to some serious problems. It is necessary that surgical and other nonambulatory patients be carried up and down stairs on stretchers. The kitchen is in the basement. Meals are served to the upper two floors by means of a human chain on the stairway passing the individual trays from hand to hand. This makes it more difficult to serve hot meals and also creates a sanitation problem.

*Ashland*

The institution, opened in 1940, was originally designed for the confinement and treatment of adult offenders. With the implementation of the Federal Youth Corrections Act in 1954 it was converted to the confinement and treatment of youths committed from the district courts west of the Mississippi. At the time of our visit, we were furnished with various statistics relating to the inmate population as of the last day of the previous month. They indicated that of 494 inmates, at the time of sentencing 478 were between the ages of 14 to 19, inclusive; and the remaining 16 were between 20 to 23, inclusive. As of the date the statistics were prepared, 428 of this total were still between 15 to 19, inclusive. It is understandable that there is a problem of "gross emotional insecurity," a need for "stabilizing influences" and the necessity of "finding ways to fulfill the youth's psychological needs" as set forth in the brochure for this institution. Most of the inmates are violators of the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act and, by reason of their ages and minimum prior records of serious crimes, they are excellent raw material for intensive efforts toward psychiatric and educational rehabilitation. However, as will be indicated below, needed personnel and facilities to this end are not available in sufficient quantity.

The institution has a staff of about 172 personnel. Although the institution has a number of problems stemming from staff shortages and the necessity of adapting an institution for minimum custody adults to one serving youthful offenders, we think it

is being operated as well as could be expected. The hospital is well equipped and at the time of our visit there were only a few patients in the wards. The food, as at the other Federal institutions, was excellent. Federal Prison Industries operates a wood furniture shop, and the boys learn the woodworking trade in the manufacture of bookcases, desk trays, costumers, and other articles of office furniture. The institutional shops building also affords training in a number of trades.

At the time of our visit the institution had no psychiatrists. In the course of our conversation with the warden we learned that one had just left and the new one assigned by the Public Health Service had not arrived. However, the professional staff did include a qualified psychologist and a number of trained workers. It was our feeling that the institution should have a staff of several psychiatrists, particularly in view of its designation as a youth center. The absence of a more adequate staff of psychiatrists may be partially attributed to the general shortage of psychiatrists in the Nation, which would make it difficult for the Public Health Service to recruit a sufficient number for service in the Federal Prison System, even if sufficient funds were appropriated therefor.

We had also expected to see a larger number of boys receiving instruction in the academic classrooms. But there were two successive escapes at the time of our visit, and the schoolrooms were closed while some of the staff were engaged in attempting to apprehend the escapees. The educational building did not appear to be large enough to meet the requirements of a youth center, but we understand that the construction of a more adequate educational building is on the long-range construction schedule for Ashland.

Although a large area in beautiful Kentucky countryside was acquired for this institution, we were somewhat disappointed with the physical plant at Ashland, for its appearance and layout were not what we had expected to see in a youth center. This is due to the fact that it was originally designed for adults. It is our understanding that the Federal Prison System at present does not have any institution which was specifically designed for youths, and funds have never been available to design and construct an institution of this type since the enactment of the Federal Youth Correction Act. Director Bennett has informed us that the long-range construction schedule of the Bureau of Prisons includes three such institutions, and it is our hope that the Congress will appropriate the necessary funds for this badly needed construction at an early date. Only through such construction can the full intent of the Federal Youth Corrections Act be realized.

*Lexington*

This narcotics hospital operated by the U.S. Public Health Service was activated in 1935. It is located on a tract of over 1,000 acres of rolling Kentucky bluegrass country. It accepts male addict patients from the section of the United States east of the Mississippi and female patients from the entire country. The number of patients at any one time averages about 1,000, including about 500 who are serving terms of imprisonment, about 375 who have voluntarily committed themselves, and a number of other types of addicts and nonaddicts.

We were informed that a very high percentage of the admissions during the year, however, are voluntary patients. The hospital has no authority to retain them, and at least half of them leave as soon as they have been withdrawn from drugs. Most of the remainder also leave before they have completed the full course of their treatment. A further defect in the treatment of the voluntary addict lies in the fact that there is no follow-up program in the communities. The high rate of relapse among these addicts therefore can be blamed not on the inadequacy of the treatment that is available for them but on the inability of the authorities to subject the addicts to the full benefits of that treatment. It seems to us that there should be some statutory requirement that the voluntary patient must remain at Lexington for the full period prescribed by the medical staff and not permitted to leave whenever he chooses.

The hospital has a complement of about 600 persons, all of whom are U.S. Public Health Service personnel. The newly admitted addicts are studied much as prisoners are in the institutions of the Federal Prison System. There are also a wide variety of opportunities for vocational training. In addition to training in the several institution departments the patients may learn occupations in the four industries: printing, woodcraft, needle trades, and agriculture.

In the absence of the medical officer in charge, the second in command gave us a thorough tour of the institution by means of slides; following the slide tour we inspected those parts of the hospital which particularly interested us. Our host explained to us the difficulty of convincing addicts that the desire to be cured of addiction must start with themselves and cannot be generated by anyone else. To bring about this insight the hospital depends on the group therapy technique, in which a group of 20 or 25 patients discuss the problems associated with their addiction. We participated in one of these discussions, and found that it was a particularly enlightening experience. The addicts in the group by and large were educated and intelligent men. Among the subjects they discussed and emphasized were those of entrapment and the mandatory phases of the Narcotics Control Act.

None of the visiting judges, incidentally, approved of the mandatory provisions of any penal statute. We feel that very often, particularly with reference to the addict seller of a few small packets of narcotics, the minimum mandatory sentence may produce an injustice. The judges should be given the same discretion in dealing with narcotics offenders as they have for any other type of offender; if a severe sentence is indicated the courts can recognize this requirement and impose a maximum term.

*Chillicothe*

This institution was built over a period of years beginning in 1926 and its buildings now spread over a 72-acre enclosure on its 2,000 acres of splendid Ohio rural country. Its age is apparent in the deterioration of some of the buildings, particularly the dormitories. At the time of our visit considerable construction was underway with the use of inmate labor, including the erection of new chapels for Protestant and Catholic services.

The population of the reformatory averages in excess of 1,200; the majority were committed under the Federal Youth Corrections Act, a few under the Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act, and others under regular adult procedures. Most commonly the inmates were convicted of violations of the Dyer Act and were committed from the district courts of the northeastern and midwestern regions of the United States.

We were tremendously impressed by the manner in which the reformatory is operated. It has a staff of 326 personnel, many of whom have seen service in other institutions of the Federal Prison System. All of those with whom we came into contact appeared to be well trained for their duties and dedicated to the basic mission of the institution.

The inmate training program appeared to be particularly well organized and thorough. The Aviation Mechanics' School is an outstanding example. It is operated through the cooperation of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, which approves the instructors, supervises the examinations which are given to the students, and issues certificates of qualifications to those who pass. A similarly high level of operation characterized the reformatory school. The youths who successfully complete their high school courses receive certificates that do not bear any indication that they were earned in a penal institution; they are issued by the Sherman High School with the authorization of the State Board of Education. The certificates are therefore a considerable help to released inmates in securing employment.

The other training opportunities were also excellent. The reformatory has a chair factory where the youths may learn production skills and earn a small wage at the same time; the working conditions and safety measures of the factory compare favorably with those of modern factories in the free community. In addition, there is a large number of well-equipped shops where the youths may undertake trade training that meets the requirements of the Ohio State Apprenticeship Council. Trainees in these programs are registered with the Council, under a formal agreement, and receive apprenticeship credit which may be applied toward journeyman certification. Also, several of the trade courses have been approved by the Trade and Industrial Service of the Ohio Department of Education, and each graduate receives a certificate from this agency for successful completion of the courses. An employment placement officer on the institution staff helps these young men obtain employment in line with their training when they are released.

We were well satisfied with the hospital and medical situation at Chillicothe. The chief medical officer is an unusually dedicated individual who previously worked there many years ago, went into private practice long enough to earn a degree of financial security for his family, and then returned to reformatory work, his real interest. While visiting the hospital we observed the doctor performing cosmetic surgery on a boy whose skin was badly scarred from acne. This boy's rehabilitation should be considerably enhanced by an improvement in his appearance which will make him more presentable to prospective employers and society in general.

During the tour of the institution I had an opportunity to speak with one young man whom I had sentenced. At the time of sentencing, this offender had been antagonistic, fresh, and as difficult a defendant as I had ever met in 17 years on the bench; the defendant had appeared before me on five different occasions for violation of probation and as a last resort I committed him. At Chillicothe the young man greeted me with a smile, and during the course of our conversation said that he had learned his lesson, realized that I had been trying to help him, and intended to use his time at the reformatory to improve himself.

*Lewisburg*

The U.S. penitentiary at Lewisburg, Pa., is within a walled 26 acre tract on a 1,000-acre reservation. We visited it on a Saturday and therefore did not have an opportunity to view the program in full operation. Nonetheless, we were greatly impressed with the efficiency that characterized the institution, particularly in view of its size. It has about 1,450 inmates in the main institution, 150 in a farm camp, and another 300 in an honor camp about 14 miles north. The original penitentiary was built in 1932, and it is so constructed that many of its buildings radiate from a central corridor.

The inmates come from the district courts in the northeastern section of the United States and are older and more sophisticated in crime than those we saw in Chillicothe and Ashland. The penitentiary also affords a greater degree of custody; it is operated by a staff of 360 persons, about 175 of whom are custodial officers. Warden J. T. Willingham is a 25-year veteran of the Federal Prison System, and was warden at the Federal Correctional Institution at La Tuna, Tex., before coming to Lewisburg. Immediately responsible to him are three associate wardens, each of whom has several departments under his supervision.

Warden Willingham took us on a tour of the entire institution, and as at the other institutions, we were highly impressed by the industrial operation. The penitentiary has three factories—metal furniture, clothing, and custom furniture—which employ more than 500 inmates. The layout of the factories, the safety practices, and the products again can be favorably compared with those of up-to-date industries in the free community.

The hospital was the largest and best equipped that we saw on our trip. The staff includes a psychiatrist, psychologist, medical officers, two dental surgeons, and a number of medical technical assistants. Also, there are a number of specialists in the surrounding communities who are available for consultation when needed. The hospital fully meets the standards prevailing in a big city and has been accredited by the American Medical Association.

It is our view that Lewisburg is well prepared to perform the diagnostic studies on the defendants committed there under section 4208b of title 18, United States Code. The staff's ability in this respect is confirmed by the high quality of the reports we get from Lewisburg indicating a thorough study and evaluation of each case. While we are not bound to follow the recommendations made by the Lewisburg team, it is of considerable reassurance to us in sentencing these defendants to have at hand the studies and recommendations that have been so carefully and thoughtfully formulated.

In connection with the diagnostic studies being made of youth offenders under section 4208(b), it is unfortunate that youths who will eventually serve their sentences at a youth correction center must be mingled with the older and more sophisticated criminals. We are of the firm opinion that new facilities should be made available so that all diagnostic studies of youths may be made at centers specifically designated for such offenders.

*New York*

We concluded the tour of Federal institutions with a trip to Federal Detention Headquarters in New York City where prisoners committed from the district of New Jersey are first received for transshipment to other Federal institutions. In our estimation, this facility approaches a disgrace and it is unfortunate that one must confess that it is a Federal institution. It is a converted garage near the riverfront with a continual extermination problem because of vermin from adjoining and contiguous buildings. The so-called dormitories resemble medieval cages with bars on the sides and tops.

These remarks are not meant to be derogatory to the warden and his staff. As with the staffs of other institutions visited, they impressed us as well qualified and doing an excellent job despite the plant handicap under which they function. Our inspection of the cafeteria and kitchen indicated that the food was of the same high quality as that found in other Federal institutions. The medical facilities are also good, with a sufficient number of beds and trained personnel; also, when necessary, the ambulance service can transport inmates to New York hospitals.

The jail has a severe problem in the daily in-and-out movement of prisoners. There is a steady flow of men to and from the courts in the southern and eastern districts of New York. Prisoners are also being removed to different jurisdictions, and others are being transferred by bus or by U.S. marshals to the institutions designated for service of sentence. In a single year there are nearly 14,000 such movements of men in and out of the jail, requiring a staggering amount of processing for the small staff of 64 persons.

Generally, there are three types of prisoners detained at the facility: first, there are those who are being held pending plea or trial and who are presumably innocent; second, there are those who have been sentenced to term imprisonment and who are being held for classification and/or transfer to the place of their ultimate incarceration; and third, there are those who are not criminals in the correct sense of the word—deportees and those held for administrative purposes. Although we appreciate the fact that a single detention headquarters is the most economical manner of handling the unique problems of this institution and we realize that the present available facilities offer no alternate solution, we feel a fundamental mistake is being committed in commingling the three different types of prisoners. Those who are not criminals in the correct sense of the word should not be compelled to associate with those accused or convicted of crime, and some attempt should be made to segregate those held in default of bail from those already convicted. Under the present physical conditions this is almost impossible.

*General impressions*

Except for the Federal Detention Headquarters in New York City, we wish to compliment the authorities for their selection of sites for the institutions we visited and the acreage acquired. The institutions are all located in beautiful areas of the various States and sufficient acreage exists for whatever expansion may be required.

We left each institution visited with the impression that it was efficiently administered. Any inadequacies we found and may have criticized in this report result from physical inadequacies of the plant and not of the personnel. The inmates are treated well and every effort is made to promote their health and well-being by personnel who are entitled to our highest regard and respect for their apparent dedication to their work. Our conversations with the inmates, including some whom we ourselves committed, indicated that their morale was quite good and that they were fairly treated.

Except for the lack of sufficient psychiatrists and the difficulty in recruiting them for prison duties, the medical facilities and services are in general quite excellent. Of particular significance was the fact that only a small percentage of the hospital beds were occupied; and those were cases where such treatment was necessary. It indicates a minimum of malingering which usually results from dissatisfaction with prison conditions.

Conditions in all the institutions regarding food were oustandingly excellent. Kitchens were clean and well managed; diets were balanced, the calorie and protein rate was high; the menus were prepared well in advance and met the high standards established by the Director of Prisons in Washington. A very salutary practice in each Federal institution is that the warden and staff eat the same food as the inmates. Of particular note was the fact that each cafeteria was pleasantly decorated and furnished with tables for four instead of the ancient regimentation at long, bleak, board tables.

It was noted that all of the institutions were racially integrated, and we saw no evidence of segregation other than that voluntarily chosen by the inmates themselves.

Religious services are available for all faiths and every effort is made to encourage the spiritual growth of inmates. The programs are fair and adequate and all areas of an inmate's religious welfare are thoroughly covered to permit him to meet his religious obligations. In some instances, it was with great interest that we noted the efforts made by the inmates to beautify the areas set aside for religious worship.

The inmates are afforded a wide range of education and vocational training opportunities. The prison libraries are well stocked and well attended.

Perhaps the greatest impression gained from our tour relates to prison industries, the factories operated by Federal Prison Industries, Inc. It was gratifying to see that almost 100 percent of all inmates were engaged in some vocational or industrial activity, earning money plus additional good time off their sentences. The standard 40-hour week, with overtime pay and extra good time, is the first regularity of employment for many. This is a very important factor in rehabilitation. The machinery and equipment are modern and in an excellent state of maintenance. Working conditions and safety features equal, if they do not exceed, private industry. Though we were aware of the importance of industry to the prison program in earning money and time off for the inmates, as well as the contribution to rehabilitation, it was of equal importance to learn that the products of the industry were not entering the general commercial market and were all being used by various governmental agencies.

On the basis of our observations, we concluded that the Federal judiciary has every reason to have full confidence in the operation of our Federal penal and correctional institutions. The personnel of the Federal system is trying conscientiously to carry out the sentences in the manner that the courts intended. They are also competent by experience and training to perfom the diagnostic studies requested from time to time by the Federal courts under the procedures of section 4208(b).

*Recommendations*

Such deficiencies as we observed in the course of our inspections were traceable to conditions which cannot be directly controlled by the administration of the Federal system. Deterioration in physical plants, obvious personnel shortages, and deplorable overcrowding are matters relating to appropriations. In order to improve the socially valuable work that is being done in the Federal institutions we would recommend that:

1. The Bureau of Prisons should be given the funds to establish youth institutions especially designed, built and staffed to carry out the full intent of the Federal Youth Corrections Act.

2. The Federal Detention Headquarters in New York City be abandoned and a new and adequately designed institution constructed so that the three general types of prisoners can be segregated: (1) those awaiting bail and trial; (2) those committed and awaiting transfer; (3) those held pursuant to administration procedures.

3. Legislation be enacted to provide a minimum period of compulsory commitment and treatment of the addicts who presently are admitted to the Lexington narcotics hospital on a voluntary basis that permits the staff no control over their period of treatment.

4. The U.S. Public Health Service should explore every means of obtaining additional psychiatrists for the Federal Prison System, especially where younger prisoners are confined.

5. Such visits would seem to be a logical extension of the sentencing institute program. In order that the courts may achieve a more equitable sentencing practice, they should be more completely familiar with what happens to defendants after sentence has been imposed. This would improve the courts' ability to evaluate and use with intelligent discrimination the various sentencing alternatives now available. Every sentencing institute for newly appointed judges should recommend that new judges visit a number of institutions as soon as it is convenient to do so. Thereafter, additional visits be made from time to time. Judges who have been on the bench for some time should visit such institutions from time to time.

*Conclusion*

The judges of the district of New Jersey feel that their visits to the Federal institutions were well worth the time and effort. We gained a tremendous amount of information and more knowledge of the problems of rehabilitating Federal offenders than we had before. This experience will be highly valuable in sentencing the offenders who come before us. We intend to make more visits of this kind, and it is believed that all judges who do so will find them professionally refreshing and helpful.

It should be pointed out that the final report contained herein was prepared after conference with and suggestions from those who visited all the institutions described: Judge Arthur S. Lane, Judge Anthony T. Augelli and Michael Keller, Jr., clerk of the court.

Respectfully,

THOMAS M. MADDEN,
*Chief Judge.*

## VFW Supports Pay Raise and Other Benefits for Military Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, because of the tremendous technological developments taking place in our Armed Forces, there is an all too frequent tendency to overlook the importance of the most essential ingredient—the personnel of our Armed Forces. I share the opinion of many others in this House that the most important single factor in the defense of our Nation is the personnel who comprise our military services. The officer and enlisted personnel who are serving our Nation and protecting our freedom on land, sea, and air in the United States, as well as distant points of the world, deserve our appreciation and support.

As Members of the House are well aware, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, consisting of 1,300,000 oversea combat veterans, is one of the Nation's most effective organizations in supporting our military personnel and protecting the interests of those who are serving and have served in our Armed Forces. The alert action on the part of the VFW and other veterans organizations in legislative and administrative matters pertaining to military personnel, both active and retired, and their dependents, has been of tremendous assistance.

Consequently, it was reassuring, although not surprising, to read the letter of the VFW commander in chief, Byron B. Gentry, to Mr. Leroy Whitman, editor of the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal and Register, pledging continued VFW support of military personnel. Commander in Chief Gentry's letter was printed in the January 19, 1963, issue of the Journal and Register. In that letter the VFW commander in chief outlined a few of the key issues of major interest to those in the Armed Forces and explained the VFW's position on these issues.

I am particularly glad to note that Commander Gentry pledged the support of a fair pay bill, and urged that it be passed quickly and given an early effective date. It is encouraging indeed to read Commander in Chief Gentry's forceful statement expressing opposition to proposals to delay the effective date of pay increases for our Armed Forces personnel. His statement that—

It is just not fair that military personnel should have their pay increases delayed, for budgetary purposes, while at the same time Government civilian employees are receiving pay increases granted during the past session of Congress—

Deserves the attention and support of both Congress and the Pentagon.

Also, I am confident that our military personnel, active and retired, and their dependents, will derive a genuine sense of reassurance in noting the clear-cut position of the VFW in support of hospitalization and the PX and commissary systems.

I invite the attention of the Members of the House to Commander in Chief Gentry's letter which is printed in its entirety at the conclusion of these remarks.

VFW COMMANDER STRESSES URGENT NEED FOR QUICK PASSAGE OF FAIR PAY BILL

I take this opportunity to assure you that the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States will continue to give full support to constructive legislation in the interest of military personnel, active and retired, and their dependents.

Also, I would like to express on behalf of the 1,300,000 combat veterans comprising the membership of the VFW, our appreciation for the longstanding and effective interest which the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal and Register has taken in matters concerning military personnel.

As a result of resolutions unanimously adopted at our 1962 national convention, the VFW is committed to a definite program in support of military personnel. These resolutions of our national convention, which establish guiding policy in such matters, call for support of commissary and post exchange rights of active and retired military personnel. In this connection, we will urge that action be taken to permit retired members of our Armed Forces full and unlimited post exchange and commissary privileges throughout the world. The VFW does not believe that these military personnel should be deprived of such well deserved entitlements because of local restrictions or monetary policies of countries in which the military installations are located. And certainly, it is vitally necessary that selfish commercial interests are not permitted, directly or indirectly, to undermine or curtail the PX and commissary systems either in the United States or abroad.

We also support continuation of adequate hospitalization and medical facilities for our active and retired military personnel and their dependents. The U.S. Government has a clear-cut obligation in this matter, and there must be no default in providing such services.

As a result, also, of the action of our recent national convention, the VFW vigorously supports legislation for an adequate and fair pay bill for military personnel. In this respect, the VFW is of the firm conviction that while it is an artificiality to compare military service with civilian employment as a basis for determining military pay, it is abundantly clear that military pay scales, both officer and enlisted, are far behind civilian standards of compensation.

We will oppose proposals for undue delay of the effective date of such increases as result from pending legislation. It is just not fair that military personnel should have their pay increases delayed, for budgetary purposes, while at the same time Government civilian employees are receiving pay increases granted during the past session of Congress.

In conclusion, I would like to point out that as an organization composed entirely of oversea combat veterans, the VFW realizes that active duty military personnel are, by the nature of their profession, unable to speak out in protection of their own interests. The VFW believes it understands the problems of our military personnel and we will continue our longstanding policy of supporting the interests of those who are serving and have served in our Armed Forces.

BYRON B. GENTRY,
*Commander in Chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.*

## Roll Out the Barrel (Pork)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, there is fun for all and something for everybody in the administration budget, in view of the editor of the Rock County Star-Herald of Luverne, Minn. Unfortunately, says Editor Alan McIntosh—

It now seems that we have been pushed, not led, to the precipice of national financial suicide.

I submit his editorial for inclusion in the RECORD:

ROLL OUT THE BARREL (PORK)

This administration's war cry which used to be "forward to the New Frontier" seems to be updated to "forward to the abyss."

It now seems that we have been pushed, not led, to the precipice of national financial suicide.

Only a few of the stanchest Democratic leaders in Congress are able to conceal how badly shaken and shocked they are by President Kennedy's $98 billion budget.

This budget, prepared to suit the philosophy of a man who never met a payroll or earned a dollar in his own right, is so ghastly that people are frightened.

The budget is one gigantic "roll out the barrel" pork distribution for everything and everybody with fun for all and something for everyone.

There is brave talk about tax cuts ahead to get our economy moving again. Only someone who still believes in babies being

found in the cabbage patches will fall for that idea. The Government will continue to take away with its left hand what it giveth in tax cuts with its right.

A $98 billion budget is beyond the comprehension of most of us.

Statisticians have translated $100 billion into these terms: $1.62 per second from Christ's birth to date, $1 per second for 3,171 years.

The sum total of all the money spent by the U.S. Government from 1789 through 1930.

It would make a stack of dollar bills 6,774 miles high.

No use lamenting the "good old days" when they ran the entire Government on half a billion dollars. (1900.) Even the extravagant F.D.R., whose peak peacetime budget was $9 billion, would roll over in his grave at the thought of $98 billion.

Those days are gone forever because the defense of America is going to take a lion's share of all our tax dollars * * * and for years to come.

But the need for keeping America strong in its military posture makes it doubly imperative that we bolster America from internal financial collapse.

There is more than a bit of trickery in the defense budget figures inasmuch as more billions of foreign aid are tucked away in the total.

We do not strengthen America by adding 130,000 new employees to Federal payrolls * * * civilian employees having no connection with defense.

We do not strengthen America by doubling the deficit rate from $4 to $8 billion a year.

We do not strengthen America by increasing the civilian payroll from $13.8 to $15.4 billion per year.

We do not strengthen America by taking the attitude that we can afford every bit of do-gooder ventures in socialism just because they "only cost $50 million."

Even the Peace Corps which started out in an itty bitty way now takes a $47 million cut out of the taxpayer and now the wild eyed are talking of a Peace Corps for within America.

The only way this economy can be gotten off dead center is for the Government to set an example of sacrifice instead of that malarkey about "don't ask what the Government can do for you but what you can do for the Government."

## Why Should All Other Taxpayers Pay This Bill?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have sent a letter to the Secretary of the Interior, asking that he disapprove two outlandish proposals now being considered by the Bonneville Power Administration, one of the agencies in his department. In one instance, the agency is proposing to extend its market area to sell power it does not have in an area that has plenty of power at reasonable rates. The taxpayers would be called upon to furnish around $100 million for the extension at a time when our national debt exceeds $300 billion and a deficit of nearly $12 billion is forecast for the next fiscal year. It is unthinkable that any consideration be given to such a proposal at any time, and particularly so when BPA is currently running into the red at a rate in excess of $15 million annually.

The second proposal is to extend the payout period and thus permit a new phony paper accounting through which a large part of the present deficits of the agency could be hidden.

In addition, I understand the two proposals taken together are to provide for setting up a basinwide payout scheme, whereby approval of uneconomic and unjustified reclamation projects would be requested on the basis that they could be paid for in the far distant future from presently nonexistent surplus BPA power revenue.

My letter to the Secretary follows:

JANUARY 23, 1963.

Hon. STEWART L. UDALL,
*Secretary of the Interior,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In the early days of your administration of the affairs of the Department of the Interior, I had the feeling we were poles apart on many features of the Federal power program. However, some of your actions in 1962 lead me to believe that you desire to operate in a manner that will protect the taxpayers' interest and also provide a desirable degree of cooperation with both the private and public utility groups.

Recent articles in the press indicate that the Bonneville Power Administration—one of the Interior agencies—is considering two far-reaching proposals that I believe are neither desirable nor justified. I hope that you will come to the same conclusion.

The first of these is a proposal for a new payout system for Federal dams in the Pacific Northwest that would extend the payout on individual power projects to way beyond the 50-year payout periods currently in use.

When the funds for the construction of the Federal hydroelectric projects in the Pacific Northwest were approved by the Appropriations Committee and the Congress, it certainly was with the understanding that repayments would be based on a 50-year payout period. To now change the basis for repayment of the taxpayers' money appropriated for these power projects would not be keeping faith with the Nation's taxpayers.

The present Bonneville power rate is the lowest in the Nation. This low rate was only made possible by the use of—

1. Over $2½ billion in taxpayers' money.
2. Interest charge below interest cost of long-term U.S. bonds.
3. No local, State, or Federal tax charge.
4. Excessive allocation of Federal project costs to nonpower uses.

Even with this subsidized low rate, Bonneville is currently operating at an annual deficit in excess of $15 million. Bonneville contends that it will be ahead of scheduled payout by around $6 million as of the end of the present fiscal year. Actually, if the payout was based on a proper interest charge in keeping with actual interest cost on long-term U.S. bonds, as it should be, there would be a deficit in payout of around $100 million.

The Bonneville proposal for a change in the payout basis appears to be an attempt to show a paper reduction in Bonneville's tremendous annual losses. I am surprised that Bonneville would put forth such a proposal.

The Bonneville Act provides for making periodic examination of Bonneville power rates to see that the required revenue to meet the payout is obtained. It seems to me Bonneville should be spending its time, not on studies of how to hide its present losses but on studies of what increases in rates are necessary to provide for the actual interest cost on and the repayment of the taxpayers' funds provided for the Federal hydroelectric projects in the Pacific Northwest. Personally, I think Bonneville power rates should also provide for in-lieu-of-tax payments to Federal, State, and local treasuries, equivalent to those being assessed against private utilities.

I am sure that you will not approve this outlandish proposal by Bonneville before it has been considered by the proper committees of Congress.

I cannot believe that the people in the Seventh Congressional District of Iowa which I have the honor to represent, as well as the people in most other areas of our Nation, should be called upon to help provide lower-than-cost power for the Pacific Northwest. Surely, if the Missouri River Basin power rate of 5½ mills per kilowatt-hour and the Colorado River Basin power rate of 6 mills can be absorbed in those areas, there can be no justification for trying to juggle figures in an attempt to justify holding the present BPA rate at a little over 2 mills.

The second Bonneville proposal relates to a proposed extension of the Bonneville power marketing area into southern Idaho. From the press reports, it appears that Bonneville and Bureau of Reclamation officials have held a number of public hearings in Idaho to build up support for their scheme. At such hearings, the Federal officials were forced to admit that no economic analysis had been made in the matter. Also, according to the press, an Idaho State official has labeled the proposed BPA report "an absolute farce" and said that the report was being made without the necessary background data.

I can agree with the Idaho State official that the BPA proposal is a farce of considerable magnitude, when by Bonneville's own admission it will be short of firm power in its present market area by 1965, and that there are estimated to be increasing deficits in firm power with the total reaching over a million kilowatts by 1970.

The extension of BPA power into southern Idaho appears to be coupled with a proposal for a sort of basinwide payout of reclamation projects to be accomplished by administrative action.

In my opinion, neither of these Bonneville proposals is justified in itself. Taken together, they constitute a brazen attempt to achieve by administrative action some very questionable end results not considered or approved by the Congress. It is an attempt to hide part of Bonneville's large annual deficit, on the one hand, and on the other hand to achieve a basinwide payout system to secure approval of regionwide projects on the claim that they can be paid for from theoretical surplus BPA power revenue in some far distant future.

In order that the other Members of Congress and the people of the Nation may be made aware of what these two bureaucratic agencies in your Department are proposing, I am inserting this letter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I hope you can advise me that no serious consideration will be given either of these proposals.

Sincerely yours,

BEN F. JENSEN.

## Thomas Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, Thomas Kennedy, president of the United Mine

Workers of America, died January 19 at his home in Hazleton, Pa. He was a labor leader of the first rank; one who, over a long period of years, saw his industry and the union movement grow and increase in strength.

Among the many tributes sent to Mr. Kennedy's widow are the following comments from the men who had worked with him for many years:

The passing of President Thomas Kennedy has left a vast void within the ranks of our organization. He, for more than half a century, devoted his life in promoting economic benefits through legislation and collective bargaining which has brought about workmen's compensation laws, pensions, unemployment insurance, safety laws, increased wages, and improved working conditions to the coal miners and the working men and women of America. His voice was always raised publicly and privately in the legislative halls of the States and the U.S. Congress in behalf of a better America and a better way of life for all its citizens. He served with distinction as Lieutenant Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and on many governmental boards to which he was appointed by the Presidents of the United States. He represented the United Mine Workers as a delegate to the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions and the Miners' International Federation while giving his vast knowledge and strength as one of the executive officers of our international union. His leadership was recognized by all who came in contact with him. He was admired and respected not only by the coal miners but the coal operators as well. His passing is a tremendous loss to our union and its membership. He was a gentleman, a labor statesman, and a great American. In behalf of our membership, we extend to you and the members of his family our sincere sympathy.

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
JOHN L. LEWIS,
*President Emeritus.*
W. A. BOYLE,
*Acting President.*
JOHN OWENS,
*Secretary-Treasurer.*

## Washington: Mostly Boondoggling and Brassy Hypocrisy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial written by Charles Dancey.

WASHINGTON: MOSTLY BOONDOGGLING

WASHINGTON, D.C.—There's not a thin dime that can be cut from the new, mammoth U.S. budget, you know, without sabotaging America in the cold war or wrecking our national security. It is the pure necessity of this bitter struggle for peace that makes a $98 to $99 billion budget absolutely essential even with an also essential tax cut—so we must just accept a $10 billion-and-up deficit.

Sure, it's all essential.

Like the new airport at Pekin for private planes, and perhaps one at Peoria, too, and in other cities and towns across the Nation. This is an urgent problem, friends.

And the new Federal buildings, each costing millions, that are sprouting up in LYNDON JOHNSON'S native Austin, Tex., and all across that fair State, nowadays—everywhere, that is, except in booming Dallas, Tex., where they have admittedly had a desperate need for new facilities and Federal agencies are scattered all over creation.

Republican Dallas can get along without, while Democratic Fort Worth, just next door, will join the list of other cities with much less urgency who will get new Federal buildings in this essential, "pared to the bone" budget just submitted.

Fort Worth, Austin, and so forth can get along without just as easily, and in most cases more easily than Dallas, and we fail to see how this multimillion-dollar boondoggle in Texas is going to get us to the moon faster, save the free world, or frighten the Russians.

Tragically, every cost control expert and major executive in any business in the land, large and small, knows that this very carefree attitude on "little" costs is precisely what accumulates into a fiscal disaster.

Sure, we want some, too. If they aren't going to leave it here, we want some of our money to come back here. We're sick and tired of leading the pack in paying taxes and being the tail-ender of all the 50 States of the Union in getting any of it back.

But that practical reality doesn't mean we have to pretend that this huge budget and its huge accepted deficit is really made up of life-or-death expenditures for the Nation.

It is just not the truth. It is armpit deep in politics and special interests—as usual.

AND BRASSY HYPOCRISY

The funniest thing in Washington these days is the screaming that goes up from the administration Democrats (that's just one of several categories) over Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN'S comment about the need for investigating the Cuban invasion attempt to set the historical record straight.

"No partisan investigation," they screech. "Nothing political." Yessiree, any political, partisan, or not completely objective investigation would be indecent, improper, and immoral.

So, they just want to let the record ride on the investigation that WAS made, and the beautifully "impartial" report that has just been made by said chief investigator, that impartial, objective, disinterested, nonpartisan, nonpolitical, noncontroversial young man—the President's brother, campaign manager, and Attorney General, Bobby Kennedy. The perfect, fair minded, unprejudiced investigator, obviously.

What classic, open-faced, brassy hypocrisy it is now to protest piously against any partisan or political investigation.

What the devil do they think we have just had?

## The Chenango Union Comments on President Kennedy's Tax-Cutting Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, as the Members of this House begin their study of President Kennedy's 1964 budget, together with his proposals for substantial tax cuts to get our economy moving again, I commend to their attention the following thoughtful editorial from the Chenango Union, one of the outstanding weekly newspapers in my district and indeed in the entire upstate New York area. The editorial appeared in the issue of January 24, 1963.

THAT BUDGET

The big newspapers are making a fuss over the President's budget. They keep asking how you can cut taxes and yet let the Government spend more money. Every big newspaper runs notices of sales of merchandise at cut prices. There would be no such sales if they didn't bring in more money. Cut taxes and you increase the number of taxpayers. The money left in the hands of the citizens will be spent. Every added transaction will bring in more taxes.

We have a certain number of people who have more money than they can use. Some of them will not invest in new industries or even to promote the growth of established industries. Our President intends to get some of that kind of money into circulation. The value of a dollar is usually measured by what you can get for it. Another measure is by what you can make it earn. Idle money earns nothing.

Without squeezing more dollars out of people who do not have enough the President intends to use the economic sinews of the Nation to get things moving in high gear. He knows what makes wheels go and what makes them stop. We are not making as much money as we should because we have too many people who will not spend some to make more. The President believes in a dynamic economy. Those big words mean let's put our money to work.

We have been plagued by strikes. Merchants, in cities, lose business because there are no newspapers to announce their sales. Other cities suffer from clogged traffic arteries because there are no public means of transportation. Docks have been loaded with merchandise that could not be moved. The unwillingness of some people to spend money in order to make more money has been a factor in most of these situations.

We do not say that labor is always justified in its demands. But when thousands of workers go without pay, for a long time, there must be some reason. Our President has made it clear that he will crack down on labor when it gets unreasonable. He proves himself to be a true friend to labor by proposals that will increase employment by increasing private purchasing power.

We have plenty of money in the United States of America. A man may have plenty of blood and yet die because his heart stops pumping to make the blood move. The President is asking the Congress to function with pulsating power to invigorate our economy. He wants all of that American money to be working for the American people. We hope our Congressmen get with the idea.

## Federal Bar Association's "Justice" Series

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I believe that all Members of Congress will be pleased to learn about a new series of radio programs entitled "Justice"' which has been inaugurated by NBC Radio Monitor in

cooperation with the Federal Bar Association.

For about 26 weeks on Saturday or Sunday, on approximately 200 stations around the country, millions of listeners will hear how the Government agencies safeguard the rights of all citizens.

The "Justice" series is intended to give listeners a more intimate knowledge of the various law enforcement agencies in the Federal Government from the Secret Service agent protecting the life of the President to the Food and Drug inspector protecting the interests of the corner drugstore shopper. The objective is to generate a greater respect for the law and those who enforce it by presenting a fuller understanding of the work of these Government agencies.

The National Broadcasting Co., Inc. is to be highly commended for this important public service. I want to especially mention the following representatives of NBC whose vision and creativity made this series possible: Howard Monderer, Esq., NBC Washington attorney and member of the Radio and Television Subcommittee of the Law Observance Committe of the Federal Bar Association; Russ Ward, NBC commentator; Ted Steele, NBC commenator; Bob Mauer, executive producer of Monitor; and Robert Wogan, director, programs, NBC radio network.

My distinguished colleague, the Honorable RICHARD E. LANKFORD, who is the national president of the Federal Bar Association, is to be congratulated on the work of the association's law observance committee, which arranged the series.

## Address of Administrator John E. Horne of the Small Business Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John E. Horne, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, recently addressed the 21st annual convention of the Mid-South Farm Equipment Association in Memphis, Tenn. Mr. Horne in an excellent speech pointed out some of the services of the Small Business Administration and how the SBA is helping the small business community. He points out that our private free enterprise system requires the existence of a strong small business community.

He then tells some of the ways in which the SBA has contributed to the strengthening of the small business segment of our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I believe my colleagues who are interested in knowing more about the work and operations of the Small Business Administration and others interested in SBA will find Mr. Horne's speech quite informative.

I ask unanimous consent that this speech be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The speech follows:

ADDRESS PREPARED BY JOHN E. HORNE, ADMINISTRATOR, SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, BEFORE THE 21ST ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE MID-SOUTH FARM EQUIPMENT ASSOCIATION, INC., HOTEL PEABODY, MEMPHIS, TENN., MONDAY, JANUARY 14, 1963

Good morning, it is a pleasure to be with you, and at the very outset I want to express thanks to your executive director, Thad Caraway, for inviting me here on behalf of your association.

As one who was born on a farm in Clayton, Ala., and can recall the days of horse-drawn plows and reapers, and the fields of cotton that were picked by hand, I am continually gratified and amazed at the vast changes that have come to the farm since I was a boy.

In 1910, there were about 24 million horses and mules and only about 1,000 tractors on farms in the United States. Today, there are some 5 million tractors and only 3 million horses and mules.

In my opinion at least, modern mechanized equipment has done as much for farming as rockets and satellites have accomplished for space science. We now have things down on the farm—"pop-up" bale loaders, straw choppers, "sure-feed" seeders, chisel plows, tillage tools, and whatnots, that would have startled farmers right out of their boots, except that most of them didn't wear boots, if they had even heard about them 40 or 50 years ago.

We have in the United States the most efficient and productive agricultural plant in the world. One American farmer today produces enough, on the average, to supply the food and fiber needs of 27 people.

As Secretary of Agrictulture Orville Freeman pointed out in a recent speech, farm income has improved substantially, even since 1960. He said that net income from farming averaged $373 higher per farm in 1961 as compared to 1960, and according to his figures, total net farm income in 1961 increased by $1.1 billion over the previous year.

It is clear that our farm production is in better balance with our markets and needs than for many years. It also is clear that farmers constantly require additional tools and machinery with which to work their fields or produce their dairy and meat products.

New and better farm equipment is coming off the assembly lines every day. You are the people who buy this equipment from the manufacturers, so you are more aware than I of the progress that is being made in farm machinery and methods. You also are the people who sell this equipment to the farmers, and so are well familiar with their needs.

I am told that many of you are anxious to expand and modernize your businesses.

To do so, you may be in need of financial assistance. In this and in other areas, the programs of the Small Business Administration may be of deep interest to you. Before discussing these programs, though, let us examine briefly how the small businessman fits into our country's overall economic picture today.

When we speak of "American business," we are speaking largely, in numerical terms at least, of small business. Of all the business firms in operation in this country, more than 4½ million, or some 95 percent, are "small." And they account for about 45 percent of the Nation's employment and 40 percent of our total business activity.

During fiscal year 1962, there was a net nationwide increase of 40,000 firms, the vast majority of them being small independent concerns. In the first 7 months of 1962, more than 112,000 new businesses were incorporated, 3.4 percent more than during the same period of last year. Business failures declined in every major industry category, and particularly in manufacturing and the retail trades.

Many business statistics bear a particular relevance to small firms. Retail sales reached an alltime high in October. For the nearly 2 million retailers this figure, like the high levels of personal income and of personal consumption expenditures, is encouraging news. A larger percentage of the gross national product has in recent years been attributed to the service industries which are predominantly characterized by small businessmen and are traditionally strong in adaptability, service and specialization.

I view these developments as encouraging news for the small business community.

Our private free enterprise system, which is basic to our liberty and to our prosperity, demands the existence of a strong and vigorous small business segment of the economy.

This is where the Small Business Administration comes in. This agency was established by Congress, not to dominate or control, but to provide the kind of services which will encourage and support the growth of small firms throughout the Nation.

We have four major areas of activity. They are, our financial assistance programs; our procurement programs; our management counseling services; and our activities as the small business spokesman in the executive branch.

First, let us take our lending activities. More than 9,000 loans for over half a billion dollars have been approved by SBA during the first 18 months of this administration, double the amount during the previous year and a half.

Several measures have been taken to speed up loan processing and otherwise to improve our lending procedures. The most recent was last September, when SBA and the American Bankers Association announced a new cooperative lending program which opened a significant new source of intermediate-term loans for small companies. Under this program, banks will lend 50 percent or more of approved loans and will receive repayment of their share of the loan before SBA is paid its share of the loan.

The chief purpose of this plan is to enable banks to participate in loans of up to 10 years.

This is simply the most recent step in our continuing efforts to increase participation with the banking community so as to make more adequate financing available to small businesses.

As you know, it is SBA's policy to supplement the bank, rather than to replace it, or to compete with it, in making loans to small companies. We actually have a requirement that before a small businessman can get a direct loan from us, he must be unable to obtain the financing from a private lender. We are pleased that about two-thirds of our loans are made with bank participation.

I want to emphasize, however, that we have the authority to make loans directly, and to approve the full amount of the loan. Thus, if for some reason a bank will not or cannot make a loan or any part of it, we will make the full loan if it is a sound and eligible application.

SBA has made a number of loans, many with excellent bank participation, to farm equipment dealers in your area.

For example, in one small town we made a $50,000 loan with 25-percent bank participation to a dealer who needed the funds for working capital. We made him this loan at 4-percent interest, since he was located in an area of substantial unemployment. Our regular rate of interest is 5½ percent.

Another one of our loans went to a tractor company in Mississippi which had outgrown its building space and was using its parking lot for machinery and equipment.

This firm borrowed $25,000 which it will use to construct a new building.

Thus, if you are in need of a loan and for some reason can't negotiate with the bank, you may want to visit one of our field offices. To try to give you personalized and convenient service, we have set up 60 field offices from coast to coast, and in Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. In Tennessee, you will find one in Nashville and Knoxville. There also is one in Jackson, Miss.; Louisville, Kansas City, and St. Louis, and Little Rock.

In addition to our regular business loans, we give financial aid to victims of major disasters. We are also authorized to make loans to small business concerns, which have suffered substantial economic injury because of drought or excessive rainfall in their areas. This means that any dealer in an area officially designated as a disaster area because of either excessive rainfall or drought, may borrow money from SBA at 3 percent interest to tide him over until the farmers are in a better position to meet their debts.

You are all familiar, I am sure, with the financial aid we give to victims of major disasters, such as floods and storms. We have made a number of disaster loans in the Kentucky, Tennessee, Arkansas, Missouri, and Mississippi area.

Our lending programs also extend to the more than 630 small business investment companies throughout the Nation. Fifteen of these companies are located in Tennessee, Missouri, Mississippi, and Arkansas.

These small business investment companies, in many cases supplementing their own investments with funds borrowed from SBA, fill a great need in providing long-term loans or equity financing to small business. A larger firm can sell stock or borrow long-term money at reasonable interest rates from a private lender. A small businessman, as you know, usually cannot meet the cost of a public sale of stock, and private financing institutions have traditionally been reluctant to make such long-term commitments. Under the small business investment companies program, the small firm may be able to obtain either long-term debt or equity financing, or both.

Latest figures show that the small business investment companies have capital and surplus of more than half a billion dollars and have made over $300 million in loans and investments to 4,200 small firms.

Small business investment companies are making and will, I hope, continue to make highrisk investment. This they must do if they are to fulfill their function of helping small business concerns needing ten, fifty or a hundred thousand dollars or more on a longterm basis to expand their businesses or to promote new markets. These are the firms which, up until the establishment of the small business investment companies program in 1958, had literally no place to go to obtain the longterm financing they required to meet their problems. As a result, they either had to find a partner or several partners or somehow generate their own funds, a slow and frequently unsuccessful procedure.

Now, I would like to review briefly some of our other services in which you might have a special interest. Lack of sound management practices constitutes the greatest single cause of small business failures, and we are endeavoring to help small firms overcome this difficulty. One of the ways we are doing this is through our management counseling programs. One such program includes management courses which are usually cosponsored with universities or colleges.

During the past 2 years we have greatly increased the number of these courses. To date, more than 50,000 small businessmen have taken these courses throughout the Nation.

In addition, we have a great number of publications which you may obtain from our field offices. We finance management research studies as another aspect of our counseling services.

For example, we financed a management research summary on farm equipment retailing in Louisiana. This summary has just been released. While the research was done by persons affiliated with Louisiana State University, I believe the contents pertains sufficiently to your areas to be of interest to you.

The study shows that in 1960 the State of Louisiana had 214 retail farm equipment dealers who sold about $60 million worth of farm machinery. Farm expenditures for gasoline and other fuel amounted to another $20 million.

Information received from questionnaires showed that on the average, 56 percent of a firm's business was realized from equipment sales, 24 percent from spare parts, and 20 percent from the service department.

About half of the firms sampled said they started with some borrowed capital, and more than half also borrowed part of their annual operating capital. Very few of the firms leased equipment to farmers, but interest in this practice appeared to be growing.

The study was made to obtain data that might lead to a better understanding of the farm equipment retail business, which is an important segment of Louisiana's economy. You may obtain copies of the full report from the Louisiana Agricultural Experimental Station at Louisiana State University.

Perhaps you are familiar with our set-aside program for small business through which we assist small firms to obtain a fair share of Government contracts. If you sell or have a desire to sell to the Government, you will want to explore the possibilities of this program.

Regardless of what the product is, the Government is doing its best to see that the small firms get full opportunity to share in Government business, and this includes everyone, from the businessman who sells office equipment to the manufacturer who makes airplane parts.

And I also wish to point out that the Small Business Administration acts as spokesman for the small business community in the councils of Government.

As you may know, one of the first things President Kennedy did after he took office was to establish a White House Committee on Small Business. This Committee, of which I am Chairman, includes representatives of the Departments of Commerce, Defense, Justice, Labor, and Treasury, and the representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, the Council of Economic Advisers, the Federal Trade Commission, the General Services Administration, and the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Among other proposals, the committee thought it would be a good idea to hold tax clinics for small businessmen. And this we are doing jointly with the Internal Revenue Service. Kansas City and St. Louis, Mo., are among the cities in which these 1-day clinics are scheduled to be held this month.

SBA is constantly seeking new and proper avenues of assistance to help the small businessman to grow and prosper.

And for good reason.

Small business is part of our individualistic, independent way of life, one of the distinctions between this Nation's free and open society and a totalitarian state.

Small business constitutes a large and diversified source of employment opportunities. They serve the public interest by helping to preserve competition and to insure high quality and reasonable prices.

They can perform some services better than large firms. They are frequently the source of new products and new methods. And, since small business is dispersed throughout the country, it becomes vitally significant in times of national emergency.

In conclusion, I want to leave these thoughts:

1. If you need counseling or other assistance, see our representatives at our field offices. The Small Business Administration exists solely to help you and other small businessmen.

2. The Small Business Administration and the national administration, President Kennedy and his Cabinet, are friendly to business, including small business. This, I think, is made clear by several things, but especially by the new tax depreciation tables, the tax investment credit program, and now by the proposed new tax reduction.

3. Finally, I read in a recent issue of your monthly magazine that the farm equipment business has improved 100 percent in the Midsouth in the last 3 years and that the outlook for the coming year is for further increases. This prediction ties in with an overall favorable outlook for a moderate business rise this year. Certainly, I wish you success in obtaining a good share of it.

## How To Approach Your Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ODIN LANGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. H. C. Warfield, a constituent of mine from Bemidji, Minn., has supplied me with a copy of a very interesting article. I would like to share it with my colleagues today. The article appears in Span, the Standard Oil Co. publication, and was written by our former colleague, Frank N. Ikard. His appropriate remarks are drawn from his experiences during the 10 years he represented the 13th Congressional District of Texas. I respectfully submit his article for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

HOW TO APPROACH YOUR CONGRESSMAN
(By Frank N. Ikard)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Many Americans have a sincere desire to have more of a voice in National Government than voting, but confess a lack of understanding as to how and when to communicate effectively with Congressmen. We asked Frank N. Ikard to provide some suggestions from a Congressman's point of view. Now executive vice president of the American Petroleum Institute, Mr. Ikard for 10 years represented the 13th Congressional District of Texas in the U.S. House of Representatives. His views follow.)

People have wanted to know how to influence Congressmen since the first days of our Republic. In recent years, even Madison Avenue has come into the act. Instructions, bulletins, pamphlets, and recommendations in depth have poured out from New York and Washington headquarters of various organizations to the grassroots level, urging each member to "write his Congressman" on issues affecting the organization.

As a Member of Congress for 10 years, including 6 on the Ways and Means Committee, I was on the receiving end of this barrage of response.

My recommendations for effective communications are simple: (1) Know your Congressman; (2) know your subject; and (3) know the procedure to follow.

1. Know your Congressman. If you don't, it is your own fault; a Congressman is about

the easiest public servant to meet. Up for reelection every other year, he has little time to mend fences, work up grassroots support, or find material support. He must continually maintain all of these prerequisites. If he ever loses these contacts, he will be replaced by a new man who has been "out meeting the people."

When he does get back to his district, he is eager to meet as many constituents as possible. He wants to know you and your problems even more than you want to know him. Next time your Congressman comes home, go to his office and meet him. Then, later, when you get in touch with him, he will have a personal feeling about your problems.

This applies to every constituent, regardless of party. Suppose you are a Republican and your Congressman a Democrat who knows you have not supported him in the past. Get to know him, anyway. More votes cast in the House and Senate cross party lines than those cast strictly along party lines. Your Congressman represents all his district, Democrats and Republicans alike. He desires to please all his people all the time, even though he knows this is impossible. Because you are on the opposite side, he should be doubly eager to find some common ground to win your support. To the true professional in politics, the best way to destroy one's enemies is to make friends out of them.

Don't fall out with him because, he doesn't vote your way on every issue. Keep your eye on the main issue. Suppose, for instance, your principal interest is legislation on the taxation of cooperatives. After discussing it with your Congressman, if you feel you see eye to eye on it, don't ruin this beautiful relationship by writing him a nasty letter when he votes for a new dam in the West, or more public housing in the East. You don't know what his commitments are on these subjects. Give him the benefit of the doubt. He will appreciate it.

2. Know your subject. Of the sackful of mail hauled into a Congressman's office every morning, only about 1 letter in 25 will be from a constituent who really knows his subject. The Congressman has, at best, only 3 or 4 staff members to answer about 300 letters a day. They can't tarry trying to explain in detail what the facts are, because tomorrow will bring in another 300 letters. So, the misinformed letterwriter receives a vague but pleasant stock reply that pleases no one, including the Congressman.

In 1962, the Senate Finance Committee was holding hearings on a tax bill that would have withheld, at the source, a percentage of interest and dividends. Senators on the committee averaged as many as 3,000 to 5,000 letters a day on this issue. They were appalled to learn from these letters that many of their constituents didn't know they already owe income tax on their interest and dividends. Their indignation only emphasized what the Treasury Department contended all along: that many citizens, through ignorance, were not paying this tax.

So, if you don't know your subject, your letter could do more harm than good.

The best evidence, as in court, is your own personal experience. Base your request on what you know from your own experience. Give your Congressman facts and figures clearly and concisely. Tell him how the issue would affect your own business.

One good source of information is your trade organization. Most of them have staffs in Washington who keep a constant stream of advice pouring out on every subject that would affect your business or organization. They're not always infallible, but on the whole, they do a good job in keeping you informed about what is happening in Washington.

3. Know the procedures to follow. Let us assume your primary issue is taxation of cooperatives. Your Congressman is, let us say, a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. As such, he attends daily committee meetings from 10 a.m. until Congress convenes at noon. He's an expert on subjects under consideration by his committee, but not necessarily on other matters. From noon until about 6 p.m. he is on the floor of the House where legislation being voted upon requires his presence, or else he is back meeting with his committee. After 6 p.m. he gets a chance to read and sign the answers to today's 300 letters. Even putting in a 10- to 12-hour day, he won't know too much about the taxation of cooperatives, which is under the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee.

Therefore, put your problem on a personal basis. He is a lot more interested in you and your financial well-being than in the impersonal problem of a general tax bill, which is the task of the Ways and Means Committee. He rarely knows what a bill will contain (unles it arises in his own committee) until the proper committee reports it out favorably. Often the bill reported out by the committee only faintly resembles the bill originally introduced. So, why should he waste time studying legislation before it is being considered in committee?

Let's go back to your letter about taxation of cooperatives. Ask your Congressman to discuss it with your regional representative on the Ways and Means Committee. Each Member elected to that committee represents a region of the United States. For instance, on the committee I represented not only Texas, but New Mexico, as well. Therefore, ask your own Congressman to consider your request, and, if he approves, to discuss it personally with the member on the Ways and Means Committee who represents your area. This is the most effective way to bring your position on an issue to the attention of the members of the proper committee. You may, of course, write directly to the members of the committee where the bill is pending. But you may not receive an answer. I tried to answer such letters from my region. But my first consideration was to letters that came from my friends and constituents in the 13th District of Texas, and to letters referred to me by my colleagues representing other districts in my region.

A constituent who follows the procedure I have recommended has not only the weight of his own testimony, in his letter, but the added persuasion of his Congressman's endorsement. Remember, it is your Congressman, regardless of his political affiliation or committee assignment, who will cast that vote on the floor of the House eventually. Also, by proceeding through him, you avoid the appearance of bypassing him in appealing to the members of the committee "over his head." Some Congressmen consider this an affront.

Timing is also very important. Write to your Congressman when the bill is pending in committee. Do not wait until the bill is brought to the floor. The place to "kill" a measure or amend it favorably is in committee. Your Congressman will be helpless if your appeal reaches him after the bill has been reported from the committee to the floor. This is particularly true in matters arising in Ways and Means Committee, because most of these bills are brought to the floor under a closed rule: no amendments can be offered from the floor.

Don't wait until a measure has already passed the House and is pending in the Senate committee. About all your Congressman can do then is refer you to your two Senators, who may not be in a position to assist you. A Senator, representing a whole State, has commitments to many more varied and conflicting interests than does your Congressman.

In general, here are some do's and don'ts:

Do try to talk to him personally about your legislation. If this is impossible, write his a letter with your business letterhead printed, and your name signed legibly or typed at the bottom. Keep it simple and personal. Show by facts and figures how you, yourself, will be affected. A letter is better than a telegram. Each day a Congressman may get from 20 to 50 telegrams, urging his vote for or against legislation. Many of them don't give enough information about either the constituent or the bill he's interested in. And the Congressman and his staff don't have much time to dig up this information, especially toward adjournment.

If your Congressman pleases you with his vote on any issue, write him and tell him so. After each rollcall vote on any major issue, Congressmen are braced for a deluge of mail from displeased constituents. Those who agree seldom express their approval.

About half of a Congressmman's mail pertains to things the constitutent wants done. The other half consists of requests to vote a certain way on legislation. The conscientious Congressman—and most are—tries tto fulfill all these requests. Once in a great while, he receives a letter thanking him. When he has voted your way, write and thank him. He will remember.

Don't feel your letter would impose on your Congressman. As long as he gets letters from home, he knows he is on the right wave length. If the mail drops off, he begins to wonder which fences have broken down. He wants to know what his constituency is thinking.

I have purposely ignored "pressure mail." This type of approach is of very little benefit to your cause. The Congressman cannot completely ignore it. But in the long run it carries very little weight, and sometimes it defeats its own purpose.

It is the straightforward letter that commands your Congressman's respect. He never tires of hearing from constituents who can contribute to the welfare of the Nation. He knows he is their voice in Washington. Your Congressman is profoundly influenced by your opinions.

## How Much Is That Tax Cut?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, while a lot of folks in Illinois are busily deciding how they might spend their share of the highly propagandized tax cut this year, the administration is trying to pull the rug out from under them. Many of our solid, homeowning citizens will find themselves without that extra spending ability and some with even less than before if this Congress supports the proposed tax program. The January 25, 1963, editorial in the Peoria Journal Star, expresses my sentiments:

HOW MUCH IS THAT TAX CUT ANYWAY?

President Kennedy's proposed tax cut is beginning to look like a real slash—right across the wrists of everybody who itemizes his deductions.

It took quite a while for the administration to ballyhoo how great a break it was going to give us taxpayers and we were on cloud 9 over the whole thing. But we fell back to earth yesterday.

We would have to see a copy of the new income tax form Kennedy has in mind before we could even guess how much of a tax cut it would mean for a person who itemizes his deductions, but we don't have to wait any longer to see that his cut is going to be a lot less than the one proposed for the majority of people who take the Government's standard deduction allowance.

We can expect that the Kennedy proposal will be recast a great deal by Congress, and we hope that our Congressmen can see that striking at those who itemize their deductions is striking at those who are carrying the heaviest tax burdens right now.

The average itemizer is the owner of a home with a heavy mortgage and a heavy real estate bill. The fact that these costs are deductible gives him a break on his income taxes—just about the only break he gets from anybody. Now J.F.K. would take that break away.

We have yet to see any explanation for this except that the administration wants more people to use the short form to cut down on the expense of collecting the tax.

This is bureaucratic thinking at its best. In order to save $1 on 5 million returns, it would set up a system which would discriminate against 5 million people to the tune of $100 apiece.

## Firsthand Report of a Recent Trip Around the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we can always gain information from those of our citizens who travel around the world and take time to make reports concerning their visits to foreign lands as in the case of Mr. Calvin K. Katter, of Minneapolis, Minn.

He addressed a letter to the Wanderer published in St. Paul and it was printed in the January 10, 1963, issue. In my opinion, Mr. Katter proves himself to be a very observing traveler. His letter follows:

FIRSTHAND REPORT OF A RECENT TRIP AROUND THE WORLD

EDITOR, THE WANDERER:

My wife and I have just returned from a trip around the world, visiting 30 countries, including a visit last summer behind the Iron Curtain. We drove along the wall in West Berlin and saw the crosses and flowers where many have been killed. While we did not actually get into Poland, we did spend some time in other satellite countries. On the first day there, we were assisted by a young lady, a Government tourist guide. She extended us every courtesy and we had no difficulties at any time. However, as we had some knowledge of their language and many of their people speak English, we were permitted to travel after that pretty much on our own. This gave us more opportunity to mix with the people.

People were friendly and approached us in museums, on the streets, and in cafes and restaurants. We traveled by bus, streetcars, boats, trains, and by plane. Usually, after some introductory remarks, we talked freely with the people on many subjects.

Generally, sooner or later, someone would ask the questions of us: "Why does your Government and/or State Department or, in some cases, certain officials coddle and favor Communist governments?" Some stated: "Your Government policies must be soft on communism, or why do you help them?" They had no reservations about letting us know they were not in sympathy with our aid to Communist governments, thereby keeping them in power, since such aid was not helping their people.

We found it difficult to give them a satisfactory answer, particularly after witnessing all the anti-American propaganda activities in these countries.

Americans simply have no idea of the immensity of the anti-American campaign being conducted constantly by Communist sources. On one Government tour we visited a large museum in a capital city. One long wall covered with anti-American propaganda for all to see—called to our attention by Hollanders, English and others on the tour.

There are more bookstores in these countries than drugstores in the United States, and all are peddling the Communist philosophy. These Communist countries also supply magazines, periodicals, literature, free, via their embassies, hotels, libraries, and public places in Asia, Africa, and the Orient as well, which carriers a tremendous amount of anti-American material. I picked up a news magazine in a satellite airport and was shocked at the anti-American caricatures. Every phase of American life is covered. Unemployment, capitalistic profits, racial tension, etc. The information of course, is false or so twisted as to give false impressions, but how are these readers to know that? Every dollar spent on Communist products helps to support this vicious anti-American program.

Another question: "Didn't we know that the major part of all our foreign-bound production is taken by the Communist governments to use as they please?" For example, food is actually taken and being shipped to Cuba in spite of its scarcity in the satellite countries. (Actually these countries have been and are being sacked by Russia.)

After seeing the conditions under which these people have to live; after seeing the standing lines of people waiting to buy the simple staples of existence—such as meat, milk, eggs, butter—which we were told are sometimes not available for days or even weeks—I wouldn't accept a Polish ham as a gift. If the Polish people have surplus meat, why isn't it directed to other satellites where meat is in such short supply? Why is it directed to the United States to compete with our farmers when millions of their own people are going hungry? Moreover, we have learned that the Polish Government has an arms contract to furnish war material to the Government of North Vietnam. This material is killing our allies in South Vietnam as well as their American advisers.

Question No. 3: "What about the racial problems in the United States?" Communist propaganda never lets up on this one. Newspapers carried full-page stories, complete with photographs, of the James Meredith episode in Mississippi the day after it happened. When we carefully explained that a few million Negroes in the United States drive and own more cars than 220 million Russians, and that the American Negro in our country takes home more pay than the average European, they were flabbergasted. We couldn't tell them that many of our Negroes have a living standard that they, the Europeans have never dreamed of.

Eastern Europe is an economic poorhouse by any standards, both as to quantity and quality.

At one large city, we waited an hour at the depot for a taxi that never came, and then were advised that taxes must be ordered a day in advance. While shopping, we were appalled at the number of people who came into the shops to sell rings, jewelry, dishes, china, to get money to buy food. Valuable art objects are padlocked in owners' homes to be "reserved" for the State. In one large city, a Lutheran church was made into a wine museum. The people have very little to say about anything.

In our humble opinion, when these nations provide the means for free elections and the people can select their own governments, that will be sufficient time to deal with their elected governments and negotiate on items of which they might have a surplus and which do not take employment from our own people.

In early August we were in Istanbul. On a boat trip up the Bosphorus, a Turkish professor who spoke good English told us that as many as 12 Russian freighters a day were passing through the Dardanelles. Most of these, he said, were loaded with war materials and other trouble-making equipment against the free world. Where does the payment for these war materials come from? Certainly not from Castro. He explained at length how it comes from out of the hides of the Russian and satellite peoples.

A few days later the papers in Greece carried the story of the Egyptian plane forced to land in Greeec for violating Greek territory. On board was $1 million in American gold bound for Yugoslavia, you can guess where it went from there—so whom are we helping?

Newspapers in the Orient carried press reports of serious food riots in Russia with many killed. Another one-half-page account told of the thousands of Rumanian "objectors" who have been liquidated in the past 10 years.

Communism is a tragic failure everywhere you look. It is kept in power by ruthless suppression. Their people told us frankly, we the free nations are their only hope; so why should our country help this diabolical masquerade? Why should Americans contribute to the torture of enslaved masses?

Karl Marx's life was a tragic failure. His children died of malnutrition, his wife died for lack of medical care. In his lifetime he earned less money to support his family than the average man of his day earned in a few months. He was kept alive by gifts and donations from Engels and others on a meager, bare subsistence level. This man is the dreamer—the schemer who is communism's symbol of success.

Communism is costing free nations billions of dollars that could be used to build schools, educational facilities, hospitals, roads, industries in many undeveloped nations. We saw many such opportunities in Africa, Asia, and the Orient. We visited many missionaries and mission stations of all denominations and have seen the phenomenal works of these groups. We've seen thousands of children and teenagers who have had an opportunity to get an education through these mission educational facilities. We visited hospitals, too. The American people can be proud of these groups and also of our embassies who are trying to help these less fortunate nations. These mission groups serve without reservation or political motives and, according to local businessmen and government officials, are among our best ambassadors abroad.

America could use many more thousands of these who get to and help the people with no strings attached.

Our best day abroad was the day the United States announced the blockade of Cuba, while we were in Hong Kong. Recognized as Americans, we were stopped on the street and

congratulated with "Hurrah for the U.S.A." and "America is finally waking up."

We found a world full of friendly people, but many spoke very frankly about our being soft on communism. Our coddling of Communists and lack of counteraction at home and abroad to them is incredible. We were chided about quick action in Mississippi and lack of action about Cuba.

People everywhere, particularly the Eastern European satellites, are happy to see tourists come and show an interest in their problems. We sensed the feeling among the satellite peoples that trade with Communist governments should stop. Such aid does not reach the people and only disturbs and confuses their confidence in our judgment. They know, as should we, that any help to such Communist governments is only aiding our own destruction.

CALVIN K. KATTER.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

## Inaugural Address of Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., President of Indiana University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, just 2 months ago Indiana University inaugurated its 12th president. His name is particularly well known in this body because at this time last year he was the Secretary of the Army. I refer, of course, to Mr. Elvis J. Stahr, Jr.

The inauguration of a new president is of great interest to the university community and to the State of Indiana generally. Because of his former associations and the aptness of his remarks, I submit the inaugural address of President Stahr, made in the university auditorium, at Indiana University on Monday, November 19, 1962.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT ELVIS J. STAHR, JR.

President Hickam, Governor Welsh, excellencies of the diplomatic corps, distinguished delegates and guests, colleagues, and friends of Indiana University, let me at the outset affirm most solemnly that this is a very great moment for me personally, that I appreciate deeply the honor just conferred upon me, that I am profoundly grateful for your confidence and support, and that my best efforts are and shall be pledged to the advancement of this university.

But beyond that, and more importantly, this is also a moment of significance for Indiana and for Indiana University, not because it formalizes a change in academic administration, for no change in institutional character, direction, or personality necessarily flows from that, but because it marks, perhaps as well as a single moment can, the beginning of a period in the life of higher education in this State and Nation so momentous, so fraught both with brilliant opportunities and with heavy penalties for failure, that it can without extravagance be termed a new era. It will inevitably be an era of great change, if only, though not only, because of the pace of our times and the impact of forces I shall mention in a moment.

The presence of each of you in this great gathering this morning contributes to both the significance and the enjoyment of this ancient ceremony, and the university is grateful to you all, as I am. You will understand, I know, if I acknowledge with special happiness the presence of my mother and my father. And it is a most delightful thing to me that my alma mater, the University of Kentucky, is represented on this platform by her distinguished president and by her noble and beloved president emeritus, under whom I once served through 8 years of rich experience, and that my second alma mater, the University of Oxford, is represented by my warm friend, fellow Rhodes scholar and esteemed colleague, the president of Purdue University.

My feeling of pride in becoming the president of Indiana University is tempered with profound humility each time I reflect, as I often do, that I am succeeding one of the great educational statesmen of the 20th century, Herman B Wells. Possibly no one but me will ever know fully what a source of continuing strength it is that he is actively with us as chancellor, inspiration, and friend.

No one should, and I shall not, take lightly the challenge inherent in the leadership of one of the great universities of the greatest nation on earth in the most exciting yet critical period in the history of our planet thus far, for American universities are closer to the heart of State, National, and global concerns than they have ever been.

"Universitas—all together, the whole, the universe"—custodian, discoverer, transmitter, interpreter, of all that is known, the university stands at the apex of the educational structure, symbolizing, if not, in fact, embracing, all knowledge, in its diversity and its unity.

In the contemporary surge of creativity and discovery, knowledge doubles and redoubles, each new fact or proposition lighting new paths for exploration and revelation beyond the anticipation or imagination of the most sophisticated. Long established divisions of related knowledge, categorized for convenience and manageability, are stretched beyond the original concepts. Subsequent splinterings into specializations and subspecializations are soon themselves made to seem arbitrary as changed awareness of the grand pattern follows each new discovery and insight.

The function of the university becomes the more important as the accumulation of what we know defies the individual mind to contain it, and frequently challenges the human mind even to classify it so that it may be retrieved with the aid of wondrous new machines and meaningfully interrelated.

Where today, but in the traditional university, can the unity in knowledge be constantly sought and honored whilst the pursuit of new knowledge along all its diverse paths is encouraged and nurtured?

THE NEW PLACE OF THE UNIVERSITY

These dual responsibilities place an exclusive and unique charge upon our traditional universities, and with the breakthroughs of basic research and the unbelievable pace of technological development, the new place of the university in the total fabric of society begins to unfold.

At the pinnacle of new specializations, new discoveries burst forth, whereupon new relationships suddenly reveal themselves. That which was a research device becomes the heart of a production machine. That which was a theory becomes a fact. The processes of research and development across the whole spectrum of knowledge have pushed universities into a new essentiality to our life and times. Exploring the unknown has always been at the heart of all that education stands for, but the products of its own efforts have placed upon the university of today a mantle of central responsibility for the future of civilization.

Postulate what worthy goals you will for man in this modern world: justice, knowledge, human dignity, economic vitality, international concord, the conquest of space, government by and for the people, the opportunity of every child, every man and woman, to realize the best that God put in him—and ignorance is the bar, education the gate, to each such goal.

The current chapter in the long annals of man's earthly adventure is an unusually dramatic one, with all the elements of high drama focused into an incredibly fast-moving plot. All here present are familiar with the simultaneous bursting upon us of the almost inconceivably powerful forces of what have been called the "explosions" of population, of knowledge, of technology, and of the aspirations of billions of people who for centuries had played but minor roles in the world's affairs. We dare not discount the potentials and rapidly emerging effects of any of these forces, nor the long shadow which intrudes persistently into our contemplation of them and of the future. For looming over every horizon is a deep and seemingly irreconcilable conflict—not a new one, to be sure, but one which in our time has reached heights of danger and suspense never before seen on a global scale. It is at bottom the age-old conflict between slavery and freedom, between deceit and honesty, between aggressive force persistently seeking to invade any vacuum it can find and defensive strength which will move only when there is no answer save a protecting shield.

What a pity that this should be. From the moment victory over fascism was won on the field of battle, this Nation and most of the war-weary peoples of the world turned their backs on armies and conquest. We in America disbanded the greatest military forces ever seen on earth; we offered to every surviving veteran the greatest opportunity our country or any country could offer, the opportunity for higher education; we gathered tens of billions of dollars of our treasure and used them to help friend and foe bind up their wounds and renew their search for a decent life in freedom; we went further and extended a helping hand to hundreds of millions of newly awakening peoples who were yet illiterate and ignorant in the ways of the modern world, but who had legitimate human aspirations. We envisioned and struggled hard, asking all others to join us, to help create a world in which all men might have the opportunity to live in peace, with freedom to pursue their finest goals, each in his own way. And we are still struggling toward those ends.

What a pity, indeed, that the only nation in that postwar world with even the possibility of rivaling America in world leadership should have been one whose own leaders found all of this repugnant, who could not accept the prospect of success of this great effort, this great dream, and who deliberately turned the world into a kind of living hell for country after country, people after people.

Perhaps it was inevitable; I don't know. Maybe we, who ourselves are not free from sin, are doomed on earth to cope with Satan till the day of judgement. Be that as it may, I refuse to believe that we are doomed to surrender to him. We therefore must not succumb to self-pity or to self-righteousness, any more than to the overt challenge of arms.

There are many big and little things we must all do in these anxious years, many day-to-day decisions our elected leaders must make, but, if we are to stay alive, and to keep alive the things that make it worth being alive, there are two overriding tasks confronting America and all free people. The first is to continue to build societies in which man can cultivate the full fruits of freedom, and the other is to maintain mili-

tary power which will deter the enemies of freedom from attempting to destroy or overrun us.

And education is today indispensable to both.

Military power of the most advanced kind will be essential to protecting freedom so long as the forces of antifreedom themselves have such power and are not content to stay at home. But true education is essential to extending freedom; indeed, it is part of the essence of freedom, and, without it, there can be neither a great deal worth defending nor any means adequate to defend it.

THE ESSENCE OF EDUCATION

I am scarcely saying anything new when I remind all of us that under our American system, from its beginning, the major responsibility for military power has been that of the Nation as a whole through the agency of the Federal Government, while the major responsibility for the education of our people has been reserved to the States and to the people. It might be supposed that this indicates that education was thought the less important by the framers of the Constitution, but I am confident they had quite a different view. They knew full well that no democracy can function without an educated citizenry. They also knew that while military efficiency by its very nature requires strict discipline of large groups of men, centralization of authority, and absolute loyalty to that authority when asserted, education by its very nature requires diversity, decentralization, experimentation, dissent, and inquiry. The higher learning in particular is, at its best, a disciplined approach, not to indoctrination, but to the full development of the individual intellect and to the searching out, through many approaches, of the deepest roots of truth, whether about nature, the universe, society, or that wondrous creature, man himself. Therefore, the framers may well have reasoned, nationwide responsibility for all of education should not be vested in any single authority. But it should not be overlooked today that education is too vital to the Nation to be permitted for long to be inadequately supported.

All of this presents exceptional challenges to the State of Indiana, for upon each State still falls responsibility under our American system for providing most of the financial resources needed for the work of public education.

Frankly, I doubt one could find more than a handful of citizens of this State who don't want Hoosier children to have opportunity as full and real as is open to any other children of their generation. And I doubt there can be found any instance in history where a high level of educational opportunity failed to make any society more advanced and more prosperous than it was before. But it is enough to recognize that no state or nation can advance without it today.

Many have asked me in recent months how I like it here. It has been clear in every case that they hoped I do like it, that they wanted me to like it, because they like it and are proud of it. My answer was and is unequivocal, I like it wholeheartedly, and so do my wife and our children. This is a beautiful place, conducive to contemplation and learning, as anyone can see, and it is a warm and friendly place, as anyone with good will can feel. It is also an exciting place, a place where more than 17,000 young people, among the brighest of their generation, are striving to complete the process of truly growing up, are gathered with hundreds of mature and superb scholars in pursuit of answers to all the great questions of the centuries and all the new questions of the age of space and the atom, are trying to digest knowledge which daily probes deeper into the unknown, are trying to prepare for life in a world greatly changed, and still changing, from what their elders have known. These eager students are not data processing machines into which mere information is fed and then regurgitated; they are questioning, debating, impatient, ambitious, sometimes confused, always expectant, never wholly good, rarely really bad, sons and daughters of humankind, and heirs to whatever world we may leave them. This is a very large institution, and I am all the more proud of the living reality of its tradition of active, personalized concern for every individual member of its family, be he student, teacher, or staff member.

The most wonderful thing of all is that this is an intensely vital place: a place of teaching and learning, of searching and finding, of thinking and creating, of high challenge to youth, of profound stimulations and satisfactions for the scholar, the artist, the curious mind, the discriminating taste, and the imaginative spirit. We must keep it that way.

The university itself, though seemingly embodied in lovely acres and impressive buildings, is in truth far more spirit than stone, its beauty but a backdrop for its high endeavors. Dedicated to the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, it also has a deep sense of mission in the service of both society and of the individual human being. We must keep it that way.

It is even justifiable to say that the entire State, much of the Nation, and most of the world's continents contain parts of this great institution. I speak not just of our alumni, who are found throughout this State and all over the world, nor just of our students, who come from every county of the State, every State in the Nation, and 86 countries around the world, but also of our direct working relationships with many other institutions, in this State and this Nation, and in Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin America. In this, as in other ways, we are helping to fulfill that sense of mission of which I spoke. We must keep it that way.

Nearly half of our credit students are enrolled in places other than this Bloomington campus, mostly in our fine center for the schools of the health professions in Indianapolis and on our several regional campuses. Together with our sister institutions of higher learning, both private and public, we have provided for Indiana a system which places opportunity for education beyond high school within 25 miles of almost every boy, girl, and adult in the State of Indiana. We must work to strengthen all these institutions, and we shall continue to work with them, constructively and cooperatively, for the benefit of the entire State.

What else must we do, particularly we of Indiana University? The list of specific challenges is far too long to be compiled in this address, but I hope that mentioning a few will suggest many of the others.

WE MUST KEEP THE DOOR OPEN

First, we must keep the door of educational opportunity open. In the face of the great upcoming surges in college-age population, we must do every practical thing to insure the continuing vitality of the proposition that ability to learn, not ability to pay, is the key to that door. We must help our fellow citizens understand that the oncoming waves of young people seeking preparation for productive careers should be looked upon not as a problem, but as a blessing.

Second, we must insure that when a youth or an adult enters our door, he will find education of excellence, never of mediocrity. This means that our libraries, our laboratories, our facilities for study and growth, and above all our faculties, must be of the high quality needed to educate for tomorrow, for it is in the complex and demanding world of tomorrow that our students must live their lives and make their contributions. The competition for first-rate faculty nationwide is becoming so fierce that some institutions may not be able to obtain or retain them. Will our own institution be among these? I pray not. The numbers of bright, ambitious young people who will graduate from high school will increase so vastly and so rapidly, beginning in the middle of the very next biennium, that in some places many will find either closed doors or greatly diluted opportunity inside the doors. Will Indiana be among these? I pray not. Should we at any time be faced with resources inadequate to provide education of high quality to all young Hoosiers who are qualified and determined to pursue it here, then some must be turned away; for it is better truly to educate a few than to defraud many. But we must strive with great energy to prevent such a tragic choice from being forced upon us, for the future of all of us and of our children is bound up with the level and quality of education of our total citizenry.

Third, I would urgently add that we have a heavy obligation within the university to insure in every feasible way that the hard-earned tax dollars entrusted to us are so used as to get every last penny's worth of educational mileage out of every last dollar. This we have done and shall continue to do. Through imagination, ingenuity, sound planning, and determination we can even turn the necessities of doing larger tasks into stimulations for doing them better.

Fourth, we must insist that the university retain its leadership in the fields in which it is nationally distinguished. It cannot and will not try to be all things to all people, but it has special obligations in a number of fields in which its contributions to the State and to mankind have been and will be signal. Central among these, and basic to all cultural, technological and professional advancement, must always be the liberal arts and sciences. I was thrilled, as all of you must have been, last month when a graduate of this university received the Nobel Prize in the field in which he had studied here under a very distinguished faculty which itself includes a Nobel Prize winner. I was thrilled again earlier this month when one of our faculty, himself an alumnus, presided at the dedication of the world's largest solar telescope, a joint enterprise of the 10 leading universities in the field of astronomy, spanning the Nation from Harvard to Indiana to California. There have been other great moments in the life of this institution and there will be again if we keep our sights on the finest and best. It is worthy of mention now, I think, that we will soon be bringing to this campus the editorial officers of the Mississippi Valley Historical Review, probably the most distinguished periodical in the field of American history. Our distinction in linguistics and in languages, of which we regularly teach more than 20, and in international studies, is recognized worldwide. Few universities between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts have as many fellows of the National Academy of Sciences and the other great learned societies as do we. Indeed, several of our departments in the academic disciplines clearly rank among the Nation's best, and I am aware of none which is less than excellent.

These vital assets enable us to carry on our largest single function, undergraduate education, with both thoroughness and high standards, in a rich intellectual environment. They also enable us to provide graduate work of demonstrably superior quality. We must keep it that way.

There are two other major concerns of this university—one is professional training; the other is research.

Each of our many professional schools and divisions today is strong; some are among the Nation's leaders; one or two are probably unexcelled. Yet we are determined to

improve them all, for complacency is a dangerous enemy of excellence.

The general public is perhaps not fully aware of how important to its own well-being are the professional schools of their State university. Here are the sources of very substantial percentages of the State's physicians, dentists, nurses, lawyers, college teachers, librarians, schoolteachers, and administrators, business managers, scientists, coaches, journalists, artists, musicians, optometrists, medical technicians, public administrators, and others who play key roles in the service of the people. Most professional training is relatively expensive, but it is indispensible to the progress of our society.

Whether in the realms of the natural sciences, the fields of the literary, creative and performing arts, the study of the affairs of man and nations, or the development of competent and ethical practitioners of the learned professions, both the disciplines and the professions at Indiana, at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, are dedicated to objectivity and creativity, are uncompromising toward mediocrity, are hostile to extreme rigidities of thought. We must keep them that way.

The reference to rigidities of thought may profit from a further word. In the presence of such rigidities on both the extreme left and the extreme right, in a world of terrible tensions, the university's role must be to maintain its even-tempered but relentless search for truth. We shall not stifle, but shall promote, restless seeking and inquiring and debating, so long as it is honest. But we shall insist that there be an atmosphere of basic objectivity. We shall encourage intellectual excitement, but shall firmly suppress both physical violence and efforts to provoke it. We shall be intolerant only of intolerance, and of deceit.

ON THE IMPORTANCE OF RESEARCH

As to research, a symposium of several days' duration would be required to report on the university's accomplishments, activities, and aims, covering as they do a wide range, from seeking the causes and cures of cancer and heart disease to probing the secrets of the universe and of life itself, from the motivations of human behavior to ways of making responsible freedom more real to more people, from the management of great enterprises and the administration of justice and government to ways of making education itself more efficient and more fruitful.

There is a further point in this connection. From the basis of two vantage points I have been privileged to occupy in this single calendar year, I am convinced that the economic future of this State and region depends upon intensified efforts in several fields of research. If adequate investment is not made in this area, and in the highest development of our abundant native brainpower, the center of gravity of industrial productivity will move out of the Middle West to the two seacoasts, as it has already begun to do, and an economic wasteland could replace it.

Today, as we have noted, higher education is more directly and significantly involved in technological advancement and economic progress than ever before. Of even private universities is this true; and public universities have felt this responsibility keenly, and with ever-increasing benefits to us all, at least since the inception of the land-grant college movement whose centennial is celebrated this very year.

Both Indiana and Purdue are particularly alert to this challenge, and both stand ready to help. To Purdue's splendid new McClure Park will shortly be added at Indiana University a new Center for Industrial Applications of Aerospace Research, supported in part by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, in part by Indiana business firms, and in part by the Indiana University Foundation and the university itself. There are other contributions the university can and must make to its own economic base, without which the university itself cannot go forward.

All I have said thus far may help to explain my earlier statement that exceptional challenges are presented in this new era to the State of Indiana. Why "exceptional"? Almost every State faces the exceptional effects of the great population explosion which began throughout the country following World War II, and the resulting necessity of educating greatly increased numbers of youth; in this sense, Indiana is no exception, and Indiana University and her sister institutions of Indiana must play greatly expanded roles. Every university faces the exceptional effects of the explosive expansion of knowledge in recent years, and the cumulative, spiraling demands it places upon the functions of organizing, preserving, and transmitting this knowledge, seeking new applications for it, integrating its specialized fields, and, not least, adding to it. In this Indiana University is certainly no exception. But few States will feel quite as acutely as will Indiana the problems resulting from the explosive changes in technology, still only in their infancy. Like an automobile, they are capable of carrying us forward or of running over us. Here, the modern university can play an important, indeed an indispensable, though never an exclusive, role, particularly through research, carried forward vigorously and with the finest talent available.

Alas, there is no magic by which either the State or her colleges and universities can expect to meet these exceptional challenges without a substantial increase in the level of resources invested by the State in higher education. And this decade would be the worst possible time in the history of either our State or Nation for Hoosiers to turn away from the obvious and inevitable facts confronting us. May I bluntly restate just one of these facts, for emphasis? During the next biennium, there will be ten thousand more Hoosier boys and girls, fully qualified, seeking education at the four State colleges and universities of Indiana than during the current biennium—and the numbers will go on up from there, for the foreseeable future.

THE WAY TO A HAPPY ENDING

This part of our story can have a happy ending. Life sometimes, even often, calls for permanent sacrifices for the achievement of worthwhile goals. But not always. Education is one of those wonderful things which is purchased at a profit to the buyer, which only enriches the State which provides it, which returns infinitely more, even in dollars, than it is ever given, which, as in the moral of the parable of the talents, costs only those who will not invest. For Indiana, the needed investment may now appear large, but it will be both small and temporary compared to the enduring richness of the dividends.

In sum, my friends, we at Indiana University are a significant part of the great world of scholarship, and our first allegiance as an institution must always be to that world. Other agencies, other people, have other worthy missions, but ours needs no apology; it is basic to them all.

In the years ahead, if God be willing, we shall carry forward with all our strength the great work in which we are engaged, building upon the splendid foundations erected by our predecessors, striving for excellence in all we do, alert to the complex problems, deep conflicts, and tremendous challenges in the world around us, and keeping before us the vision of bringing light to our youth, knowledge to our people, progress to our State, strength to our Nation, and, hopefully, wisdom to ourselves and to our fellows.

## Remarks of Honorable Robert Moses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JAMES C. HEALEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am privileged to present the remarks of the Honorable Robert Moses at the opening ceremonies of the Alexander Hamilton Bridge, the George Washington Bridge Bus Station, and sections of the Cross-Bronx Expressway, on January 17, 1963.

This new bridge runs into my congressional district and the Cross-Bronx Expressway runs through the center of my district. Eventually this will be one of the most important links between New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut.

It was my privilege to participate in the ceremonies and to hear Mr. Moses' fine address, which follows:

REMARKS OF ROBERT MOSES AT THE OPENING OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON BRIDGE, GEORGE WASHINGTON BRIDGE BUS STATION, AND SECTIONS OF THE CROSS-BRONX EXPRESSWAY

Sloan Colt, your excellencies, Mr. Mayor and friends, these great metropolitan land and water crossings and incidental traffic facilities represent no happy impulse, no mere gleam in an official eye, no ambitious political and planning gestures. They are thrown open to the traveling public today as the result of much thought, conviction, and stubbornness in the face of misrepresentation, misunderstanding and other formidable obstacles.

As you ride next year over this roadway to the World's Fair at Flushing Meadow, the rock outcrop below grade on the Cross-Bronx Expressway, which we made into monolithic landscaping, will show no scars and will seem always to have been there. This is no gasoline gully, no elevated eyesore. As it sinks below and soars over the heart of the great city, this is metropolitan architecture in the finest sense.

Those who profess to believe such results are obtained within the conventional political framework, in a congested, highly critical community, by diplomacy, smoothness and clever avoidance of criticism and controversy, are never in evidence in the hours of trouble and conspicuous only after the event when success is acknowledged. In this, as in other similar contexts, the cost of prolonged delays has been enormous. I suppose we must charge it more or less cheerfully to the inherent expensiveness of the democratic process.

The remaining east and west crossings from Long Island through Manhattan and the Bronx, over and under the East River, Harlem and Hudson and across the Palisades to the Jersey meadows and beyond, will be increasingly difficult to realize as those in charge are thwarted, lampooned and libeled and without steady support. It is easy for demagogs to shout about bulldozer methods and indifference to the wishes of small people. If Government Smith were here, he would call the Lower Manhattan Elevated Expressway a Kathleen Mavourneen—"It may be for years, and it may be forever." On the other hand, like the maid in St. Matthew, it may not be dead, but sleepeth.

Nothing is easier than to drum up opposition to any major public work where the press leans to sensation, libel goes unpunished and officialdom worries about block votes and reprisals. In these rhu-

barbs the less durable characters are broken like old matches. Only the tough survive. Over and over again I have seen dead projects miraculously revived, minority opposition disappear and early opponents admit to being ashamed of their initial bitter denunciations.

Without a lower Manhattan elevated expressway, bridge and tunnel congestion will be appalling. If there is no midtown Manhattan elevated expressway, the essential third tube of the Queens Midtown Tunnel and its maze of Queens arterial approaches will be impossible to finance. With all due respect to the elected officials who suffer most from the pressures of vociferous minorities, time will tell them how shortsighted the opposition to these links in the great metropolitan chain has been. Is there a sane economist who proposes to curtail the production of motorcars? If there are more cars, there must be roads for them to run on, and in building these roads, through traffic must be separated from the local street pattern.

This building of public works to meet the challenges of urban growth is a fascinating and baffling business, and the number of those willing to take it on grows less. Nobody can clear the way for these swaths, which lift and depress expressways above and below the local streets and over and under rivers, without moving people and business, and it can't be done with mirrors, by sleight of hand or by magic. The task is for those more concerned with ultimate respect than with immediate popularity.

Perhaps this is why, in addition to any energy we may still possess, those of us who have been in the game a long time and want nothing further, have something to offer. Wise men were living before us. We have invented little. At most, we have supplied the guts and elbow grease to build what others previously urged but lacked the gumption, support and luck to achieve.

If it were not for the big authorities with their relative independence and private financing, the task would be hopeless, but the authorities are not automatic, electronic business machines. They perform no miracles without men. The port authority came into its own slowly. Triborough was a paper organization for a decade and the power authority was dormant for 24 years before anything significant happened.

Some of us who have been called upon by the heads of the State and city governments to establish new or rescue and revitalize sluggish or dying authorities, have accepted the task as a public duty, without expectation of plaudits. The success of agencies like the Port of New York Authority, the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority, and the Power Authority of New York is evidenced upon the sound reputation and rating of their bonds and the confidence imposed in them by banks, bankers, and prudent investors. If this confidence is undermined, the authorities will soon decline, and this ingenious device, combining government, business, and private financing, will no longer have merit or validity.

We of the Triborough have been most happy in our close association with the Port of New York Authority, and I can speak also as the link which cements the authorities with the city, Federal, and State arterial program. Many public agencies, private corporations, engineers, and technicians have joined the building trades and the makers of steel and other materials in this notable example of cooperation.

Much remains to be done to finish the metropolitan arterial complex, and the end is not in sight. Mayor LaGuardia's pet slogan was "patience and fortitude." It is as good a motto as any, but there is today less time for patience and more demand for fortitude. If the distinguished officials who speak here today will give us the tools and the backing before it is too late, we can finish the job.

We have traversed in good company the spine of Manhattan. We have met rocks, rivers, and resistance of modern redskins. The whole island of Manhattan cost only $24. Maybe in time this arterial expenditure too will be considered a bargain. In any event, the job has had its enduring satisfactions, and that's all there is to public work.

## The REA Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the Rural Electrification Administration, which has provided through the years one of the greatest benefits to the rural citizens of our Nation, has again come under attack from one of our Nation's large newspaper chains.

On the same day that the REA was being taken to task for providing long-term loans to assist many rural areas in our country in obtaining electricity and in improving their electrical service, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman was addressing the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association Convention in Nevada on the service that REA has provided the Nation.

Secretary Freeman pointed out the very valuable assistance the REA has provided our farm citizens through the years and particularly some of the more important achievements of the last 2 years.

The Secretary points out that in order to serve the sparsely populated rural areas rather than the high-density urban areas it is necessary to provide the REA cooperatives with low-interest-rate financing and that through this type of financing REA cooperatives have provided a great benefit to our Nation's farmers and residents of rural areas.

He states as one example that REA cooperatives have built 1.4 million miles of electric lines in order to serve 4.8 million rural customers. This means that the REA cooperatives serve 3.3 customers per mile and the average urban-based utility has 32.2 customers per mile. Thus, it is much less profitable to serve the areas covered by REA cooperatives than by the urban-based utilities. Therefore, a low interest rate for REA loans is both justifiable and needed.

Mr. Speaker, the Secretary points out other important services of the REA in his very interesting and informative speech.

Under unanimous consent, I include the remarks of Secretary Freeman in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN BEFORE THE NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION CONVENTION, LAS VEGAS, NEV., JANUARY 14, 1963

I welcome this opportunity to speak to the 21st annual meeting of your association for several reasons:

First, it is a good time to review the progress of the last 2 years, progress in rural America, in agriculture, and specifically, progress by the Rural Electrification Administration.

Second, it gives me an opportunity to take a close look with you at some of the policies which guide REA, to reexamine their validity in this time of change.

Third, I want to discuss the need to apply more broadly the local leadership tradition which REA cooperatives have developed to such a significant degree.

As 2 years of the Kennedy administration draw to a close, it is appropriate to bring to farmers and city people a report of the highlights of the activities of the Department of Agriculture.

Since 1960, through actions by the Administrator and by the Congress, we have seen:

An increase in gross farm income of $2 billion in 1961 and $2.5 billion in 1962, as compared to 1960. Net farm income in both years averaged $1.1 billion higher than in 1960.

Grain surpluses have been reduced 700 million bushels, and taxpayer costs will be down some $300 million this year as a result. With continued progress over the next 2 years, we can see the end of feed grain surpluses in 1964. The end of wheat surpluses is in sight, if favorable action is taken this spring by wheat farmers in the referendum for the 1964 crop.

With a favorable vote, wheat farm income can be maintained at the favorable 1960–62 level, and the wheat surplus can be scaled down to near an adequate level in about 3 years. If the referendum fails, the surplus will remain and wheat income will decine sharply, as wheat prices fall from $2 to $1. per bushel. The effects will be disastrous to farm and city and to foreign markets alike.

While these advances in agriculture have been taking place, the cost of food has remained stable, increasing about as much as the overall cost of living.

Today we are sharing our food abundance more widely at home and abroad, thus fulfilling our moral responsibility to those who do not have enough. In March 1962, as many as 7.4 million persons in needy families in this country shared in our food supplies through the direct distribution program compared with 4.1 million in March 1960. The food stamp program launched by direction of the President is being expanded to 48 areas, and has become one of our most successful programs. The food-for-peace program during, fiscal 1962 moved a record volume of $1.6 billion worth of food and fiber overseas to feed needy, hungry people. Food and fiber is becoming an increasingly vital tool in our programs to stimulate the progress of developing countries all over the world.

We have launched a massive, all-out effort to infuse new economic vitality in rural areas through the redirection of old programs and the creation of new programs in rural areas development, a subject I will have more to say about shortly.

Now these are just a few of the accomplishments of 2 years, all of them together represent only the beginning of our effort to meet the task ahead in agriculture and rural America. But I am proud of the start we have made.

I am proud, too, of what we have done in REA where, as you are well aware, there is much progress to report.

Last year the President requested and the Congress authorized an increase in REA loan funds to permit the financing of additional generation and transmission facilities. For fiscal year 1963, $400 million was authorized for the REA loan program, including $100 million for a contingency fund. This made a record $250 million available for generation and transmission loans. By comparison, 1960 authorizations were $161 million, and

only $89 million was loaned for G. & T. purposes.

Since January 1961, REA has approved 28 loans to borrowers seeking new or additional sources of power. Seven of these loans represented new starts. Overall, these 28 loans will mean a 10-year saving of more than $47 million as compared with the power supply arrangement available to the borrowers at the time their loan was approved.

An equally significant measure of progress in REA is the recognition by the President of those policies which are essential to the vitality of the REA idea, to the integrity of the rural electric cooperative.

Let me be more specific.

This administration supports the 2-percent interest rate. This is not a recent or a capricious decision. It is based on a careful analysis of conditions inherent in the job you are trying to do. There are vast differences between the conditions under which you operate and the conditions which prevail on the city-based utility systems.

Some of the special handicaps you face in providing areawide service which will permit your consumers to use power fully and efficiently bear repeating. They are not generally known, and need to be emphasized. I want to take this occasion to set them down clearly and carefully.

Low density: In order to serve 4.8 million rural consumers, the REA cooperatives have built 1.4 million miles of line. It means that you have 3.3 customers per mile. The average urban-based utility has 32.3.

Lack of diversity: Where farms in a particular area are of the same type, and this is usually the case, power needs tend to be heavy during certain periods of the day, and often negligible in the rest. REA systems, with few small commercial or large powerloads to provide diversity, must make proportionately greater investments in facilities used only a few hours a day. Interest charges are based on a 24-hour day.

Low revenues: Low density and lack of diversity keep revenues low. In 1960, for example, when commercial utilities reported revenues of $6,580 per mile, REA-financed systems had average revenues of $414 per mile. On a per customer basis, your revenues averaged $127, or a little more than half the $204 reported by commercial utilities.

Low load factor: Whether you generate power or buy it, low density and lack of diversity work to increase REA co-op power costs. This is true because the capacity and the facilities you build for certain peak loads, a necessity, are used on an average of only 50 to 60 percent of the time.

Isolated systems: REA co-ops have undertaken to serve the remote and out-of-way pockets in America. Here in the West, for example, you have mountains, deserts, and large forest areas which create special problems. These and other factors have kept many systems small and separated from other REA borrowers. Low interest rates enable such borrowers to perform the services expected from rural systems.

Yet, despite these handicaps, rural electric cooperatives have made an outstanding record in repayment of their loans. Last year, repayments passed the billion-dollar mark, representing 29 percent of the funds advanced. Only two electric borrowers are behind in their payments and these total only $140,000.

Another policy of great importance is the increased emphasis on generation and transmission loans. We propose to continue this emphasis.

During the past 2 years, G. & T. loans have accounted for about 57 percent of all approved loans. Each was in response to a demonstrated need for lower cost power, the low-cost kilowatt that permits your consumer-owned systems to get on with their essential job in rural areas.

This policy which has made possible the expansion of the REA co-ops as their task has grown is also designed to meet two other particular needs, to enable you to take advantage of new technology, and to help preserve your territorial integrity.

It is essential that the REA-financed generating stations, which account for less that 1 percent of the Nation's total electric power capacity, be geared to the technological advances within the electric power industry.

In the last 2 years, this new emphasis on G. & T. loans has been applied by rural systems to take practical advantage of savings in power pooling, system interconnections, large-scale generating units, and in the location of plants adjacent to sources of low-cost fuels.

The use of G. & T. loans to block raids by private power companies seeking the historic area of rural electric co-ops is new. Where such situations arise in the future, G. & T. loans will be approved.

This criterion has been used only once. It was in an area where a supplier, who was serving several distribution co-ops at wholesale, insisted that he be able to go into their territory and pick off retail consumers as he chose. This demand posed a distinct threat to the service capabilities, and to the existence, of the cooperatives.

I hope raids on REA territory will stop. But as many rural electric cooperatives build their power volume, this problem remains a very real threat. It must be recognized that the expansion of urban areas into the surrounding rural countryside provides a particularly inviting target to raid.

It is possible, therefore, that more G. & T. loans will be made to strengthen REA co-ops in the immedate months and years ahead. In the long run, however, I hope and I believe raids will cease as the more moderate leaders in the private power field prevail.

When that day comes, real cooperation between all commercial and cooperative power systems, with the resulting maximum use of all systems, will mean increased benefits to all users.

I repeat, it is not asking too much to recognize that the service areas you have developed are rightfully your own, and that the consumers within them, new and old, are rightfully your consumers.

On review, then, I believe these past 2 years have shown that the pledge which President Kennedy made in 1960 in Billings, Mont., has been kept. He said that his administration would: "Restore REA to its former role of preeminence, freeing it from constant concern over political interference, higher interest rates and budgetary starvation, and enabling that remarkable American institution to get on with its work of providing low cost electricity and telephones for every American farm family."

For my part, the contribution which rural electric cooperatives have made to my own State of Minnesota, to its farm families, has long ago earned them my dedicated support.

I have worked on farms before, and after, REA. To me, REA is more than a concept, it is the difference between a kerosene lamp and an electric light; between a hand-cranked cream separator and one driven by an electric motor; between a refrigerator and an icebox with an overflowing pan of water; between milking by hand and by machine; between an electric clothes washer and the old type of washer I pumped back and forth when I was a boy.

Each of you can be extremely proud of the accomplishment you have made in electrifying rural America, in meeting a challenge which many people considered beyond hope. I salute you for progress. At the same time I challenge you as we look to the future.

If one reason had to be selected as to why the REA idea has achieved its great success, I would give the credit to the unique pattern of local leadership which you have developed.

Perhaps other factors, such as effective Government assistance and a helpful attitude from local, State and Federal governments, have been important—but the quality and leadership of REA people have been the determining factor.

And this brings me to the third point I made in my opening remarks, there is a very real need to apply your local leadership pattern to a new program, to use your skill for a task greater than REA, a task which encompasses all rural America, and for which you are only beginning to mobilize your talents and resources.

That task is to wipe out the causes of rural poverty.

Let me briefly describe the nature of this new challenge.

First, there is more poverty in rural America today than in all the urban sector combined. More than 15 million Americans in rural areas live under poverty conditions by our standards today. Of the 8 million families in this country today who earn less than $2,500 annually, some 4.1 million live in rural America. In other words, rural areas account for only a third of our population but for over half the poverty.

Second, the commodity programs which have monopolized public attention for so long will, at best, even when full parity income is attained, provide adequate incomes for less than half of those who now live on farms.

Strangely, much of this poverty has come in the wake of astonishing advances in farm technology and production. It underscores the fact that an expanding rural economy necessary to combat this problem cannot be achieved by conventional commodity programs alone.

In fact, I believe that farm programs as we are familiar with them will at best be able to do only half the job that must be done.

This, then, is a real challenge. It is a challenge that I am confident we can meet. But nothing less than a massive counterattack combining the resources of both government and local people will do the job and reverse the downward spiral in which rural America finds itself today.

Such a counterattack has been launched through a dynamic new action program. Most of you have heard something about this program called Rural Areas Development—or RAD, for short.

The RAD program is a blending and coordination of all available resources of the Department—conservation, credit, forestry, recreation, industrial development, education and other public services—into a long-range effort to erase the blight of rural poverty.

A very important responsibility in this program has been assumed by the leadership of the cooperative movement, and your REA co-ops, in particular, have much to contribute. As you know, your dynamic and driving general manager, Clyde Ellis, recognized the importance of this program very early, and has been a strong force in it for effective action.

As a result, the REA has been assigned primary responsibility for developing industrial and commercial projects under the area redevelopment program, and other programs, as well.

You already have some experience in this task through the use of consumer facility loans authorized in section 5 of the REA legislation. Under this section, some of you have assisted industries and businesses in your areas with the financing of electrical equipment and plumbing. Using these funds only when financing is not available on reasonable terms from any other source, public or private, you have made possible new job opportunities that could not otherwise have been created. Since July 1961, you have used these funds 14 times and for only a little over a million dollars, but the avail-

ability of section 5 loans has made much else possible.

In helping the local community within your territory to increase jobs, and expand the benefits of economic growth, you also are increasing your own business. It is a natural combination, and fulfills the basic aim of REA to bring progress to rural America in many forms.

However, REA leadership in stimulating community development is not always tied to a direct REA power benefit. The manager of a local electric cooperative in Pennsylvania, for example, has led the drive in his community to get four new industries, and each buys power from a private power supplier.

The manager maintains, and correctly so, that both the private and cooperative power suppliers are benefiting, the co-op from new consumers who live in its territory. But most importantly, the community, the people, will benefit from new opportunities.

I am encouraged to see the dedication and energy which local REA co-ops are giving to the RAD program. Reports from about one-third of the REA borrowers indicate that since July 1961 they have helped to launch 400 industrial and commercial projects. It is anticipated that they will directly create 30,000 new jobs, and indirectly, another 22,000. When reports are in from all co-ops, undoubtedly these figures will be higher.

More than one-fourth of these new enterprises involve processing and marketing of farm and wood products, which mean additional outlets for farm and forest products as well as new jobs for rural citizens. This is a real "double shot" in the arm.

It is also important to note that in these newly launched projects, Government financing is playing a "seed capital" role by stimulating the investment of much larger sums by private and local sources. The REA figures indicate that the 400 projects are being financed by more than $250 million of private capital compared with about $15 million from Federal Government sources.

These projects are scattered throughout the country. They include a lumber project in Idaho, a furniture factory in Kentucky, a commercial recreation enterprise in Illinois, a packing plant in Nebraska, and a chipping plant in Mississippi. In addition, the 600 REA borrowers report they have assisted their communities in launching a number of public facilities, hospitals, water systems and sewerage systems.

Thus, we have, with your assistance, made a good start with the RAD program, but it is only the beginning, for we have only scratched the surface of the need in rural America.

A good start means that rural electric cooperatives will have more and more to do as rural America responds to the challenge of the sixties, as it moves positively forward once again. And as these things take place, demands for power will expand rapidly.

Presently your members are doubling their power needs every 7 to 10 years. Today, the power requirements of your systems are about 37 billion kilowatt-hours. By 1970, those requirements will soar to 68.6 billion (or more) and by 1985 to almost 200 billion (or more).

President Kennedy has said that power is the key to this century, power on the farms and in rural areas as well as in the cities. At Oahe project in South Dakota last summer he said: "The role of the REA is not finished, as some would believe. To be sure, most farms now have electric lights. Most REA cooperatives and power districts are well established. But we are rapidly approaching the time when this Nation will boast a 300 million population, a $2 trillion national income, and a grave responsibility as the breadbasket and food producer for a world whose population will have doubled. That is the prospect for the end of this century, and the key to this century is power, on the farm, in the factory, in the country as well as the city."

The role of the REA is not finished, it is only beginning.

This, I submit, is sound policy and one that will serve the Nation well. Let us, working together, militantly carry it forward.

## It's Only Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, we have seen a great many comments about the administration's proposals to increase spending by several billions of dollars and to reduce Government income by several billions at the same time. Perhaps few of these comments are as much to the point as the following editorial taken from the January 29 issue of the Washington Daily News:

IT'S ONLY MONEY

Sly adulteration and debasement of money probably started with the first coinage. The names of Polycrates of Samos (500 B.C.) and Dionysius of Syracuse (400 B.C.) are associated with the great monetary frauds of antiquity.

Besides setting fire to Rome, Nero reduced the precious metal content of the coinage by 10 percent and pocketed the difference. Henry VIII of England is remembered for his many wives. He also issued a silver-plated shilling, bearing his likeness. When the plating wore off, starting with his most prominent feature, he was known as Old Coppernose.

All this was done in the dark of night. During the Middle Ages the penalty for doctoring the coinage was to have the head held under in a kettle of boiling water. After Hastings, William the Conqueror decreed mutilation, such as having the ears cut off, for anyone caught fooling with the coinage.

As we note, this practice was frowned upon into modern times. It took John Maynard Keynes, in the depression years of the 1930's, to figure out that legal counterfeiting not only was respectable, it actually would help the economy. Lord Keynes probably never intended to go that far but such, in effect, is the deduction of his disciples who are as thick as hors d'oeuvres around Washington.

Since, between Nero and Keynes, paper money had been invented, probably by Kublai Khan or his mandarins, procedures were simplified. It no longer was necessary to melt up the silver and gold, adding copper or other inexpensive metal in the reissue. The printing presses merely could be turned loose to print unlimited quantities of certificates that at least looked like money.

That, in substance, is what we've been doing in the United States for a generation. The sum of this production is tabulated in a major part of the public debt, now $305 billion in round numbers.

But just as the Romans found the new denarius wouldn't buy as much as the old one, Americans have found the new dollar has lost its punch. At last acocunting it had declined in purchasing power to 46 cents as compared to what it would buy just less than 25 years ago.

And the tax cut—spending program thought up by the disciples of Keynes to get the economy moving again involves more of the same—a great deal more.

In the administration plan it is contemplated that at the end of the 3-year program, $8.5 billion a year in personal tax-cut money will be pumped into the economy. Every dime of this, and more besides, will be borrowed money—which is just another way of saying it will be printing press money. The deficit for next year alone is very conservatively estimated at just under $12 billion and even Treasury Secretary Dillon can't look ahead to the year in which the budget may be balanced.

This trick practically is guaranteed to bring a quick flush to the economy. But over the long haul it never has worked in the whole history of money finagling—and never will, except as a means of siphoning away the savings of the people. It is within the power of the Government to call 50 cents a dollar but no government ever has been able to make it buy more than half a dollar's worth.

But they never quit trying.

## Part 5: Let's Keep the Record Straight—A Selected Chronology of Cuba and Castro—September 13–October 14, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, part 5 of my chronology of Cuba and Castro begins with a series of newspaper quotes on our U.S. policy for dealing with Cuba.

While the Monroe Doctrine and its application to the present situation was endlessly debated by our newspapers, our columnists, commentators, and newspapers in other countries—our Congress stubbornly went ahead adopting resolutions upholding the right of the United States to invoke the Monroe Doctrine, protect our country, and protect the entire hemisphere against an extension of the Marxist-Leninist Cuban Government.

Because of the reluctance of our NATO allies to cease shipments of materials and goods to Cuba which would be detrimental to the interests of this hemisphere, the House of Representatives boldly included amendments to our foreign aid appropriations bill which would cutoff aid to any country that permitted its ships to transport goods to Cuba. This perhaps was not what we might call a diplomatic approach but it certainly was a practical approach to the problem. It underlined the psychological approach of appealing to self-interest when the idealistic approach failed.

And on September 21, 1962, Adlai E. Stevenson admitted in the United Nations, in answering Soviet threats, that it was officially known that the U.S.S.R. was stuffing Cuba with planes, rockets, and other arms.

It began to be clear to all who followed the situation that some of our news columnists were about to find themselves

with "egg on their face," because of their weighty—and in some cases—frightened pronouncements on what we as a Nation should do or what we could not do.

A SELECTED CHRONOLOGY ON CUBA AND CASTRO—PART 5

September 13, 1962: U.S. policy for dealing with Cuba: "If necessary we can take care of Cuba; and if the necessity is obvious, the Russians, despite what they now say, will acquiesce. They do not have any greater desire to fight a nuclear war over Cuba than we do. Force might some day prove the lesser of two evils for us; but it could never provide a solution for the Cuban problem" (New York Times, Sept. 12, 1962). "The only plausible employment for [the Russians] in Cuba * * * is to do more or less exactly what the Americans are doing in South Vietnam; that is, to train the local army to fight a more advanced kind of war . . . the defense of Cuba against another invasion. Whether [the Russians] are troops or technicians is at bottom immaterial . . . in the sense that the Americans cannot very well assert the right to intervene, whatever the Russians are. Doubtless, in a perfectly ordered world, the Monroe Doctrine would require the removal of these alien intruders. But in the imperfect real world, where the Americans keep troops along the border of the Communist block (in one case, within it; remember Berlin), and claim an unhindered right of access to these outposts, it is going to be awkward, to say the least, to expel or blockade the Russians in Cuba. Mr. Khrushchev has made the neatest of moves in the international chess game; take my pawn in Cuba, he says, and you risk your castle in South Vietnam—or your Berlin queen. If Dr. Castro is one day replaced by a democratic government, it will not be as a result of the one threat against which Russian advisers can give his army any real help—a regular invasion, a la D-day, from over the sea. The United States learned its Cuban lesson in April last year. The United States can perhaps help to organize and supply a rebellion, as the Communists do elsewhere; it cannot import a rebellion, prepackaged. Given enough time, and enough rope, the Cuban regime may yet produce the internal disaffection that will be its downfall. If [Dr. Castro's] support in the countryside begins to fade, one of the conditions of a successful revolt against him will have been established. And if the test ever came, it would be far harder for the Russians to keep an unpopular government in office in Cuba than it is for the Americans to do a similar job in other parts of the world which are better left unnamed. Mr. Khrushchev has no 6th or 7th Fleet to keep his supply lines open. If things go the way the United States hopes—if discontent grows inside Cuba—any further investment in Dr. Castro is going to look very risky indeed to Moscow. Patience, not a choleric lunge, is the Americans' best policy" (Economist, London, Sept. 8, 1962).

"In the hemisphere, in the United Nations, with the uncommitted nations, the reaction [to a U.S. invasion of Cuba] would be most unfavorable for us" (New York Times, Sept. 14, 1962). "The United States is, of course, able easily to blockade Cuba. But stopping ships under threat of seizure or sinking would be an act of war not only against Cuba but against the Soviet Union. The invasion of Cuba would, of course, be an act of war against Cuba. But what we could not be sure of doing is to prevent the retaliatory moves to which we would have laid ourselves wide open, moves against Berlin or against Turkey, or against Iran. For we would have acted on the rule that a possible threat against our security or our interests justifies us in going to war. We would be saying that because Cuba is in the grip of an unfriendly European power, we have a right to blockade or occupy the island; we would be saying too that the Soviet Union has no such right to act against the American military positions in Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, right on her own frontier. Let us not fool ourselves. Such an argument does not wash. It would be rejected, probably even laughed at, not only by all neutrals but by powerful elements among our closest allies. We could go to war if Castro injures us. But we cannot go to war, even against Castro, because of what he may do in the future. We cannot wage a preventive war against Castro without establishing the rule that a preventive war is legitimate against our military position in Berlin, Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, Thailand, South Vietnam, Formosa, Okinawa, South Korea, and Japan" (Walter Lippmann, in the New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 18, 1962). "Cuba has made Mr. Kennedy look like a man with not one, but two, Achilles heels [Berlin and Cuba]. Americans are suffering from the all too familiar affliction of frustration. They think that they were ineffectual in dealing with the Berlin wall and they fear that the administration is going to be ineffectual again in dealing with Cuba * * * acknowledging that an armed invasion of Cuba would mean the deaths of thousands of Cubans, of an untold number of Americans. Not totally precluded are landings by anti-Castro Cubans, avoidance, this time, of a Bay of Pigs disaster and the start of serious guerrilla warfare. Almost everyone is perfectly aware of the dangers of Cuba becoming the scene of another Spanish civil war, in which Russians as well as Cubans would no doubt kill and be killed.

"Perhaps the chief restraining factor on bitter American impatience is that action by the United States against Cuba, including a naval blockade, might tempt Mr. Khrushchev to snap shut the trap in which Berlin finds itself. Yet the administration's own view of the world remains essentially unaltered. It is still thought that Mr. Khrushchev will not in fact risk a third and final world war over Berlin; that, whatever happens there, he still has his own difficulties and that one of them is that his own country is changing, on the whole for the better; and that an eventual easement of tensions through disarmament and bans on nuclear tests is in Russia's interest as well as the West's. Recent events suggest, however, that Mr. Khrushchev, having grasped the fact that general war has become impossible, is tempted as a result to be more rather than less provocative" (Economist, London, Sept. 15, 1962).

On the same day, U.S. Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, declares that "the American people will not be satisfied with President Kennedy's reiteration of a do-nothing policy toward Cuba."

September 15, 1962: Press reports state that the U.S. Government has had little success in persuading its Allies to withhold ships being chartered to carry Soviet supplies to Cuba. The Governments of Britain, West Germany and Norway are reported to have begun inquiries among their shipowners, but these are regarded as polite responses to U.S. diplomatic pressure, and center on the question whether Allied ships are carrying arms among their cargo to Cuba. U.S. officials have pointed out to these Governments that the use of Allied ships for ordinary goods releases Communist-bloc shipping for arms deliveries to Cuba.

September 17, 1962: U.S. Secretary of State Rusk briefs members of the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Forces Committees at a joint closed door session. "Rusk took pains to assert a direct relationship between events in Cuba and Berlin, particularly in the next 3 months. * * * It is widely assumed [in Washington] that the Russians will make the big push in Berlin before the first of the year, but after the November 6 elections [in the United States].

September 18, 1962: Former U.S. Vice President Richard Nixon urges President Kennedy to take stronger action on Cuba and suggests a program including a naval blockade of the island and the obtaining of commitments from U.S. allies that their vessels will not be used by the Soviet Union for shipments to Cuba. He concedes that the risks of nuclear war are raised by a blockade, but asserts that "the risks of inaction are far greater." He adds that immediate action is needed to "revitalize" the Monroe Doctrine.

The present state of the Monroe Doctrine in relation to Cuba: "The policy of the United States in the Western Hemisphere is guided by two main considerations: its own national security and the peace and security of its hemispheric neighbors. On the one hand, the United States has the tradition of the Monroe Doctrine, enunciated more than a century ago as a warning to European powers that the United States would move against intrusions into the hemisphere. On the other, the United States is pledged, under the Rio Treaty of 1948 which formed the OAS, and under the U.N. Charter, to abstain from unilateral military action. The United States, nevertheless, has affirmed that it would take whatever steps are necessary to move, unilaterally if necessary, against a clear and present threat to its security and that of its allies in Latin America. * * * There is a vocal body of opinion that the Russian shipments of arms to Cuba is a clear threat to U.S. security and therefore a violation of the Monroe Doctrine demanding immediate action. This opinion holds that the Cuban buildup, in effect, constitutes the establishment of a military base by Russia in the Western Hemisphere" (New York Times, Sept. 16, 1962).

"The Monroe Doctrine has been modified to apply only to situations which directly endanger the security of the United States; 'The United States will consider any attempt by European powers to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety.' * * * Soviet Russia has made this extension in Cuba, and is amplifying the activity. But President Kennedy has evaluated it thus far as not endangering our peace and safety, thereby narrowing the original scope of the Monroe Doctrine. The fact is clear. But the only administration spokesman who has publicly conceded it is Senator HUMPHREY" (Arthur Krock, in the New York Times, Sept. 18, 1962). "It is true, of course, that the Soviet lodgment in Cuba is a gross violation of the Monroe Doctrine. Yet we cannot invoke the Monroe Doctrine. Why not? The crucial point is that the American claim for the isolation of the Western Hemisphere was coupled with a renunciation of American interest in the Eastern Hemisphere: 'In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do.' * * * This basis of the Monroe Doctrine disappeared in the 20th century, in the two World Wars, the Korean war and the cold war. We cannot invoke the Monroe Doctrine without meeting the question of what we are doing all over Europe and Asia. Our right to put Cuba under surveillance, and if necessary to blockade an invader, rests not on the Monroe Doctrine but on the elementary right of a people to insure its own security. * * * This right can, however, be exercised only when there is a clear and present danger. Castro is an insulting nuisance but he is not, and is not now remotely capable of becoming a clear and present danger to the United States. So we must practice watchful waiting, and hold ourselves in readiness, never for a moment forgetting the vastly greater dangers elsewhere" (Walter Lippmann, in the New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 18, 1962).

On the same day the U.S. State Department announces that an informal, private meeting of American Foreign Ministers will take place in Washington on October 2 to review the Soviet military buildup in Cuba and possible steps for dealing with the whole Cuban problem.

September 20, 1962: U.S. Senate adopts by 86 to 1 a resolution stating that the United States is determined to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending by force or threat of force its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere; to prevent in Cuba the creation or use of an externally supported military capability endangering the security of the United States.

On the same day, the U.S. House approves the foreign-aid appropriation bill, including three amendments intended to cut off aid to any country permitting the use of its merchant ships to transport arms or goods of any kind to Cuba.

The House approved the foreign aid appropriation bill without restoring any of the $1,124 million urged by President Kennedy. By a 249-to-144 vote, the measure was sent to the Senate after the Democratic leadership decided not to risk deeper cuts in a floor fight. In earlier voice votes, the House shouted its approval of three amendments to cut off aid to any country that permits its ships to transport goods to Cuba (New York Times, Sept. 20, 1962).

A resolution endorsing the use of arms, if necessary, to prevent Cuban aggression or subversion in the Western Hemisphere was adopted by the Senate, 86 to 1, after 3 hours of debate (New York Times, Sept. 20, 1962).

September 21, 1962: The Soviet Union issued a new warning that any U.S. attack on Cuba would precipitate a nuclear war. The threat was made by Foreign Minister Gromyko in a tough and uncompromising policy statement to the United Nations General Assembly. Adlai E. Stevenson replied that the threat to peace came from the Soviet Union, which is "stuffing Cuba" with planes, rockets, and other arms.

September 24, 1962: Secretary of State Rusk met yesterday with the Norwegian Foreign Minister, Halvard M. Lange, in an effort to win cooperation in blocking shipments of strategic goods to Cuba. They conferred in New York where Mr. Rusk has been making similar appeals to other allied diplomats. Italy and West Germany were said to be responding more favorably than Britain and Scandinavia.

September 25, 1962: Russian trawlers will operate out of Cuba under a plan disclosed by Premier Castro in a television speech. He said the two nations would build a port somewhere on Cuba's coast for a joint Atlantic fishing fleet.

September 26, 1962: The House of Representatives completed congressional action on a declaration of the U.S. determination to oppose with force, if necessary, Communist aggression or subversion based in Cuba. The House approved the joint resolution as anger and concern mounted in Washington over Moscow's plans to help build a port in Cuba for Soviet fishing trawlers. Moscow portrayed the project as a routine agreement for aid to the Castro regime.

Ways to guard against Cuban-based aggression and subversion were discussed in New York by Secretary of State Rusk and foreign ministers of the Latin-American nations. One proposal is the establishment of a Caribbean military organization.

September 29, 1962: Cuba stands in greater danger of attack, Premier Fidel Castro asserts, because U.S. politicians facing November elections are "trying to push the country toward aggression."

In a television address last night, Premier Castro said that in the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate "there is a competition to see who can shout most. It doesn't matter to them that they play with the destiny of the world and play with war."

He said armed intervention in Cuba could lead to World War III.

"We know the Soviet forces are with us," Dr. Castro declared. "If the imperialists think the Soviet Government's words are merely words, they are wrong."

September 30, 1962: At a White House luncheon, the President and Britain's Foreign Secretary discussed ways to contain further Communist expansion and subversion in the Caribbean. A joint communique suggested that Britain might have changed her policy of regarding the Cuban problem as a matter of concern only to Washington.

October 1, 1962: OAS meets today to discuss Cuban crisis.

October 2, 1962: Behind closed doors at the State Department, Secretary of State Rusk assured Latin America's foreign ministers that the United States was prepared to give the necessary leadership to efforts to defeat Communist inroads in this hemisphere.

October 4, 1962: A U.S. program to penalize all shipowners who transport Soviet-bloc supplies to Cuba will be even tougher than expected. The four-point program, to be started within 2 week, will threaten foreign shipowners with the loss of all U.S. Government-owned or financed cargo if even one of their vessels engages in such trade.

October 8, 1962: Amid the applause of some delegates and the cries of hecklers, Cuban President Dorticos urged the United Nations yesterday to condemn the American "naval blockade" of his country. Gripping the rostrum, the bespectacled President had to shout his speech to the General Assembly. He was interrupted 4 times by hostile demonstrators in the visitors' gallery and about 12 times by applause, mainly from the Soviet bloc.

Havana sources predicted that the release of 1,113 captives held since last year's abortive invasion would be announced soon after final talks today between Premier Castro and James B. Donovan. In a move against Cuban trade, leaders of the International Longshoresmen's Association planned to ask their men not to load cargoes to or from the Soviet Union and to boycott all lines servicing Cuba.

October 9, 1962: On Cuba, Secretary of State Rusk vowed U.S. aid for Cuban development if Communist rule is ended there, but he said the big issue now was Communist use of Cuba as a military and subversive base. Meanwhile, Washington said the release of anti-Castro Cubans seized in last year's invasion attempt still was not set. In Havana, however, James B. Donovan, who is negotiating for the prisoners' release, was optimistic about an early agreement.

October 10, 1962: A Cuban exile group—Alpha 66—announced that its members made a successful raid Monday on the Cuban port city of Isabela de Sagua. The exiles said that a commando group of 15 to 25 men had killed about 20 defenders, including Russians.

October 12, 1962: Britain has discussed with the United States a threat by a Cuban exile group, Alpha 66, to attack all merchant ships carrying supplies to Cuba. A carefully worded statement by a Foreign Office spokesman avoided saying that any complaint had been made. Washington indicated it was not yet ready to act against the exiles.

October 14, 1962: Responding to a radio message, the Coast Guard picked up two wounded crew members of a Cuban patrol boat and flew them to a Miami hospital. The Cubans were shot when their craft was sunk by a raiding vessel manned by exiles off the Cuban coast.

## Women Play a Good Part in Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, my quarter century of service in this House has gained for me, so I am told, a reputation of being rather tight-fisted with the people's money. I own up to the charge.

However, one place where I am quite generously disposed to spend tax dollars is in the field of soil conservation. I am even willing to support amounts in excess of budget figures for this important work.

No undedicated person is ever likely to rise to become head of the Soil Conservation Service, so there is not going to be any chance to compare good and bad administrators or administrations in this vital field. The country started out in 1937 with the daddy of soil conservation, the late great Hugh Hammond Bennett, heading the service. And now for several years we have had another director with conservation in his blood, Don A. Williams.

As a matter of fact, the country gets twice as much for its money in having Don at the head of the Soil Conservation Service, because with him we get the fine supporting cooperation of Mrs. Williams, the experienced Ruth, who is a true champion of conservation practices throughout this blessed land.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to insert at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Women in Conservation Are All Alike—They All Are Doing Their Part," by Ruth Williams, from the January 1963 issue of Soil Conservation:

WOMEN IN CONSERVATION ARE ALL ALIKE—THEY ALL ARE DOING THEIR PART

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This "women in conservation" issue of Soil Conservation would not be complete without this personal observation by the wife of SCS Administrator Donald A. Williams, one of the many wives who have been through the soil and water conservation ranks with their husbands. A South Dakota farm girl, she has since 1935 shared with him, and with the wives of the farmers and ranchers with whom he worked, the fight against soil erosion and water waste—lived and "preached" conservation from coast to coast.)

(By Ruth Williams)

It was the spring of 1932 and I was on my way from Aberdeen to Clark, S. Dak., to see my prospective husband. It was spring and like James Russell Lowell's poem:

"Now is the high tide of the year
And whatever of life hath ebbed away
Comes flooding back with a ripply cheer
Into every bare inlet and creek and bay
And no matter how barren the past may have been
'Tis enough for us now that the leaves are green."

But the poem we memorized back in the fifth grade just didn't make sense this spring morning. Another "black blizzard" had just roamed through the Plains States and had again left it a sea of desolation. There were no songs of the birds to herald the morning.

for birds must have water and cover. There was neither—only powdery dust.

The road passed through miles of once-fertile fields and pasture—now a vast nothingness—broken down fences half buried in dust, trees trying desperately to put forth a few leaves—that is if they still survived. We were stopped at the railroad crossing as a long train of cattle cars filled with bellowing, bawling, half-starved animals on their way to Omaha or Sioux City crawled past. They should have been in green pasture with new calves.

Along the road were farmhouses, once painted white with organdy curtains and potted plants in the window. Now they are like the landscape about them—gray and forlorn, and some abandoned. The man at the next filling station, once a farmer, muttered: "I just can't take it any more." Even hope for many had become a meaningless word.

The dust bowl was only one of nature's rebellions against man's misuse of her resources. For example, I remembered the little city of Vanport, Oreg., destroyed in minutes by a flood on the mighty Columbia River, made mightier by uncontrolled water runoff from melting snow on the watersheds. Then there was a lovely little lake back from the coast a mile or so—where Don actually caught fish. A clear-cut logging outfit had raped the bordering mountains, leaving the slashings. Fire followed, and then flood silt drained into the lake, and it no longer had an abundance of fish. And who can forget the Tillamook Burn in the Cascade Mountains in Oregon. Thousands of Douglas-fir trees lay waste—a scene as desolate as the dust bowl itself. And how about the strip-mining spoils and debris in the Appalachian Mountain country at the other end of our great country?

These are all dreary pictures we would like to forget, as we would like to forget the week of October 19, 1962, with its possibility of laying waste our Nation. But we dare not forget! It often takes disaster or near catastrophe to start a movement for a better way of life. So it was that out of disaster the Nation's modern soil and water conservation program as we know it today was born 30 years ago.

Men everywhere joined in the movement and with them, as the coworkers, the moral support, the "power behind the throne," the "no dollar a year gal"—the women. I have yet to meet a wife of a conservationist or of a conservation farmer or ranches who was not conservationist in her own right. She may not build stockponds, terrace the hills, or make contour furrows; but I'm sure she's approved his conservation program, pushed it, preached it, and cut the budget so it could be done.

There is no greater pleasure than to go with Don to conservation meetings. It doesn't matter which State you go to, the women in conservation are all alike. They all are dedicated and are doing their part in conservation.

We have a Ladies Auxiliary of the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts. It is an effective education arm of the association; and there are growing numbers of State association auxiliaries, and even some local district auxiliaries. You will find the conservation women also have left their mark on the public school course of study, on garden clubs, General Federation of Women's Clubs, League of Women Voters, 4-H clubs, Girl Scouts, and Camp Fire Girls. You name it and, if by chance they missed, well, just give them time.

I knew a little Camp Fire Girl several years ago who could classify land like an expert. And I've heard more than one teenager proudly express the wish in typical teenage fashion that just once they'd like something dished out, other than conservation, at the evening meal. So you see this conservation movement is not for men only, but a family affair.

## Standardization of Firehose Coupling Threads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the International Association of Fire Chiefs Committee on the Standardization of Firehose Coupling Threads has made numerous appeals to higher authority to standarize firehose coupling threads and thus avoid undue disaster. Therefore, I have reintroduced my concurrent resolution calling for the President to appoint a commission to study the feasibility of requiring by the enactment of Federal legislation the standardization of threads on the couplings on fire hoses used by fire departments.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include both an address to the International Association of Fire Chiefs Committee on Standardization of Firehose Coupling Threads by Robert Ely, chairman, and a highly applicable and illustrative poem entitled "Tragedy."

REPORT OF INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FIRE CHIEFS' COMMITTEE ON STANDARDIZATION OF FIREHOUSE COUPLING THREADS

First I want to thank our committee members, Chief John Garthe, and Chief Nicholas R. Warner for their help in making our progress possible. We also want to thank Chief Ray W. Shukraft and Chief Roi B. Woolley for their invaluable assistance. The help and guidance received from your executive director, B. Richter Townsend, and your public relations director, Al Drayton, has been a great help. The support of your president, Chief Edward F. Deignan, and the entire membership has been greatly appreciated.

Your committee has continued to urge the use of national standard firehose threads and standard gasket grooves on all couplings and fittings used for fire protective purposes. It has been a pleasure working for you and we appreciate your continued support on this worthwhile project.

From history we find that standardization of firehose coupling threads was the main topic of the first convention of the International Association of Fire Engineers in 1873. Concern in 1873 was caused by confusion due to misfits of hose coupling threads experienced in the great Boston fire of 1872. Ninety years later we are still trying to get all sizes of firehose coupling screw threads converted to the recommended national standard dimensions.

According to the New York Times, nonstandard firehose coupling threads were a contributing factor in the disastrous fire aboard the aircraft carrier *Constellation* on December 19, 1960. Forty-nine workmen lost their lives and there was a property loss of $47,942,000. A lot of threads could be standardized for that price. Refer to the New York Times of December 28, 29, and 31, and January 4, 1961.

We are happy to report that the U.S. Forest Service has converted their 1½-inch firehose coupling in southern California to the national standard thread and they are now in the process of converting their equipment in northern California.

Yes, progress has been made, but as long as any firehose coupling threads are in use that don't comply to the national standard dimensions there is still work to be done.

We suggest that each divisional organization of the International Association of Fire Chiefs appoint a committee to assist in the standardization of firehose coupling threads in its particular district. Our international committee will assist in any way possible. We have had experience in the standardization program which should be a help. Methods have been developed to rethread existing equipment at considerable savings. We are also open for suggestions and will welcome any assistance to help get the job done.

In last year's report we enclosed a copy of our letter to the President of the United States informing him of the use of so many nonstandard firehose coupling threads and asked that he take the necessary steps to aid and assist the fire service in standardizing all firehose coupling threads nationwide. Our letter was answered by Mr. Barent F. Landstreet, Deputy Assistant Director for Emergency Community Services, Department of Defense, and as yet there has been no help from the President or Office of Civil Defense to help get firehose coupling threads standardized.

The International Association of Fire Chiefs 1959 Resolution 5 asking OCDM for matching funds to help defray the costs of the equipment necessary to accomplish the standardization has apparently been ignored. We urge OCDM to reconsider the resolution and assist the fire service in the standardization program.

On September 27, 1961, Congressman BOB WILSON, of California, had our letter to the President of the United States, with the supporting material on firehose coupling threads read in the House of Representatives and inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. You may find it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix on pages A8028 and A8029 of the October 10, 1961, issue.

The fire service is on record asking that all coupling threads be standardized and has notified the responsible people of our country of the dangerous condition that exists with the use of so many nonstandard firehose coupling threads. The fire service cannot be held responsible for loss of life and property by fire where nonstandard firehose coupling threads are a contributing factor if the fire chief has gone on record in writing to his superiors asking that their nonstandard firehose coupling threads be converted to the recommended national standard firehose coupling screw thread dimensions as soon as possible. Have we protected ourselves in writing?

The NFPA, NBFU, and IAFC have adopted standards for the coupling screw threads for all 10 sizes of firehose used for fire protective purposes. The American Standards Association has adopted seven of these standards. However, the 4-, 5-, and 6-inch sizes which were the last to be adopted by the NFPA, NBFU, and IAFC have not been adopted by the American Standards Association as yet. It is desirable to have these standards adopted by the ASA as it will make the NFPA, NBFU, and IAFC coupling thread standards more secure and will help to get wider adoption of the standards. There has been a committee appointed by the ASA to study the firehose coupling threads.

Having worked with the development of the 4-, 5-, and 6-inch standards and through the recommendation of your executive director I have been appointed to represent the IAFC on the ASA coupling thread committee. A meeting of the ASA coupling thread committee will be held soon.

Funds should be appropriated for traveling expenses so that I can attend the meeting and help to get your IAFC 4-, 5-, and 6-inch thread standards adopted as the American standard.

It has been a pleasure working for you and your continued support for the standardization program is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT ELY,
*Chairman, IAFC Committee on Standardization of Fire Hose Threads.*

TRAGEDY

(By Bill Pitts)

The huge ball of fire rose fearsomely
As the "H-bomb" rent the night.
And the heart of the great metropolis,
Dissolved in the hellish light.

Though 50 percent of the city
Was beyond the help of man.
Most of the rest might still be saved
By a previously set up plan.

As the "fire storm" ate like a cancer,
Apparatus began to roll
From fire departments far and near
The stricken town their goal.

This was to be the ultimate test
Of Disaster Defense of the State.
Untried as yet, only theoried,
If not right, it was far too late.

The companies arrived to make their stand.
Then frustration forced them to quit.
Despair took over as the cry rang out,
"The fire hose threads won't fit!"

That just couldn't happen, may be your thought,
And it shouldn't happen, it's true.
But it does and will continue so,
While hidden from public view.

A hundred or more different hose threads
Are manufactured today.
Instead of one national standard thread,
As national requirements say.

And who do you think bears the added cost,
Of producing these various threads?
Is it those who won't listen and correct this mess,
But like ostriches bury their heads?

No, it isn't they, it's someone else
Like me and you and you.
The tab for payment with public funds
Is picked up by old John Q.

And what of the added fire loss,
Caused by this national disgrace.
It seems 'tis time for responsible men
This serious fact to face.

So start the clamor for action,
'Ere disaster with accompanying dreads,
Overtakes your State and catches it short,
Without national standard threads!

## Straining the Imagination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the comments of F. A. Douglass, editor of the Lakefield (Minn.) Standard, on the hazards of the administration fiscal program are so much to the point that I include the editorial on the subject as a part of the RECORD.

STRAINING THE IMAGINATION

President J. F. Kennedy's plan for raising national spending while bringing about a reduction in taxes may test the imagination a little too much for the average American.

We are sure that Mr. Kennedy had the advice of some of our Nation's leading economists and we are just as certain that both they and he are convinced the plan can be consummated with no ill effects on the economy.

And for every economist so inclined, we could probably find another who would insist, also with good reasoning, that deficit spending does constitute a danger to our economy.

The danger, however, is not with the deficit itself. It is the danger that the American people, conscious that a good business cannot continue to run successfully at a deficit, will lose faith in their Government and in its monetary system.

If that faith is badly shaken, a panic or depression could ensue.

We are not saying that will happen if Mr. Kennedy's plan is enacted. And we would be foolish not to admit that the economics of our Nation has become much too complicated to break down in such simple terms.

It may be that it is this very complication which has been the salvation of the American system during record spending and record deficits.

The whole subject will undoubtedly come under close scrutiny in the Halls of Congress before the budget is approved.

We cannot help but conclude, however, that while the possibility of a tax cut captures the imagination of all of us, a plan to cut taxes while raising spending may strain that imagination just a little.

## Federal Intrusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I recently received information calling to my attention what appears to be another step toward moving into the field of private enterprise by the Federal Government. This, as often is the case, is done under the guise of being for the public good. Not through the legislative process but rather by rules established by governmental bureaus.

A case in point, I believe, is the proposed rulemaking as it appears in the Federal Register of December 29, 1962, relating to electric power transmission lines traversing public lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture.

It should be pointed out that federally owned land, whether a large national forest or a tiny post office lot, are held in public trust. As the Government is the servant of the people, so are its lands similarly expressed. It would thus appear reasonable that they should not be used as a pawn in the intrusion of government into the field of gainful activity.

One can only ask, what is the real motive behind this proposed rule change? Within reasonable bounds of public safety and welfare and the preservation of natural resources from unconscionable dispersion of destruction, government lands have always been available to persons for traversal upon payment of a fair price. If this statement is correct and I am confident it is, then I ask in all candor, are the proposed rules reasonably appropriate or are they arbitrary and capricious?

Mr. Speaker, today we hear much of back-door referendums and back-door spending. Well, it occurs to me that this sort of low by regulation is a kitchen-door approach—a foot-in-the-door entry by government into the field of gainful production.

Both departments in this particular instance allude to the right to withhold a right-of-way grant if it is not consistent with the Federal marketing program. What is this program? Nowhere in the proposed rule change is it described nor its limits defined.

Once more we tread on dangerous ground. Let us all be more alert to the dangers ahead. Thanks for the opportunity to express myself on this subject.

## Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, in his message to the Congress on Tuesday the President said:

Education is the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress.

I think that statement would be meaningful if the word "to" were substituted for the word "and." It would read:

Education is the keystone in the arch of freedom to progress.

Thus the arch is freedom and it leads to progress.

Of course the message was the President's appeal for Federal aid for education—a 25-point program which some observers say is the most all-inclusive ever. It is not my purpose at this time to go into detailed comment on the subject. I am sure I will have plenty to say about it in the future.

Many proponents of the President's education program will in the weeks and months ahead be insisting that Federal funds for education and the best possible education for America's children are synonymous.

A most timely and appropriate message places the emphasis where it really belongs, and focuses on the greater need. It suggests that more attention be given to the "thinking" of our young people, and the best kind of "learning" will follow. It is contained in an editorial in the January 23, 1963, issue of the Janesville (Wis.) Daily Gazette, a highly respected newspaper published in my district. The editorial reflects the grassroots thinking of people who are concerned with both providing the best education for our children and seeing that their thinking as they approach their studies is straight. I believe every Mem-

ber of the Congress would profit from reading this thoughtful message.

KEEP THEIR THINKING STRAIGHT

The future of this society will depend upon the thinking of young people who are now learning what life is in this country and elsewhere. It is vital that they learn the basic truths that make this country great and that the facts be correct. In coming years their thinking will be based upon the information they are given today, by teachers, by what they read and what they hear.

It is important that young Americans learn what freedom means, how precious it is, how dearly it was paid for, and what they as individuals must do to preserve it. Likewise, it is important that they learn why the American system of a free economy produces more than the systems of other nations.

Allied with this is the basic truth that without freedom they would not be attending such a school and that freedom to work is as vital and as rewarding as the freedom to worship.

Rather than following the demoralizing concept of "security from cradle to the grave" they should be taught the satisfactions of giving of themselves to whatever work they undertake, of contributing to society, of producing and adding to the knowledge and wealth of mankind.

Too often a youngster, avid for learning, arrives at adulthood with the concept that society is made for his benefit, that he has only to go to an office for a check, that government—near or remote—will take care of his illness, provide security, pay him when he is unemployed, take care of his old age, his children and even provide life insurance.

There is no such thing. His thinking ought ought to be started right so that he is imbued with the pride of independence, with the desire to stand on his own feet, with the purpose to give more to life than he takes from it, with the spirit of doing something for his fellow man.

Social security is not a gift from some genie or government uncle, it is bought and paid for by the employer and the employee in equal shares. Nothing is free. Government has nothing to give that it does not first take away.

Unemployment compensation, which many believe, is free, is paid entirely by the employer. The employee pays nothing but receives all the benefits.

Working people receive sick benefits, hospital, and surgical benefits because their employers provide such group insurance or the employer and employee pay for it together. But it is not a gift of some government. Hundreds of millions of American workers have these benefits because they pay for them with their employers. Some employers even offer hospitalization insurance to their pensioned employees.

Most companies offer pensions of some kind to their employees, and most of these likewise are paid either by the employer or by the employer and employee together. Many unions also have pension trusts which members pay for.

The so-called four freedoms include freedom from want, as though this were an individual right. It is no more a right than is the right to steal. As a matter of fact freedom from want, from toil, and from need would reduce man to a worthless, shiftless idler. Let the Government feed him from cradle to grave and he would deteriorate into a spiritless, spineless begger. Man is not made to be fed at the hand of Mammon.

One of the problems of young people today is that they are encouraged to seek security first. As one schoolboy wrote, "Security is the problem of keeping people free from worry." Since when have Americans been free from worry? That is as unnatural as for them to be kept free from want. No largess from Uncle Sam can lift these human driving forces.

Young America should be inspired by the tales of the Edisons, Ketterings, the Lincolns and the Morgans and Clarks. If they are taught that Government is the solution to their problems, they will soon be trading freedom for socialism.

## Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following analysis of the President's tax bill was sent to me by a friend and constituent, Mr. J. Fletcher Gillinder, of Port Jervis, N.Y.

What Mr. Gillinder writes is an exact statement of how the new proposals will affect him as an individual. It is not the rosy dream of a Keynesian egghead or the griping of a bloated plutocrat.

It is the truth as it affects an average citizen, and will affect many more like him:

GILLINDER BROS., INC.,
*Port Jervis, N.Y., January 28, 1963.*

Re income tax reduction.
Hon. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MRS. ST. GEORGE: I have just completed my income tax report for 1962. I also have studied "Kennedy's Tax Blueprint" as printed in the Wall Street Journal of Friday, January 25.

With my figures before me for 1962, I applied the proposed "tax reduction" to them. The resulting tax was actually higher. To be sure I was correct, I had a CPA do the same for me—not merely check my figures but make the entire calculation. The result was the same.

The main reason for this is that part of the blueprint which would allow as a deduction only that part of itemized deductions, including taxes, interest, etc., that exceeds 5 percent of income.

About 45 percent of the increase is due to the proposed loss of dividend received credit and removal of the dividend exclusion.

The dividend received credit and the dividend exclusion are surely an incentive for capital investment in industry to produce growth and expansion. It should not be overlooked that there already is a double taxation on dividends as they have already been taxed 52 percent at their source. Contrary to the avowed purpose of the administration to stimulate such growth, it is proposed that this be eliminated.

The limitation on the deduction from income of real estate taxes and interest on loans likewise is contrary to the stated purpose of the administration of stimulating growth. It will surely be a deterrent to home building and will penalize consumer credit purchasing.

This same limitation, as applied to contributions, will unquestionably adversely affect the work of organizations, such as the Red Cross, and many others, and will probably and unfortunately be felt by the churches throughout the Nation as well.

I well realize these are proposals only and are a long way from enactment. Doubtless, some will be eliminated—perhaps were put there for that purpose so there can be something on which to appear to yield in the showdown.

In my thinking, there are not grades of honesty. A policy is either honest or dishonest. To foster a tax reduction of this kind on the public under the sole guise of helping the economy, when it is obviously to woo votes of a certain bracket of taxpayers, is anything but honest.

Sincerely,

J. FLETCHER GILLINDER.

## Surrender to Russia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, ever since Mr. Rostow went to Russia it seems almost according to his plan that we are stripping ourselves of first-strike capability. In the January 26 issue of the Long Island Press, Edith Kermit Roosevelt makes an excellent analysis of the danger of current thinking of the President insofar as it affects our security:

RUSSIAN ROULETTE, AMERICAN STYLE

(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

WASHINGTON.—Cancellation of the Skybolt under investigation by Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, is only one of a series of disarmament steps by our Government in recent months.

We are in the process of abandoning all our first strike capability weapons which preserve our standing as a class A nuclear power. First strike weapons are all those weapons which could be destroyed by an enemy attack—or those in stationary, unprotected positions. Here is the record to date:

B-58 supersonic medium bombers—production stopped.

B-70 bombers with speeds of 2,000 miles per hour and an altitude range of more than 70,000 feet—development halted.

Nuclear powered bombers—development halted.

RS-70 reconnaissance planes—cutback in research funds.

The Dyna-Soar or manned spacecraft bomber system—cutbacks in funds in the new defense budget.

Goal of military use of outer space replaced by Presidential anouncement of "peaceful uses of outer space." Instead of developing a satellite weapons system capable of delivery nuclear weapons, funds are diverted to the moonshot. As one grim-faced Army colonel expresses it, "While the Russians have parties all over the world, we're planning a tea party on the moon."

Finally, there is the replacement of Thor surface-to-surface missiles in England and Italy by the Polaris, a second strike capability weapons system designed to fire missiles from submarines.

Second strike capability weapons include all those weapons groups which cannot be destroyed by receiving the first blow because they are either mobile or hardened. However, erosion of our second strike capability also has already begun.

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara bluntly told Congress that he would not put component parts of the Nike-Zeus system into production even though this system had been successfully tested. Yet the Nike-Zeus system, an antimissile system, was de-

signed to defend the United States and Europe from Communist attacking ballistic missiles.

But disarming unilaterally, policymakers apparently hope to induce the Soviets to compete with us in this Americanized form of Russian roulette. But irrespective of any physiosophical motivation, concentration of all the defense apples in the missile basket constitutes in itself a disarmament measure.

Presently, the 200-missile U.S. missile right arm includes 126 Atlases, 54 Titans, and 20 Minutemen. This missile force represents a firepower of about 600 megatons. If you add the firepower of 144 Polaris missiles and 100-odd Jupiters and Thors remaining, our present missile force has a 1,000-megaton punch. But about 1,600 B–52's, B–58's, and B–47's are able to drop in excess of 10,000 megatons. This is their single mission punch. (These figures do not take into account carrier aircraft, fighter bombers, and tactical missiles.) And even if the Soviet defenses were perfect many of these planes would fly several missions.

If we wish to replace our bombers with missiles, we will need a minimum of some 10,000 missiles. But no one has yet talked about a U.S. force even approaching this size. If we reduce our strategic force to 2,000-odd missiles, as seems to be the present plan, our deterrent and retaliatory power would be cut by four-fifths or more.

Furthermore Khrushchev stated recently that the Soviet Union has invested in a defense effort against ballistic missiles equal to that invested in the missiles themselves. Obviously, the invulnerability of our Intercontinental Ballistic Missile system cannot last.

As Dr. Stefan T. Possony, former adviser Chief of Staff Air Force intelligence, points out aircraft must come out on top in the offense-defense race because (a) it is manned and therefore, genuinely maneuverable; (b) it can carry defensive armament and (c) it would be used jointly with ground-to-ground and air-to-ground missiles which would be aimed at the enemy's missile and aircraft interceptor bases.

The missile is unable, by itself, to identify and pinpoint targets; attack moving targets; and destroy very hard targets. Hence, a missile force cannot function without aircraft and cannot be the main element of a strategy designed to knock out the enemy's offensive force and stop the invasion of Western Europe.

"If the manned aircraft fleet is dead," says Dr. Possony, "perhaps the United States should prepare for its dignified funeral."

The Russell committee should investigate the entire spectrum of defense policies. A one-sided "peace race" could result in war sooner than an arms race since military weakness invites aggression. It could be a war the United States would lose.

## U.S. Navy Honors James Iredell Waddell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the course of their history the United States have produced many leaders who have been honored in many ways. One of the most effective means of the U.S. Navy in recognizing the just fame of its heroes, has been in the naming of certain types of war vessels after them.

It is indeed gratifying that over the years, the policy of our Government in these regards has been broad, permitting vessels to be named for leaders on both sides in the supreme catastrophe of our history—the War Between the States.

One such recent example is that of the missile destroyer named in honor of James Iredell Waddell, the 138th graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy in 1847, who joined the South in 1861 and won fame as commanding officer of the Confederate States ship *Shenandoah*.

An informative article by Ruby R. Duval in the December 1962 issue of Shipmate, magazine of the Naval Academy Alumni Association, summarizes the career of Captain Waddell.

The article follows:

U.S. NAVY HONORS JAMES IREDELL WADDELL

(By Ruby R. Duval)

A guided missile destroyer has been assigned the name *Waddell* in honor of James Iredell Waddell, Naval Academy class of 1847, who distinguished himself in later years as captain of the Confederate States ship *Shenandoah*.

The *Waddell* (DDG–24), a highly maneuverable combatant ship larger than destroyers of earlier years, is designed for a complement of 24 officers and 330 enlisted men. Her armament, and that of her sister Tartar guided missile destroyers, will greatly increase the antisubmarine and antiair warfare capability of our Navy.

When James Iredell Waddell, of North Carolina, received a midshipman's warrant at the age of 17 from Secretary of the Navy George E. Badger he was destined to become a Marylander by adoption and one of the most colorful citizens of Annapolis after the War of 1861–65. He reported for duty aboard the ship-of-the-line *Pennsylvania* at Norfolk, Va., in December 1841. Later assignments led to duty in the *Vandalia* and, during the war with Mexico, he was one of the complement of the brig *Somers* off Vera Cruz.

While attending the naval school midshipmen had ample opportunity to meet Annapolis families and their young ladies; and young Waddell soon lost his heart to Miss Anne Sellman Iglehart, daughter of James Iglehart, whose home was within a few blocks of the Old Fort. He claimed Miss Anne as his bride in 1848 and his effusive "Lines to Miss Iglehart," U.S. Naval School, December 8, 1845, are found among treasured keepsakes in the late Mrs. Waddell's scrapbook.

In the summer of 1859 Waddell received orders to the U.S.S. Saginaw under construction at Mare Island, Calif., and scheduled for duty in the Far East. Two years later, while serving aboard this vessel off Hong Kong, he received news of the distressing political situation in the United States and the impending war. He was fortunate to be detached from the Saginaw and ordered to the *John Adams*, a sloop-of-war, about to sail for New York.

When the *John Adams* reached New York in November 1861, James Iredell Waddell lost no time submitting his resignation to Secretary of the Navy Gideon Welles, explaining that he could not bear arms against the South. Not until late January 1862 was his resignation acknowledged, and he was informed that his name had been "stricken from the rolls." He soon made his way to Annapolis, where his wife awaited him at her father's home, and he promptly made preparations for departure to Virginia and the Confederate capital.

In the interim between assignments at sea, Waddell was under instruction at the Naval School which had been established under Comdr. Franklin Buchanan at old Fort Severn, Annapolis, and was graduated as a past midshipman in 1847.

The whole State of Maryland was under Federal martial law by this time and normal means of travel were avoided by Southern sympathizers to escape possible detention and arrest. It was the latter part of February when Waddell sadly took leave of his wife and little daughter and started his trek South, via southern Maryland, where he crossed the Potomac and made his way to Richmond.

In the spring of 1861 James D. Bulloch, of Georgia, formerly an officer in the U.S. Navy, was selected to serve as the Confederate States naval agent in Europe to seek ships and necessary supplies with which to build a Confederate States Navy. At that time the South had only one fighting ship—the *Sumter*, skippered by Raphael Semmes—and Bulloch was arranging not only for the construction of vessels but for the purchase of seaworthy ships already completed. It was through his cautious negotiations that the Confederate States goverment was able to acquire the *Sea King* in the fall of 1864. Built at Glasgow and known to be one of the fastest ships afloat, the *Sea King* was readied to begin an epoch-making voyage around the world.

James Waddell had been commissioned as a lieutenant in the Confederate States Navy in March 1862 and ordered to a ram under construction at New Orleans. Later he was detailed as ordnance officer at fortifications erected at Drewry's Bluff overlooking the James River below Richmond, and eventually duty took him to Charleston, S.C., where he received letters of instruction in regard to an impending command. It can be justly stated that his most significant opportunity came when he was ordered to Europe for foreign service in August 1864 and, upon reaching England, learned that he was slated to skipper the swift cruising *Sea King*, soon to be commissioned as the C.S.S. *Shenandoah* and to work havoc with commerce and the whaling fleets of the United States.

Among the officers detailed for Waddell's command and who joined the *Shenandoah* off Funchal, when the Stars and Bars of the Confederacy were run up and the cruiser was duly commissioned, were: William C. Whittle, of Virginia, first lieutenant and executive officer; Lt. John Grimball, of South Carolina, Sidney Smith Lee, Jr., of Virginia, Francis T. Chew, of Tennessee, Dabney M. Scales, of Virginia, and Sailing Master Irvine S. Bulloch, of Georgia. Whittle and Grimball were former classmates at the Naval School, Annapolis, Class of 1858; Sidney Smith Lee, Jr., was a son of Capt. Sidney Smith Lee, C.S.N., and a nephew of Gen. Robert E. Lee, C.S.A.; and Bulloch had served under Capt. Raphael Semmes in the Confederate cruiser *Alabama*, sunk off Cherbourg in the engagement with the U.S.S. *Kearsarge* in June 1864. Lieutenants Chew and Scales had received their initial training at the Naval School, Annapolis, and resigned in the spring of 1861 to offer their services to the South.

Promoted to the rank of captain, Confederate States Navy, James Iredell Waddell lost no time in getting underway to follow his official orders and headed the *Shenandoah* into the South Atlantic to leave in her wake many burning merchant vessels. He rounded the Cape of Good Hope and set sail for Australia, en route to the South Pacific and thence to the Arctic Ocean, where the *Shenandoah* took heavy toll among the large wooden whaling ships off Siberia. In her historic cruise of 1 year and 17 days this swift sailing vessel ran down and captured approximately 39 ships and took many prisoners. Many of the captured ships were sunk and others, considered too valuable to destory, were manned by prize crews and sent to the nearest Southern ports.

On August 2, 1865, the *Shenandoah* fell in with a British merchantman which had sailed from San Francisco 13 days earlier, and Captain Waddell learned that the war of 1861–65 was over, that General Lee had surrendered at Appomattox nearly 4 months before. Realizing that his officers and crew had been waging war on Yankee-owned vessels after the official surrender, Waddell pondered his next maneuver with a view of just what it would mean to each and every man of the *Shenandoah's* complement. He decided to spike the ship's guns and set a course for England via Cape Horn—a journey of approximately 17,000 miles.

The *Shenandoah* put it at Liverpool on November 6, 1865—still flying her wind-torn and faded Confederate flag. This was the only Confederate flag to circumnavigate the world—it waved on every ocean, except the Antractic, and was hauled down over 6 months after the termination of the war. Captain Waddell surrendered his proud ship to the neutral British Government and begged asylum for his officers and crew.

For several years after his arrival in England, James Iredell Waddell remained abroad. When he returned to the United States and to his family in Annapolis he sought employment in keeping with his wide experience in maritime service and procured command of the *San Francisco*—one of the steamships of the Pacific Mail Co.'s passenger fleet. In 1877 the *San Francisco* struck an uncharted reef off the coast of Mexico and sank. Fortunately for all concerned, Waddell's rigid discipline and excellent leadership prevented any loss of life even though over 400 passengers were abroad in this disaster.

Soon after this trying exigency he returned to Annapolis where he and Mrs. Waddell made plans for the erection of their home on a lot at the south corner of College Avenue at the intersection of Prince George Street and overlooking the campus of St. John's College. Eventually he was appointed by the Governor of Maryland to command a flotilla known as the "State Oyster Fleet," a small number of patrol vessels serving as an enforcement agency to protect the State's oyster beds from the raid of illegal tongers.

When Captain Waddell died in March 1886, the Maryland Legislature adjourned to attend his funeral service at historic St. Anne's Church, and to thus pay their respects to the man who won the distinction of commanding the only man-of-war to fly the Stars and Bars of the Confederate States of America all around the world.

## Let's Get the Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, it is astounding that President Kennedy should be so exercised over the French veto, when he has been so condescending at Russian vetoes in the United Nations. Perhaps I, too, do not like the result of the French decision on the Common Market, but nevertheless, France is still an ally of this country and our differences should be talked out. Here again, why does President Kennedy want so much to talk with Khrushchev and not with Mr. de Gaulle?

To show the other side of the coin, an excellent article by David Lawrence in yesterday's Washington Star and an analysis by Ted Lewis in the January 26 Boston Herald indicate that Mr. de Gaulle is not solely to blame in this matter.

It is my view that the Kennedy administration has generated this serious deterioration in relations between France and the United States.

Just as the great Winston Churchill thought of Great Britain first, so does Charles de Gaulle think first of France. I wish President Kennedy would show that same concern for the United States.

The articles follow:

[From the U.S. News, January 30, 1963]

DE GAULLE: REALIST FOR FRANCE

(By David Lawrence)

There's no use getting mad at General de Gaulle just because he is a realist in a world of anxiety or just because he doesn't see things the way Washington or London see them.

The French President has lately been the subject of some rather severe criticism as a stubborn, self-centered individual who would rather mess up NATO and the whole defense plan of the West than give up his concept of a united Europe based on continental supremacy without Britain. Naturally this irritates many people and causes intimations to be given in White House circles that maybe General de Gaulle is living in the 19th century.

Yet General de Gaulle has merely stood firm on the principle that a leader's first obligation is to take care of his own countrymen. He hasn't swallowed the propaganda of the supranationalists who think the many nationalities in Europe can be best governed by a single council of state.

It was on January 14 that General de Gaulle gave comprehensive answers to questions asked at a press conference in Paris. He has not modified his position since. While his views were not accepted with enthusiasm here or in London, they were by no means opposed fundamentally to allied solidarity or to the organization of a common defense against the Communist menace. His statement explained that France would welcome Britain into the Common Market on terms of equality, but not as a special partner with trade concessions for the benefit of its home agriculture and its Commonwealth associates.

Nor did General de Gaulle exclude the strategy of a common military defense. He said:

"In these conditions, no one in the world—particularly no one in America—can say if, where, when, how and to what extent the American nuclear weapons would be employed to defend Europe. Moreover, this does not in the least prevent the American nuclear weapons, which are the most powerful of all, from remaining the essential guarantee of world peace. * * * But it remains that the American nuclear power does not necessarily and immediately meet all the eventualities concerning Europe and France.

"Thus, principles and realities combine to lead France to equip itself with an atomic force of its own. This does not at all exclude, of course, the combination of the action of this force with the action of the similar forces of its allies."

Referring to the agreement reached at Nassau between President Kennedy and Prime Minister Macmillan, the De Gaulle statement said:

"It is a question of constituting a so-called multilateral atomic force, in which Britain would turn over the weapons it has and will have and in which the Americans would place a few of their own. This multilateral force is assigned to the defense of Europe and is under the American NATO command. It is nevertheless understood that the British retain the possibility of withdrawing their atomic weapons for their own use should supreme national interest seem to them to demand it. As for the bulk of American nuclear weapons, it remains outside the multilateral force and under the direct orders of the President of the United States.

"It is true that we, too, can theoretically retain the ability to take back in our hands, in the supreme hypothesis, our atomic weapons incorporated in the multilateral force. But how could we do it in practice during the unheard of moments of the atomic apocalypse? * * * In sum, we will adhere to the decision we have made: to construct and, if necessary, to employ our atomic force ourselves. And that without refusing, of course, cooperation, be it technological or strategic, if this cooperation is, on the other hand, desired by our allies."

Here is a nation's leader who is thinking primarily of his own country and who is not willing to entrust its safety to the trigger finger of an executive in another country. General de Gaulle thinks this would entail "a web of liaisons, transmissions, and interferences within itself, and, on the outside, a ring of obligations such that, if an integral part were suddenly snatched from it, there would be a strong risk of paralyzing it just at the moment, perhaps, when it should act."

The lesson of all this is that there is need for soul-searching conferences and consultation without the emotional discords that arise when the head of a foreign state is described as "egoistic" just because he thinks of the future of his own people and is unwilling to entrust their safety to a strategy that relies wholly on missiles or, to a large extent, looks on conventional weapons as obsolete. Yet the possibility of a big war in Europe without nuclear weapons remains as always, on a continent in which the Soviet Union today has the biggest standing army in the world.

---

BRITAIN NOT BLAMELESS IN TIFF

(By Ted Lewis)

WASHINGTON.—The amount of hysteria generated here by French President de Gaulle's alleged attempt to keep Britain out of the Common Market definitely requires the application of a cold towel.

This can be supplied only by French sources which scarcely anyone here has bothered to contact, preferring instead to froth at the mouth over de Gaulle's activities without trying to find out the whys and wherefores of the general's position.

NEW PARTNERSHIP

Nobody here in high or low authority has blamed the British for the Common Market mess.

In fact, without trying to determine what really has been going on, such Senators as New York's JACOB JAVITS have now joined the Anglophile ranks with a "down with de Gaulle" statement proposing a new trade partnership of the United States, Britain, and Japan.

Close friends and aids here of de Gaulle are understandably furious about his being made the whipping boy. They certainly, whether right, or wrong, should have their case put on the record.

French officials, for example, insist that de Gaulle did not slam the door on Britain's entry into the Common Market. He still stands ready to accept this momentous step, however many misgivings he might have personally.

The real reason for the present snafu, in the French view, is simply that Britain has refused and is still refusing to agree to the rules of the club it wants to join—even after many concessions have been made to meet its special problems. All de Gaulle did in his now famous press conference a week ago, the French say, is to lay it on the line to the British to fish or cut bait, to accept the Market terms or forget about full membership.

With all the inexorable logic of a man of destiny, De Gaulle sharply questioned whether Britain would ever be willing to cut its ties to the Commonwealth or its special relationship to the United States to join the European Community "without restriction and without reservation."

NO ULTIMATUM

This was widely interpreted as an ultimatum to Britain to drop its links with the United States—the Nassau agreement on the Polaris missile, for example—or forget about getting into the market. But the French say nothing of the sort was intended.

They insist that De Gaulle's worry about what Britain might do to his ideas regarding the future political organization of Europe doesn't rule out the admission of the United Kingdom to the Market now.

Strong currents are propelling the Market along toward an eventual political organization, but this hasn't happened yet. At the moment, the Market is still purely and simply an economic union. And in the French view the reasons for the current snag over Britain's admissions are basically economic.

Negotiators for Britain and the six Market countries have been haggling for 15 months over the terms of Britain's admission. Concessions have been made on both sides, but two critical issues still stood in the way of agreement at the time of the De Gaulle press conference.

Britain still refused to agree to the Market proposals for solving the knotty problem of British agriculture. France and its partners insisted that Britain immediately accept the Market rules on farm tariffs, price supports and other issues, but agreed to permit a transition period of 7 years.

Britain insisted it should be allowed to continue its own farm subsidy program. It promised to adapt progressively to the Market system but did not agree to the 7-year limitation.

As De Gaulle put it, the British nourish themselves "by importing foodstuffs purchased at low prices in the two Americas or in the former dominions, while still granting large subsidies to British farmers." He said this is "obviously incompatible" with the Market system.

## Small Business Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GILLIS W. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, January 29, 1963*

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have read with interest, and I may say some dismay, a series of articles which appeared recently in the Washington Daily News concerning the Small Business Administration.

The articles, written by Mr. Dickson Preston, give a biased, incomplete, and distorted account of both the functions of this agency and the services it offers to the Nation's small business firms.

If I may, Mr. President, I would like to mention just one of the several very important functions of SBA which Mr. Preston either overlooked or chose not to discuss. And I am rather surprised, too, at this omission, inasmuch as Mr. Preston's articles discussed at length SBA's lending activities.

One of the most important facets of SBA's lending program, is that of making loans to local development companies organized specifically to assist small firms.

This authority, given to SBA by Congress through enactment of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, has proved invaluable to small communities interested in improving their economic position.

I know of one small community in my own State of Louisiana for example that formed its own local development company and got a $250,000 loan from SBA to assist a small lumber company. In this one instance alone, 150 new jobs were created.

Throughout the country, SBA has made about 250 of these local development company loans totaling over $32 million. SBA has advanced nearly $29 million and local banks have added another $3 million. The development companies have in addition put up about $13 million, and the total value of these projects is nearly $45 million.

These loans have resulted directly in the creation of nearly 16,000 new jobs.

Of course, the total effect of these loans is not apparent in the basic figures cited. But loans of this type have a cumulative or "snowballing" effect. As a result of these loans a community gains more people, more households, more schoolchildren, higher personal income, higher bank deposits, more passenger cars, more retail establishments, and more retail sales.

This beneficial effect on the Nation's economy is the net result of this one program offered by SBA.

Of course there are also other valuable services rendered by the SBA which were not mentioned in Mr. Preston's articles but which are, nevertheless, an integral part of the functions of SBA which represents the more than 4½ million small businesses in the country and does so most effectively.

That is why I do not wish to let Mr. Preston's slurs on the SBA—and his omissions—go unchallenged.

SBA is doing a good job and we should all work to help it become still more effective.

## Eliminate the Two-Price Cotton System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROY A. TAYLOR
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I made yesterday before the Cotton Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee which is considering legislation to end the two-price cotton system:

STATEMENT OF HON. ROY A. TAYLOR, OF NORTH CAROLINA

Since 1956 the Federal Government has subsidized the purchase of U.S. cotton by foreign buyers to the extent of 8½ cents per pound, creating a two-price system for U.S. cotton. A substantial quantity of U.S. raw cotton is exported under this subsidy plan and later shipped back into this country in a manufactured form to compete with the output of U.S. mills.

It is not right that foreign buyers should be permitted to continue purchasing American cotton on the world market 8½ cents per pound cheaper than American manufacturers can buy the same cotton on the domestic market and then sell the finished products on the American market in competition with the American textile industry.

In the past 10 years U.S. imports of cotton products have risen from the average cotton equivalent of 68,000 bales in 1952 to 225,000 bales in 1956, to 234,000 bales in 1958, to 526,000 bales in 1960, and approximately 672,000 bales in 1962. This upward trend in the main has occurred since 1956 when the two-price cotton system was created.

Since the advent of two-price cotton in 1956 active cotton spindles have dropped 9.1 percent. Textile employment has declined 176,000 workers. Mill consumption of cotton has declined and imports of cotton textiles continue an upward surge.

The textile industry is the second largest employer in the United States and has been hard hit by imports from low-wage countries. The American cotton farmer is being hurt by this decline in the textile industry on which he must depend. A bale of cotton has little value until it is processed. The export market is uncertain so the strength of our Nation's cotton production industry must depend on a healthy American textile industry. The two-price cotton system is not only weakening the textile industry but is hurting the American cotton farmer.

I have received numerous letters and telegrams from textile and garment manufacturers in my congressional district pointing out the necessity of early action to eliminate the two-price cotton system. I hope that new cotton legislation can be passed by Congress in time to apply to the 1963 crop. We cannot afford to delay, with textile employment shrinking, and the number of cotton spindles being constantly reduced. Our textile workers deem it most unfair to suffer unemployment and shorter hours while their foreign competitors are supplying so much of the American market.

President Kennedy has characterized the two-price cotton system as "a unique burden upon the American textile industry for which a solution must be found in the near future."

We must quickly eliminate the system under which oversea textile mills may buy American cotton at $42.50 less a bale than U.S. mills must pay.

## Native of Southwest Missouri Heads Associated Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DURWARD G. HALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative in this House of the Seventh

Congressional District of southwest Missouri I am honored to call the attention of my colleagues to the remarkable and well-deserved success of a talented man who was born 56 years ago at Diamond, Mo.

That gentleman, Paul Miller, is the president of Gannett newspapers and has just become president of the worldwide news service of the Associated Press.

Mr. Miller, who is to receive the William Allen White Journalism Award in a few weeks, is the son of the late Reverend James T. Miller, of Diamond and Neosho, Mo. The new AP chief executive was educated in the fine schools of the city of Neosho and from there began the career that has led him to this high post.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD at this point an editorial honoring Mr. Miller which appeared January 25 in the Carthage, Mo., Evening Press:

THE RISE OF PAUL MILLER

The world's biggest, most comprehensive news wire service is the Associated Press. It taps the flow of current events at a thousand points on the globe, and transmits concise summaries of everything from an international incident to an individual's case in municipal court to newspapers, radio, and television stations on every major continent.

And the president of that vast organization is a man from Diamond, Mo., a town well known to all Carthaginians. According to the 1960 decennial census it had 453 residents. Not only is Paul Miller new head of the Associated Press, he's president of the Gannett Co., which publishes 17 newspapers in 4 States, operates 4 radio and 2 television stations. He's also editor and publisher of the Rochester (N.Y.) Times-Union and publisher of the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle.

How did the 56-year-old Miller, eldest of eight children of a circuit-riding Christian Church preacher, get from Diamond to leadership of the world's most powerful wire service?

He started as sports editor of the Daily O'Collegian at Oklahoma A. & M. College at a salary of $15 a month plus another $25 for college publicity work. The money enabled him to enroll as a student there. Two years later he quit to become editor of the Guthrie Daily Leader, although later, while working in Oklahoma City, he finished out his college education with 2 years at the University of Oklahoma.

Hired as a member of the Columbus AP bureau, in 5 years he advanced to the New York cable desk, then to the general news staff and work as a correspondent in Kansas City, served as bureau chief in Salt Lake City, then chief at Harrisburg, Pa., and on to Philadelphia.

After serving as executive assistant to the general manager, Miller was named chief of the Washington bureau in 1941. In 1947 he left AP and became executive assistant to Frank E. Gannett of the Gannett chain, and upon Gannett's death in 1955 became operating head of the group and president of the Frank E. Gannett Newspaper Foundation. Meanwhile, he served three terms as an AP director, and was elected first vice president last April, leaving that post for the presidency.

And that's how you get from Diamond to the leadership of the Associated Press.

His achievement makes Miller another of the national leaders of whom southwest Missouri is justly proud, and under his direction the citizens of Diamond, of Missouri, and of the Nation can expect to see the Associated Press rise to new heights of service to the free world.

## Congressional Fellowship Program Benefits Fellows and Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. DURWARD G. HALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to participate this year for the first time in the congressional fellowship program of the American Political Science Association. As many of the Members of this House already know, this program provides congressional experience for young journalists, political science teachers, and career Government employees, and also includes a group of fellows from Asia.

I would like to point out that this nationwide fellowship program is the only one operating in Congress which provides congressional offices with the services of professional men, who already have proved their talents in their chosen professions. While the program benefits the fellows in large measure, it also is a boon to the congressional offices able to utilize their services.

I highly commend to my colleagues the nonpartisan congressional fellowship program. And I submit for publication in the RECORD the following list of congressional offices, the names of the fellows working in them this session, and the newspapers, colleges, and Government positions from which the fellows came:

HOUSE OFFICE ASSIGNMENTS—1963 CONGRESSIONAL FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

Hon. F. BRADFORD MORSE, of Massachusetts—Agustus Adair, of Gramling College, Louisiana.

Hon. NEIL STAEBLER, of Michigan—Dale Arnold, of the Detroit Free Press.

Hon. ROBERT H. MICHEL, of Illinois—Bruce Beacher, of the Department of Agriculture.

Hon. RICHARD BOLLING, of Missouri—Jerald Blizin, of the St. Petersburg, Fla., Times.

Republican Policy Committee—Terry Cabahug, of the Philippine Senate.

Hon. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI, of Pennsylvania—Everett Cataldo, of Ohio State University.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS, of Indiana—Carl Chelf, of the University of Nebraska.

Office of the Speaker of the House—George Condon, of Washington State University.

Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee—Howard Farkas, of the Public Health Service.

Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT, of California—Fariborz Fatemi, of Syracuse University.

Hon. KEN HECHLER, of West Virginia—Daniel Fleming, of Marietta, Ohio, High School.

Hon. DURWARD G. HALL, of Missouri—Jerry W. Friedheim, of the Joplin, Mo., Globe.

Hon. W. R. POAGE, of Texas—George Herzog, of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Hon. JOHN A. BLATNIK, of Minnesota—Andrew Hickey, of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, of New Jersey—James Hoge, of the Chicago Sun Times.

Hon. DONALD M. FRASER, of Minnesota—William Jacobson, of NASA.

Hon. CHARLES A. MOSHER of Ohio—Coit Johnson, of Columbia University.

Hon. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, of Michigan—S. K. Law, of the Sarawak Information Service.

Government Operations Committee—Thomas King of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Hon. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, of Pennsylvania—John Lim, of the Korean Foreign Service.

Hon. CARLTON R. SICKLES, of Maryland—Richard Melton, of the Department of State.

Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, of California—John Morgan, of the Appleton, Wis., Post-Crescent.

Hon. JOHN KYL, of Iowa—Shams Nizami, of the Pakistan Ministry of Justice.

Hon. CHARLES E. BENNETT, of Florida—Kenneth Olson, of Smith College.

Hon. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, of Wisconsin—Ronald Steel, of Scholastic Magazine.

Hon. ROBERT E. JONES, of Alabama—George W. Tourtillot, of the Forest Service.

Hon. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR., of New Jersey—Thomas van der Voort, of the Public Health Service.

Hon. GERALD R. FORD, of Michigan—Bruce Van Dusen, of the Providence, R.I., Journal.

Hon. WILLIAM F. RYAN, of New York—George Von der Muhll, of Harvard University.

Office of the majority whip—Eric Wentworth, of the Portland Oregonian.

## A Salute to Fleet Reserve Association, Branch 63, for Their Distinguished Contributions and Patriotic Efforts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include the very worthy comments taken from a letter to Mr. Roy Baker, branch president, from Capt. C. D. Simonsen, regarding the distinguished contributions and patriotic efforts of the Fleet Reserve Association's Branch 63, located at Iwakuni, Japan. Under unanimous consent, I include these remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

January 15, 1963.

Mr. ROY BAKER,
*President, Iwakuni Branch No. 63*
*Fleet Reserve Association*
*Iwakuni, Japan.*

Dear Mr. BAKER: Because of the honorary membership your branch afforded me at the outset of my tour, and also because of the close association I have had with many of the members of Branch 63, it has been my pleasure and privilege to observe closely, and often participate in, the many tremendously beneficial programs and projects continuously being sparked and sponsored by your dynamic group. All who benefit directly and indirectly from your well-placed support and sponsorship efforts realize beyond all doubt that you provide a most meritorious and indispensable service to your country, the Navy and this very important oversea community.

In particular the numerous youth activities backed by branch 63 including all categories of Scouting, Pee Wee Basketball League, Little League, Pony League, bowling leagues, are of inestimable benefit to the youngsters of this base and the city of Iwelani. These efforts will produce untold dividends in terms of character, health, and

teamwork for the upcoming generation. The works your members accomplish in terms of the President's people-to-people program in helping support the Iwakuni Home for Destitute Children, assisting elderly U.S. Navy Japanese retirees, counseling many Japanese in their problems relating to U.S. customs and procedures, coming to the fore in emergencies such as the recent Guam typhoon disaster and providing generous help and cheer for less fortunate orphans at Christmas and other holidays, are most commendable.

It has also been my privilege to attend your traditional and impressive Fleet Reserve Association Memorial Day services in both 1961 and 1962. Indeed, I have never known a group which has been so active and achieved so much in the realms of meaningful community and human relations. The noteworthy achievements you have accomplished for the good of the U.S. forces stationed here and our Japanese hosts in Iwakuni are absolutely superlative in every way. Speaking as one whose problems concerning morale, personnel welfare, recruiting, youth activities, and wholesome recreation have been immeasurably eased and benefited by your fine organization I am deeply thankful to every member of branch 63. Your works are of great importance. They bespeak a true Christian and American endeavor.

I am proud to commend Branch 63, Fleet Reserve Association for its distinguished efforts, its vitality, patriotism, and the high ideals for which it stands. I thank you all again for the many courtesies and hospitality extended to me during my stay in Iwakuni, and I shall pray for continued success, growth, and development of your outstanding association.

Sayonara,

C. D. SIMONSEN,
*Captain, U.S. Navy, Commander Fleet Air Wing 6, U.S. Marine Corps Air Station, Iwakuni, Japan.*

## Eighth Air Force, Strategic Air Command, With Headquarters at Westover AFB, Observes 21st Anniversary of Founding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 29, 1963*

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the battle-hardened 8th Air Force of the Strategic Air Command, with headquarters at the great Westover Air Force Base at Chicopee Falls, Mass., in my congressional district, is celebrating its 21st birthday this week. I include with my remarks a story on the history of the 8th Air Force published in the Springfield Daily News on January 28:

BATTLE-HARDENED 8TH AIR FORCE COMES OF AGE (21 YEARS) WITH ICBM

WESTOVER AIR FORCE BASE.—The 8th Air Force reached voting age today—its 21st birthday.

A fair argument might be whether any organization, military or civilian, has traveled farther or faster in reaching majority than has the 8th—or has endured more.

Born and nurtured in warfare, the 8th Air Force, fittingly enough, recently marked its coming of age with the takeover, at frigid Plattsburgh Air Force Base, N.Y., of an intercontinental ballistic missile complex.

That move ushered in the space age for the historic, battle-hardened command, and is an augury of its future. Already the most powerful arm of the Strategic Air Command, its devastating retaliatory striking power was enormously increased by the addition of the dreaded, nuclear-tipped ICBM to its weaponry.

NINE HUNDRED AIRCRAFT

Headquartered at Westover, the 8th Air Force now has more than 900 aircraft, including B–52, B–47, KC–135, and KC–97 models, along with its ICBM's. Its more than 78,000 personnel are assigned with 21 units spread along the eastern coastline, anchored north and south at Thule Air Base, near the Arctic Circle in Greenland, and Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico, and inland in Ohio.

Actually, the 8th Air Force has been "mansized and shaving" for many years.

The 8th Air Force was activated on January 28, 1942, at Savannah, Ga. By the summer of that year, on August 17, the first of its great Flying Fortress B–17's were in combat. On that date, a small force of 12 Flying Forts took off at Grafton Underwood, England, in the first daylight, unescorted raid of Europe. Almost as an anticlimax, all 12 planes returned undamaged to their base.

DAYLIGHT BOMBING

The decision of the Army Air Force generals to send their four-engine bombers against German Luftwaffe fighters in broad daylight was a momentous experiment, the significance of which may be lost on Air Force recruits today, many of whom were not yet born. The entire concept of strategic bombing—and, indeed, the Strategic Air Command itself—were founded on it—and thus the maintenance of the peace today.

Commanded by such legendary figures as Gen. Carl "Tooey" Spaatz, Gen. Ira Eaker and Gen. Jimmy Doolittle, the 8th grew to tremendous size during World War II. By the end of the war, its record stood at 600,000 sorties flown during which 700,000 tons of bombs were dropped. Its aerial gunners and fighter pilots destroyed 15,000 enemy aircraft.

This was not without cost, however, as hundreds of its planes were shot down, and thousands of its personnel killed or taken prisoner. Thirteen of its members were awarded the Nation's highest decoration—the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Eighth Air Force reached its wartime peak of power on Christmas Eve of 1944 when the command sent 2,000 bombers and 800 fighters over Germany.

DESTRUCTION POWER

Today, however, the nuclear tips on 8th's Atlas ICBM's at Plattsburgh or carried in the bomb bays of the B–52 Stratofortresses represent far more destructive power than in all the weight of bombs dropped during World War II.

Its 200-ton B–52's, utilizing air refueling, a concept developed by the command, can range the world in reaching targets.

The command has never stood still during its 21 years, moving from plane to better plane and concept to better concept as they developed. As signified at Plattsburgh, its eyes are to the future when the Air Force and the 8th, shall become true space powers. Its huge personnel—as was proven recently during the Cuban crisis—stands ready on the instant to swing into wartime footing.

But its mission, like that of all armed service branches, remains the same—"Peace through power."

## The American Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BASIL L. WHITENER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 24, 1963*

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the American textile industry is suffering a great disadvantage in the highly competitive textile market by reason of the advantage enjoyed by foreign textile manufacturers in the purchase of American cotton. Under the existing law foreign mills can purchase American cotton 8½ cents a pound cheaper, or at a cost of $42.50 less per bale than can the American manufacturer.

Legislation has been introduced by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] to remove the inequity existing in our two-price cotton program. Yesterday I appeared before the Cotton Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee in support of the legislation, and it is my earnest hope that some relief will be secured for the textile industry in the immediate future.

I commend the members of the Agriculture Committee on the approach that the committee is taking to this vital matter, and I include the statement I made before the Cotton Subcommittee yesterday on the two-price cotton program in the Appendix of the RECORD.

STATEMENT OF HON. BASIL L. WHITENER, 10TH DISTRICT, NORTH CAROLINA, BEFORE COTTON SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE ON JANUARY 30, 1963

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am deeply grateful for the opportunity that is being given for the presentation of my views with reference to the two-price cotton problem. As I understand it, the committee has two bills before it; one of these is the Cooley bill and the other is the Gathings bill. I further understand that these bills are intended generally to be a basis from which to work in arriving at legislation which will serve the public interest.

By way of introduction let me say that I represent a congressional district which has a very keen interest in the entire cotton economy. One of the counties in my district is the second largest cotton producing county in North Carolina, and the district is the largest textile manufacturing congressional district in the United States. It is, therefore, necessary that I take into account the interest of agriculture and industry in what I say and do in dealing with legislation affecting cotton.

The members of this committee are well aware of the genesis and history of the two-price cotton system. It is, therefore, not necessary that I take your time to give any detailed statement as to reasons for the present price differential of 8½ cents per pound, or $42.50 per bale, which is enjoyed by foreign textile manufacturers in their competition with the domestic textile industry.

I would also hasten to point out that I believe that it is important to our economy that our cotton farmers continue to receive a fair price for the cotton which they produce upon their farms. I think it is equally important that we take the long-range view and try to protect the cotton farmer from

losses of his market in future years. If we confine our action to the picture as it exists today and disregard the future, we will not have served either the farmer or the public generally in a very commendable fashion.

Already your subcommittee has had testimony from economists and other interested parties giving you statistical data with reference to the failure of cotton fiber to keep pace with the growth and use which has been experienced in the use of manmade synthetic fibers. You have had testimony which is uncontradictable setting forth the reasons that there has been a great acceleration in the use of these manmade synthetic fibers in the production of many end products which were formerly produced entirely from cotton fiber.

Let me first deal with the matter of the future of the cotton farmer as it relates itself to the question of eliminating the two-price cotton system.

On November 13, 1961, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, in a letter to the President of the United States, recommended that the President request the U.S. Tariff Commission to make an immediate investigation, under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, with reference to the effect of the two-price cotton system upon the cotton programs being carried out under the supervision of the Secretary. I know that no one would even suggest that the Secretary of Agriculture in making this request was speaking as a representative of industry. It is abundantly clear that his concern was for the future of the American cotton farmer. His request to the President was made solely with the view of serving what he deemed to be the best interest of our cotton agricultural economy.

In his letter the Secretary pointed out that the programs and operations for upland and long-staple cotton which were being threatened by the two-price system included our price support programs, acreage allotment, marketing quota program, and the export subsidy program for cotton and cotton products.

The Secretary pointed out that during 1961 525,500 bales of cotton were used to manufacture cotton textiles imported into the United States and that this was a new high. He further pointed out that for the 5-year period ending in 1960 there had been an average annual rate increase of 69,000 bales of cotton imported into the United States in the form of cotton textiles.

It was also interesting to note that Secretary Freeman found that the aggregate mill consumption of cotton in the United States had shown a decline in the average of about 29.3 pounds of cotton per person in the 1946–55 period to about 23.9 pounds per person in the period between 1956 and 1960 and that imports of cotton textiles had increased from about the equivalent of 0.5 pound per person in 1955 to approximately 1.4 pounds per person in 1960. These findings by the Department of Agriculture properly alarmed them with reference to the future of the cotton programs heretofore enacted by the Congress.

Related to this problem and its threat to the farmer is the rapid growth in the total textile output of goods made of synthetic fibers. Wherever possible, textile mills have been shifting into the use of synthetic fibers or blends of such fibers with cotton in such a manner as to turn their spindles and looms away from cotton textile productions. This has been done for several reasons, but primarily because of the price situation. Of course, there has been a great deal more attention given to research and development and promotion of synthetic fabrics than has been given to cotton fabric. Another factor which enters into this shift to synthetics is the uniformity and quality of the synthetic fiber as compared to the lack of uniformity in cotton, together with a predictable source of supply at predictable price rates in a manner not enjoyed by industry when dealing with cotton.

I am told by many of our manufacturers that in recent years this item of quality of cotton fiber has been a major consideration with them in the operation of their plants. Within the past few days members of the textile community have told me that it is most difficult to find cotton grown in the eastern part of the United States which measures up to the requirements for the production of fine-combed yarns. They attribute this to a multiplicity of factors. Some of these factors are the production by the farmer with the view of producing quantity rather than quality because of our supported price situation; the use of mechanical pickers and subsequent overginning of cotton; and the weather elements which always enter into the cotton-producing experience of our farmers. These are problems which do not face the producer of synthetic fiber who can bring forth his production with chemical processes under fully regulated climatic and plant facilities.

So, the cotton farmer today is threatened in his domestic market by the rapid growth of the synthetic fiber industry with its advantage in price, quality, and convenience.

The legislation that the committee has under consideration would approach this price differential problem by an additional subsidy which would reflect itself ultimately in the price paid by the domestic textile manufacturer for the cotton fiber which he processes in his plant. Candor compels me to state that from my contact with industry people that they do not feel that they should be paid a direct subsidy at the expense of the taxpayers. Their reasoning, in my judgment, is sound when they say that they do not want to be accused of seeking a direct subsidy for themselves when they have no responsibility for creating the situation which makes an artifical price equalization program necessary. They correctly aver that the two-price system results from the action of our Government in placing artifical prices upon domestically grown cotton through the price support program at such a level as to make our American cotton sell at such prices as to remove it from competition in the world market with foreign-grown cotton. They contend that it was not by any action on their part that the price of American cotton has reached the level at which it has become necessary for our Government to place a price on our cotton in the foreign market place at a level of 8½ cents per pound or $42.50 per bale cheaper than the same American cotton may be bought by an American manufacturer.

The American cotton textile manufacturer, however, does take the position that he should be permitted to purchase American-grown cotton at the same price that the same can be purchased by a foreign textile manufacturer. He further feels that it is the obligation of his Government to bring about this result and that this should be done in such way as not to have a direct subsidy paid by the Government into the hands of the textile manufacturer and subject him to the accusation of taking a handout from his Government. Basically, gentlemen, I believe that it is the attitude of our American textile people that they are entitled to be dealt with equitably and fairly by their own Government. So long as the price differential in the raw material which they use in their plants exists by reason of Government action, equity and justice will not have been meted out to this important segment of our economy.

I would also like to present for your consideration another contention which I do not believe has been presented to this committee in connection with its consideration of the problem of two-price cotton. This relates to the effect that it would have upon the pocketbook of the American taxpayer.

I know that there are those who apprehend that the subsidy approach encompassed in the bills now under consideration would constitute an excessive burden on the American taxpayer. I believe, however, that it can accurately be said that when we talk in terms of subsidy from the taxpayers that we are engaging in illusory conversation. This is true for the reason that it seems logical that a reduction in the cost of cotton to the American mills to the extent of 3½ cents a pound would result in a substantial price reduction in the end product which is purchased by the American consumer. In fact, when profit margins are considered in the various stages of manufacture and distribution, the reduction in raw cotton prices of 8½ cents per pound could result in savings to the consumer equal to 17 cents per pound, or in excess of $700 million annually.

You will no doubt immediately ask how this is possible. Consider with me some of the basic facts which lead to this conclusion.

The cotton textile industry is one of the most competitive industries in America. A study of mill margin reports over a period of years indicates that the price of cotton tends to follow closely trends in the price of market cotton. Any reduction in the price of raw cotton would be reflected in reduced raw material costs to processers of cotton textile products and would ultimately pass on to the consumer. In the industry there is a tendency for a savings at an early stage in the productive and distributive process which is magnified on an absolute basis through later stages, resulting in the maintenance of a more or less constant percentage price.

During the early stages of a reduction in raw cotton prices this reduced cost of the end product to the ultimate consumer would not, in my judgment, dramatically present itself. This is because of a general tendency of prices to remain at a certain level pending the industrywide experience of reduced production costs to the extent necessary to make the normal competitive practices come into play. You can well understand that this delayed action, insofar as price reduction to the ultimate consumer is concerned, would be a natural experience because of the considerable period of time involved between the opening of the bale of cotton and its being converted into yarn, and then fabric, and then cut and sewed into wearing apparel, and then going into the retail market. In the case of wearing apparel this could vary from 3 to 8 months from the opening of the bale until the date that the apparel is placed on the retail counter. So, when I project the thought that the ultimate consumer—the American taxpayer—would realize a saving in excess of the so-called subsidy, I would want you to understand that I am not predicting that it would be an overnight occurrence.

As a basis for this projection I would point out that in the years 1958–61 approximately 4.2 billion pounds of raw cotton was consumed in the United States. Of this total 0.6 billion pounds went into industrial goods, and 3.6 billion pounds went into consumer goods, including 1 billion pounds for home furnishings and 0.4 billion pounds for other consumer-type products. Experts estimate that a reduction of 5 cents per pound in the production of raw cotton would result in a minimum saving to ultimate consumers in nonindustrial goods of $180 million per year. These same people state that in their judgment the savings to the ultimate consumer of industrial fabrics would be even greater and that it would probably amount to $30 million per year as a minimum. They state

that as a broad overall figure that it can be assumed that the percentage of markup on the value of goods moving through manufacturing and distributive channels beyond the stage of first consumption of cotton can be taken as approximately 100 percent. This would mean that while the savings to the ultimate American consumer flowing from a 5-cent-per-pound reduction in raw cotton would eventually be a minimum of $210 million per year that the more probable figure is $420 million per year.

Based upon an estimate that the saving to the consumer resulting from each 1-cent-per-pound reduction in the price of raw cotton would amount to $84 million in the United States and that the saving can be estimated on the most conservative possible basis at no less than $42 million a year, it appears that it is probable that a reduction of 8½ cents per pound would bring to the ultimate consumers in America a saving of $714 million.

If these projections from expert observers are at all accurate, it is readily apparent that in the final analysis the American taxpayer will be benefited rather than burdened by the equalization of the price which he pays for cotton with that paid by his foreign competitor.

Another benefit that would no doubt flow from elimination of the two-price cotton system would be the improvement of our competitive situation in the world market for finished yarns and fabrics of the type having a high cotton content. As you no doubt know, coarse carded yarns and cotton fabrics made of that type yarn have a high cotton content which means that the ultimate price of this type product is more greatly influenced by the price of cotton than is true in fine combed yarns and products made of that type yarn. American manufacturers of these types of textile products have particularly felt the cutthroat competition from foreign textile manufacturers, and the elimination of the price differential of 8½ cents per pound on cotton would open up new foreign markets for our domestic manufacturers because of the ability that they would then have to meet the lower cost of foreign-produced yarn and fabric. Generally such foreign-made products are quoted in America at approximately 10 cents per pound lower than domestic prices. The 8½ cent per pound reduction in the cost of cotton to the American manufacturer, together with the loss resulting from waste, would make the American manufacturer more nearly competitive on the foreign market and would clearly make him competitive with the foreign producer in the American market.

It is apparent that once we have attained this goal of unquestioned competitive equality for the American textile market and possible competitive opportunity for the foreign textile market, we will see a greater demand for the product of our cotton farmers and at the same time will be creating American jobs for our own people.

Mr. Chairman, there are so many aspects of this problem that I would like to discuss with this subcommittee, but out of consideration for others who have come here to testify I do not feel that I should consume more of your time. Let me conclude, however, with the expression of my sincere hope and the hope of the people that I am privileged to represent, that this committee will act with real dispatch in bringing out legislation which will bring about equality of opportunity for our American industry and the people who earn their livelihoods in the American textile industry insofar as cotton pricing problems are concerned.

I have said that I hope you will act with dispatch because this is essential. You gentlemen are familiar with the devastating effect that the uncertainty of the course of action which the Congress will take has brought about at all levels of the cotton industry. Cotton purchases have been limited by industry to the bare minimum, and the purchase of finished textile products by the customers of the mills are being held at a minimum awaiting the outcome of the matter which you are considering today. Mills are already curtailing because of this condition. Certain types of textile products are becoming more difficult to buy because of this uncertainty. For these and other reasons with which you are familiar I believe it is imperative that we give to the American people an answer on this question at the earliest possible date.

In closing I express to you again my deep appreciation for your willingness to hear me today in my effort to present to you the need, as I see it, for legislation eliminating the unfavorable differential which has been forced upon our domestic textile industry.

Thank you.

## America's Answer—A Commonsense Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the great executives of the shipping industry, Mr. George Killion, has presented a most thought-provoking expression of views on the American economy and the resurgent national interest in foreign trade.

Mr. Killion's views are contained in the December 1962 issue of the Industrial News Review. In this article the point is made that the merchant marine of the United States will have a prominent role in the future economic progress of our great Nation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD this significant article entitled, "America's Answer—A Commonsense Market."

The article is as follows:

AMERICA'S ANSWER—A COMMONSENSE MARKET

(By George Killion)

Not for a century and a half has the future of America been so unpredictable as it is now. As we struggled simultaneously to conquer a frontier and to form a nation, it would have taken a bold and prophetic eye to envision the industrial giant and the economic marvel we were to become.

By the combined grace of geography and of an enterprising cast of mind and character, we had become by the early part of this century the world's foremost economic power. Our success was not then primarily due to our foreign trade, but to the almost incredible growth and development of our internal market.

For most of the last half century, however, our economic growth and our prosperity have been dependent upon our foreign trade. About 10 percent of our manufactures are sold abroad, about 8 percent of our goods consumed come from abroad. This is the sensitive 10th of our economy. Without it, we stagnate; with a vigorous and growing foreign trade, the whole Nation prospers. We can no longer build a wall, of customs duties or of prejudices, about our shores. Our economy must draw nourishment from abroad.

We are no longer the unquestioned economic masters of the world. Our gross national product, that handy, stylized index of how a nation is getting along in this world, is increasing at the rate of about 3 percent a year. That of Europe is increasing at the rate of 6 percent; that of Japan at 7 percent; and so far as we can tell that of Soviet Russia at a rate of about 5 percent.

A few years ago we had a statistical consolation. A war-ravaged economy, with a low industrial base, would naturally register a larger percentage growth as its recovery progressed. We have outlived an easy statistical rationalization. I suggest that we must start from the premise, however novel and however disquieting, that along with the United Kingdom we represent in this year 1962 one of the less dynamic of the major industrial areas.

THE CHALLENGES

Who are our competitors, and what are their challenges?

First, there is Soviet Russia. It has a vast internal market with great natural resources, about three times the extent of the United States and with a third more population. It operates with a ruthlessness we can never match. In terms of purchasing power its best paid workers would come up only to about the level of our minimum wage laws. Its products are sold abroad at prices which reflect not their costs but the tactics and strategy of economic and political warfare.

We should not stand in dread of this competition. We have the greater assets of individual decision, of the flexible adaptability of the profit economy, and of free workers. But let none believe that we don't have a hard and rocky road ahead.

Second, there is Japan. Their natural resources are negligible, unless one includes in this category their wonderfully perservering, shrewd, and enlightened people. They are able, almost without effort it seems, to match the best of Western innovation, efficiency, and daring and to mask it disarmingly behind the centuries-old graces and dignity of the Orient.

Finally, and probably most formidable of all, we face that vigorous young giant, the Common Market of Europe. Taken together, the seven countries have, even before the entry of the United Kingdom, the largest population of any of the industrial powers. It is a skilled, educated, and civilized population which has been endowed by the Common Market not with the languid spirit of an aged civilization but with the bursting, ambitious drive of a newly expanded and newly invigorated economy.

Dr. Robert R. Dockson, Dean of the Graduate School of Business Administration at the University of Southern California, recently told the Pacific Coast Association of Port Authorities that in the next 13 years the United States must double or triple its exports if "the private enterprise system is to remain predominantly private."

How well equipped are we, at home and abroad, to hold our own?

THE OBSTACLES

We still have, in the ranks of government, industry, and commerce, vigorous leaders who have in their blood the inherited vigor of the frontier and the daring of the 19th century. We have a freedom of business decision which is, much as some may from time to time denounce Washington and all its works, probably greater than any of our great competitors and incomparably greater that that of the Soviet business-government bureaucracy.

We have also some major obstacles to overcome, and they can be overcome. Probably most of our obstacles come down to the question of price. There aren't many areas left where we can sell products simply

and solely because they are American made. By and large, the American exports are no longer the world's cheapest. We have no longer a near-monopoly on the economics of mass production. We have, to be brutally frank about it, in many areas a high-wage and high-cost industrial and commercial structure where either the ingenuity of the machinemakers, or our ability to put their machines to efficient use, has lagged behind the constantly mounting wage bill. The wages of the Japanese and the Russian worker are about equal; the European worker is almost twice that amount, and the American rate is about double that of the European.

High wages make for healthier, happier, and better people. They make also for expanded markets and active economies. But there is an obvious limit. If we are not to price ourselves out of the world markets, our high wage rates must go along with prices equal to or lower than those of our competitors.

This is not impossible. This country has for many decades typically produced the cheapest product with the highest paid labor. That has been due to two things, the ingenuity, scale and efficiency of our mechanical plant and the enterprise of our managers. Both, from quite divergent sources, are endangered today.

In our Nation today automation is in many areas limited not by the ingenuity of the engineers nor the capital of the investors but instead by the attitude of labor. It is human and perhaps natural that the union leaders should try to drive out, by frontal assault or by costly conditions, the machines which will cost jobs in his plant. But somehow they have got to learn that high wages, in a worldwide market, are based only upon major reliance on machinery. Somehow they have got to learn that full employment can be reached only by making the economy thrive, only by joining with industry in making production improvements so that the plant can continue and so pave the way for the creation of different jobs and more jobs in other fields in our economic civilization.

Business does not ask the impossible of labor. John Lewis has brought the coal worker from the bottom to the top of the wage brackets by fighting for the maximum of mechanization. He has half the number of coal miners paying dues, but they are well-paid and contented men. Many other examples, most especially in the oil refining and aluminum industries, can be found. But these are, by and large, the exception rather than the rule.

The second major deterrent to effective American competition seems to be found in the ranks of management rather than of labor. It is much less tangible and just possibly much more dangerous.

I refer to the organization man, to the conformist, and to his company's policy. To an increasing degree we demand of our junior, and sometimes even of our senior executives, not only that they do the right kind of job but that they live in the right kind of house, drive the right kind of car, marry the right kind of wife, read the right kind of books, wear the same distinctive kind of clothes, and play the right kind of games.

It would not be so bad if the young men of today were in rebellion against the neat and tidy pattern of the company life. But vast numbers seem to welcome it. When a youngster of 22 asks about the company's retirement plan before he takes his first job, quite likely he is going to be a docile man around the office but he is never going to lead the company, or any part of it, to new and greater heights of accomplishment.

We need daring, nonconforming minds. We need men who believe individual enterprise means doing something on their own, not just lower taxes or fewer antitrust suits. We need men who will take risks, who will do new things. Where are we going to find them if we will hire and promote only those who fit tidily into the company pattern? Where, if we grow up a race of pensioneers, will business find the new thoughts and the bold innovations which have in the past made business prosperous and the Nation great?

THE SHIPPING INDUSTRY

Now let me get down to particulars, in the industry I know best and the one which is an essential part of almost every export or import transaction.

The shipping industry is a sizable one. The U.S. merchant marine employs more than 200,000 in seafaring, shoreside, and shipbuilding jobs—54,000 seamen, 72,000 longshoremen, 52,000 shipyard workers, 24,000 office workers. The merchant marine's total contribution to the national economy is estimated at $5,300 million annually.

In a speech last August, Donald W. Alexander, Maritime Administrator, U.S. Department of Commerce, told the Propeller Club of the Port of Los Angeles-Long Beach that our active merchant fleet today numbers about 900 oceangoing ships. Nearly 1,900 other vessels are located in reserve fleet anchorages around the country. He then pointed to the rising curve of the Soviet shipping offensive, which will bring its deadweight tonnage to within 2 million tons of ours in less than 3 years, and will surpass ours in less than 10 years. He then ascribed our shipping decline in large part to what he considered "poor labor-management relations," and warned that "unless there is improvement in this area there will, in the foreseeable future, be no American merchant marine at all."

U.S. foreign commerce has more than doubled during the past 10 years, from 65 million tons in 1950 to 155 million tons in 1960. Yet during this decade the share of that doubled foreign commerce carried by the U.S.-flag merchant fleet has dwindled to less than half of what it was immediately following the end of the Korean war. It dropped from 28 percent to a mere 11 percent. Today, U.S.-flag ships carry 16 percent of the export trade and only 8 percent of the imports of the United States.

Also decreasing has been the number of ships available under the U.S. flag. Since 1954 the decline has been about 22 percent.

One would expect that as the fleet declined, the number of active seafaring personnel who derive their livelihood from sailing U.S.-flag ships would decline in approximately the same ratio. But this is not so.

Since 1954, the number of active seafaring personnel has increased by about 8 percent. An 8-percent increase in the face of a 22-percent decrease in the number of ships that needed manning. In terms of the ratio of the number of seamen to the deadweight tonnage of the U.S. flag merchant fleet, it has since 1954 risen from something less than 3.5 men per 1,000 deadweight tons to 4.5 men per 1,000 deadweight tons.

This may be illustrated perhaps more concretely by the fact that the west coast U.S.-flag privately owned merchant fleet has decreased in the number of vessels during the past decade from close to 300 ships to a little over 100. Yet at the same time, the number of seamen employed on each ship has increased from 50 to 61, an increase in manning of 22 percent.

It should be clear from these figures that as ships have been driven out of service by the heavy cost-price squeeze, seamen have been effective in artificially maintaining work opportunity and even in forcing expanded manning of the remaining ships in the fleet. Wages, including fringe benefits, paid to seamen who man the U.S. ships sailing from Pacific coast ports, have risen at twice the rate of the increases in the Consumer Price Index. They have risen at a rate 50 percent greater than the index of general freight rates in the Pacific West-Bound Conference.

Wages, including fringe benefits, paid to longshoremen on both the east coast and the west coast have nearly doubled in this same period. While national productivity has gone up 31 percent, longshore productivity has dropped 14 percent.

In contrast with most onshore industries a generation ago, and with many today, our wage costs can't be absorbed by the economies of a more efficient factory. There is today almost nothing to choose in the way of efficiency of operation between a foreign and an American-built ship. Yet there is a very great deal to choose in the way of the price of the vessels. The costs of shipbuilding in the United States are the highest in the world. Since 1950 the costs of acquiring a ship have increased 65 percent.

Because freight rates must be kept competitive on an international basis, whereas wages must be kept competitive on a domestic basis, those of us in international commerce find ourselves bound to a sort of two-way procrustean bed: stretched out to fit labor's demands, cut off short to meet competition.

It is highly doubtful, and sad to contemplate, that we would have any American-flag ships sailing in our foreign commerce today if it were not for our subsidy program and our cargo preference laws.

THE STEPS THAT MUST BE TAKEN

First. We can no longer afford to put aside automation and any other mechanical or procedural road to efficient operations. We should of course make generous provision for displaced workers, but neither the Nation nor they can afford to have our industrial machine build unnecessary work into the price of our products.

Mr. Stanley Powell, president of Matson Navigation Co. of San Francisco, recently said:

"Our studies reveal that the average C–3 freighter now requiring a crew of 51 can be operated safely and efficiently with a crew of 15. And without developing any new technologies or equipment. What's more, the capital investment for such a conversion would not be large. Our studies have also shown that an orderly and economically attractive procedure can be developed to alleviate the burden on the unions involved."

If we could operate our C–3 freighters with 15 men, we would be competitive with any foreign vessel, and I dare say to the delight of our Government and taxpayers.

The unions must be made to recognize that the choice is between all 51 men losing their work or, eventually, having them employed on several vessels. We can sail three ships with competitive costs where we now sail one and may in a few years sail none.

Second. We must have a machinery to permit settlement of basic and critical labor-management disputes. These, incidentally, are to an increasing degree arising out of labor-saving proposals of management which are most bitterly resisted by many of the unions. We are in a world market, and ground so lost can never be regained.

Senator Butler at the last session of the Congress introduced S. 3511 which would permit, when all other alternatives were exhausted, compulsory arbitration of off-shore maritime labor disputes. The west coast steamship industry, which had by then been battered by three strikes within a year, gave it their unanimous support.

Third. We must re-think our anti-trust laws. When the Sherman Act was passed in 1890, and the Clayton Act in 1914, our markets and our economy were essentially domestic. A near monopoly, or a trade com-

bination, in the domestic market gained powers which would not be limited by foreign competition.

Consolidation and integration of separate units tend to increase efficiency and to lower costs. In areas where there is intensive foreign competition, this sort of efficiency should be encouraged and not prosecuted.

Fourth. Let us recruit and train our young executives so that we reward the innovator, the man who builds new roads to travel, and give to our stereotyped young organization men the dim, gray and modest careers many seem to want. We need boldness and initiative, not simply inoffensiveness. We are not going to keep our customers, and certainly we are not going to win new markets, simply because our top executives play a good game of golf at the right clubs.

TWO STEPS ALREADY TAKEN

The 87th Congress has within the past few months taken two gigantic steps toward a realization of our national goal of a resurgent foreign trade.

The first is President Kennedy's trade expansion program. It embarks us firmly on the course of greatly increasing our foreign trade, not stagnating behind immovable tariff barriers. It gives us the tools by which we can in many areas work out an effective partnership with the enormously important European Common Market.

The second is the Communications Satellite Act of 1962. It represents the beginnings of what might be a bright and brilliant future. The Congress has now opened the way for this country to achieve what should be a permanent leadership of the world in global communication. It has done so, what is more, in a fashion that gives appropriate recognition both to the advantages of private enterprise and to the regulatory responsibilities of the Government.

CONCLUSION

We are going to need the most thoughtful analysis and the most vigorous action of which we are capable. Given that, surely the world can erect no barrier to a resurgent American economy. The American merchant marine, whose own life depends upon that success, will do all that it can to aid, to work and cooperate, in fighting for the economic progress of our great Nation.

## Little People to Little People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, the young son and namesake of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, PETER W. RODINO, has already evidenced outstanding qualities of mind and heart that bespeak a brilliant future for him. Young Peter III, troubled by today's bitterly divided world, conceived the idea for a little-people-to-little-people organization that would increase the contacts and cooperation between and among children all over the world. Peter has pursued his goal of a better world with tenancity, undaunted by the pessimism of older folks who would let the obstacles in the way overcome their will and determination to secure peace with justice and liberty for all. Not Peter—he knows that all great achievements in all ages have been great precisely because they had seemed beyond our reach. Who can measure the influence for good that young Peter and his children's crusade will exert through the years ahead?

Among those who have recognized the value of young Peter's work is the illustrious organization, UNICO National, which presented him with an award on January 2, 1963, at the Newark UNICO meeting. Prof. Hugo W. Senerchia, past national president, delivered a brilliant speech on the occasion that will be of interest to all Members. I commend UNICO for its wisdom in selecting for this signal honor "this youthful crusader for international understanding." As Professor Senerchia stated:

If we share in his vision for world peace through the mobilization of young hearts, we too shall hope for a better tomorrow.

Professor Senerchia's full remarks follow:

PRESENTATION OF AWARD TO PETER RODINO III AT NEWARK UNICO MEETING, JANUARY 2, 1963

(By Hugo W. Senerchia)

In all the years UNICO has been presenting awards, the reasons for such recognition have been as diverse as the personalities of the recipients. They have been honored for exceptional bravery, for their generous gifts to worthy causes or simply because they exemplify those noble qualities we all admire so much as they struggled to overcome adversities to attain success in their fields of endeavor. As for the recipients themselves, they have always been adults with years of worldly experience, and with different religious and ethnic elements that are found in our democracy. But no matter how richly deserved and meritorious their achievements have been, none of them can parallel the significance of the award and of the recipient we honor tonight.

Tonight we place in the UNICO spotlight for honor and public commendation, a 10-year-old boy. He has done nothing heroic or sensational such as rescuing someone from drowning; his youth obviously does not carry the weight of worldly experience. Nevertheless, he has conceived an idea that bespeaks of the wisdom of the ages; his magnificent and tremendous idea embraces the community of the whole world. An idea of such universal proportion is in itself remarkable, but that it should be conceived in the mind of a 10-year-old boy is astounding.

With the innocence and the simplicity of a child's heart, he penetrated the knotty problems that beset the world today to arrive at a solution. If youngsters of all countries could unite in mutual understanding and hope for peace, their protest against war could be an important beginning for the avoidance of war. With this in mind, he wrote a letter to Khrushchev and one to President Kennedy.

What shall we say of young Peter's little-people-to-little-people's program? We certainly cannot dismiss it as too visionary or impracticable, or as a child's fanciful dream or a passing whim. It strikes a responsive chord in our hearts because we too feel the same need and desire for peace through better understanding. But because we are oppressed with a superior knowledge of the frailties and the deceptions of human nature, we remain timid and silent.

Hope in survival against the forces of nature and against the greed and stupidity of man has grown painfully slow through history. Many times hope has yielded to cynicism and despair. And yet, because we have had apostles of faith and hope in human nature, man has survived. The rest of mankind lived like dwarfs on the shoulders of those giants.

Who can forget the fateful week in October when we hung perilously on the brink of destruction and chaos? There was fear, despair, and gloom as we recalled the annihilating consequences of an atomic war. One bomb alone, we were warned, could kill between 30 and 70 million. Many were ready to accept this doom as inevitable because faith and hope were regarded as useless and outmoded luxuries or myths.

When confronted with such a crisis, we can appreciate the significance of Peter's dream. When we stand in need of inspiration and renewal of faith in human values, we can find them in this youthful crusader for international understanding. If there will be a future and if men will learn to live in peace, they too will be like dwarfs living on the shoulders of this youthful giant.

Tonight, therefore, UNICO takes pride in honoring this young man who expresses our universal dream for peace. If we share in his vision for world peace through the mobilization of young hearts, we too shall hope for a better tomorrow.

## Address of Mayor Robert F. Wagner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, the manifold problems which confront the youth of America are nowhere as much in evidence on a broad scale as in the city of New York. The effort through the several agencies in the administration of Mayor Robert F. Wagner to cope with these problems is a matter of interest to all of our people who live in urban areas.

I believe the following address by Mayor Wagner pointing out many facets of youths' fitness will be of interest to my colleagues.

Under unanimous consent I insert the address in the Appendix of the RECORD.

REMARKS BY MAYOR ROBERT F. WAGNER AT MEETING OF ADVISORY COUNCIL OF PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY AND YOUTH CRIME

I am pleased to be at this meeting of the Advisory Council of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. I am particularly happy that the Council has chosen New York City for its first field meeting. We can benefit from your experience and observations, and I very much hope, vice versa. We do have the problem here, and a few of the answers. But all of us are still looking for the answers to the main questions.

Here, as all of you know, the city government provides an unprecedented variety of services to its citizens, especially in those humanitarian categories which can be labeled "human services."

In general, in my judgment, the quality, of the "human services" provided in our metropolitan communities and the manner in which we approach and handle our human problems, are among the great challenges of our time. I am referring to those

Government programs which are designed to achieve the following basic social purposes:

1. Education of the young.
2. Integration of minority groups into the life of the community.
3. The full development and utilization of our potential manpower, by the development of skills and aptitudes and their use without discrimination by reason of sex, race, color or creed.
4. The promotion and protection of the physical, mental and moral well-being of all our inhabitants.
5. The special care and comfort of the aged, the sick and the emotionally and mentally disturbed, and
6. Promotion of the constructive and restorative use of leisure time through exercise, instruction and cultural development.

The number and extent of governmental services in these categories, especially as they concern youth, has increased spectacularly, almost astronomically, within recent years, as I shall illustrate in a moment by fact and figure. Yet there is both pressure and need for a continued expansion in these services. But in my judgment the real touchstone of progress today lies in the quality of the services being rendered, as much as in the quantity and variety of them.

How greatly we strive, how deeply we resolve, and how well we succeed in raising this quality and in meeting the need will serve as a principal measure of what we who are engaged in government on the local level have been able to give to our times and our country.

We live in days full of tension and danger, but also of infinite promise. The depression of the thirties, the wars of the fourties and early fifties, the surge toward equality of Negroes and other peoples in the United States and throughout the world, the great migration of Americans from one part of the country to another, the fearsome danger of nuclear holocaust, these powerful forces have shaken and reshaped our lives. They are beyond the control of any municipal government, and in many ways beyond the control of even national governments.

The impact of these forces on the lives of children is even greater than on those of adults. This is a fact we sometimes overlook or fail to recognize. The young personality is far more vulnerable and sensitive to external impact. Generally we know this. Yet we sometimes seem to be surprised that the young should react so violently to the impact of the violent forces all around us. But this impact which can do enormous damage can also help develop enormous strength. There is evidence that both effects are being achieved today.

This is not the occasion further to discuss these factors or to weigh their impact. We know that the effects are there, and we believe that the basic factors I have mentioned have contributed to these effects and to the present problems.

In New York City, the government expends a major portion of its energies and income on and in behalf of the youth of this city. An analysis of our budget shows that the city government spends $100,000 annually, or we will this year, on social and educational services for our young people. Let me break this figure down into the classifications and the specialized undertakings which seek to give our services the quality I referred to a few moments ago.

The basic teaching process in the public schools has been under continuous improvements through the expansion of the size of staff and the quality of teachers and of the curriculum.

More than 6,000 additional teaching positions including 900 additional remedial reading teachers have been filled during the past 8 years. Teachers' salaries have been increased most substantially, a 75-percent increase in the minimum salary and a 60-percent increase in the maximum salary between 1953 and 1962.

In the public school system, there has been a growing emphasis on meeting the special problems of children coming from severely deprived backgrounds. Thus, the number of full-time guidance counsellors in the schools has been increased from 100 in 1955 to 600 during the current school year.

The higher horizons program, an innovation of the New York City school system, which is now being widely copied in many cities of the country, serves over 60,000 children in 76 schools.

Municipal recreation services have been substantially increased during the past decade; over 175 playgrounds, 250 community and recreation centers in schools and public housing projects have been added to the facilities previously available. It has been estimated that during the last 6 years the cost to the city for recreation serving all age groups has increased by approximately $10 million.

Social services for seriously troubled children and families have been expanded and intensified. The street-club project of the New York City Youth Board, which was in contact with 22 gangs in 1955, has been so greatly expanded that it now serves 250 of these groups.

Yes, the city government is engaged in a great many different youth activities through the schools and through many other public and semi-public agencies which I have not taken the time to mention.

This listing, however, and this citation of the total amount of money we are spending on youth does not in any way mean that we are satisfied with the amount or the quality of what we are doing. As I said at the very beginning of my remarks, we do not know the answers to the really tough questions about youth. In order to dig more deeply in the direction of these answers and to make our existing programs more effective, we have embarked within the year on a second major approach epitomized by the mobilization for youth project on the lower East Side. This will be followed next year by another major effort, in Harlem; Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited. These are area projects. In these areas we are attempting to find the ways not only to improve the educational training opportunities for low-income youth, but to give them better access to jobs; to enable them to find the jobs that they can do, and to train them for the jobs that they can find.

By raising the levels of opportunities for these young people, we are attempting to affect the root causes of delinquent behavior. We have also been trying to help forge a true partnership between the local voluntary agencies, the local population, the city government and a great university.

I am convinced that these demonstration projects hold forth great promise, and the role of this council and of the President's Committee has been of inestimable value in stimulating these and other innovations on a national scale.

At the same time, we are reviewing the proliferation of governmental youth services and their relationship to the organization of the city government itself. It is apparent to me, as I reflect on the activities of our complex municipal government, that it is becoming increasingly difficult to separate the planning and coordination of services from the other activities of government.

It is clear that the problems of different age levels are both interrelated and interdependent. The problems of juvenile delinquency cannot be separated from the problems of family life generally.

Mindful of this fact, we have been greatly concerned over the adequacy of the city's administrative machinery for planning and coordinating its mammoth efforts for children and youth. Hence, we have recently commissioned a thorough administrative review, by the Institute of Public Administration, of our machinery for the planning and coordination of youth services. We expect the report of this survey late this spring.

I see the need for greater emphasis on social planning in our metropolitan communities. We need fresh approaches to using our human resources, to unleashing the full potential within each individual for his own well-being and the welfare of the community. We may compare this need for social planning to the recognition a generation ago of the need to establish machinery for urban planning. In order to face current social problems, we need to define basic goals, arrange priorities and evaluate our efforts.

I said that New York City's direct expenditure for its children and youth is $1,100 million. Of this sum, almost $300 million is spent for children who need special kinds of care because of handicaps, dependency, delinquency, or neglect. The balance is spent as part of the general educational, recreational, and cultural services of the city government. In the past 7 years, expenditures for financial assistance and rehabilitation services have increased by $140 million. Our costs for the care and treatment of narcotic addicts, for example, have increased manifold in this period; our expenditures for casework and related services have increased fourfold, from $8 million in 1955 to $31 million currently.

These expenditures constitute a great proportion of our total expenditures for youth. Moreover and unfortunately, we have found that these expenditures are not self-reducing. They do not reduce the size of the problem. Instead, there is a constant pressure to increase these expenditures. This diverts funds from more fundamental undertakings.

Today we clearly realize that we must devote increasing energies to creating new jobs and to training our young people in new skills, and to breaking down the barriers of discrimination. Unless we do this, we will be compelled to meet the steadily mounting costs of public assistance, rehabilitation services, and of police activity. This pattern has become increasingly clear. Let us hope that this pattern may be reversed by an increase in communitywide social planning for the creation of better social conditions which will, in the end, greatly reduce both the human and financial costs of social and economic maladjustment.

I believe this to be among the truths which we must take into consideration in our further spending and working on the youth problem.

Recognizing these truths, the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime has given strong support to comprehensive planning, but with a neighborhood focus. This, of course, is what the mobilization for youth is all about. I believe that the time is approaching to consider broadening these planning efforts. We must look at the problem and plan for the attack on the problem on a citywide basis, and also on a nationwide basis, even while we continue to seek ways to mobilize neighborhood energies for the attack on the neighborhood problem.

For this broader social planning approach, we will need the experience and dedication of the voluntary agencies as well as the objectivity and scientific skills of our academicians. We must make it possible for all to work together, and not, as in separate worlds.

We must be ready to move in new directions and to follow untrodden paths. We must be willing to follow any course of action which holds promise, no matter how unorthodox.

What is at stake is not just the welfare of a few maladjusted, socially disadvantaged individuals, but the welfare and fate of all our children and of our country and the world whose destiny will one day be guided by the emerging generation.

## With the Boy Scouts, Character Counts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, the week of February 7 through February 13 marks the 53d anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America. An organization incorporated in 1910, chartered by the U.S. Congress in 1916, with the President of the United States as honorary president, and dedicated to the development of good citizenship among the rising generation, is an organization which we as a nation proudly salute.

The young people of our great country are today, as in the past, faced with the task of preparing themselves to meet an uncertain future, one which holds many grave responsibilities and duties, both private and public; many opportunities, rights and privileges, both those granted by law and those gained through individual initiative. Perhaps never before in the history of our democratic process have the meeting of these responsibilities, and the utilization and exercise of these opportunities and rights been so necessary to the perpetuation of the doctrines and beliefs upon which this country is founded. The Boy Scouts of America is an organization in the finest American tradition. It teaches the values of both responsibility and opportunity.

The principles underlying the Boy Scouts' activities and practices are framed to develop character, intelligence, skill, handicraft, physical, mental and moral health, self-care and reliance, and the practice of service for others. The efficient individual becomes an asset to his community and in turn to his Nation.

The thousands of men and women who have contributed countless hours to perpetuate the teachings of the movement deserve our respect and gratitude, for without their tireless efforts, the high ideals and purposes set down in the charter would not be fully met. The feeling of belonging to a group is a basic need in every young boy, and the competition, group activity, firm and able leadership offered to a Scout do much to meet this need. It is therefore not surprising that where the scouting movement is strong and vigorous, the amount of juvenile delinquency is proportionately less.

The Explorer Scout has a code by which he tries to live. It is a code from which every American might profit:

I believe that America's strength lies in her trust in God and in the courage and strength of her people.

I will, therefore, be faithful in my religious duties and will maintain a personal sense of honor in my own life.

I will treasure my American heritage and will do all I can to preserve and enrich it.

I will recognize the dignity and worth of my fellow men and will use fairplay and good will in dealing with them.

I will acquire the Exploring attitude that seeks the truth in all things and adventure on the frontiers of our changing world.

## Private Initiative Wins Foreign Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, so often, in the constantly increasing whirl of public activity and government involvement, we overlook the important role being played by countless voluntary private efforts to help those less fortunate, here and abroad. One such effort has taken place in Sussex County, N.J., within the confines of my district.

Two young missionaries, Joe and Jeri Blakeslee, son and daughter-in-law of Mr. and Mrs. Jacob Blakeslee, of Halsey, N.J., have been serving unselfishly in the Amazon jungle reaches of Ecuador. A mission school has been established among the Indians, but a need was recognized also in relation to the task of making a living from the soil. For this reason, friends and neighbors of the Blakeslees in Sussex County organized a Mission to Ecuador Tractor Fund Committee, to buy a tractor and equipment for use in the jungle environs.

The contributions and efforts have been rewarded with the shipment and arrival of the tractor in Ecuador, at the seaport of Guayaquil. Joe Blakeslee and two other drivers took the tractor on a truck over the Andes Mountains. From there, the Ecuadorian air force, free of charge, made three trips with the dismantled tractor to the mission area.

We can only speculate on the good will, as well as the good works, springing up from this voluntary effort by private American citizens, but there can be no doubt as to its existence. The following article from the November 25, 1962, edition of the New Jersey Sunday Herald gives further details on this inspiring activity:

The young missionaries have been in Ecuador for just about a year now, and are slowly making progress in their endeavors to bring a better way of life to the Aucas, the seminomadic Indians there. With the Blakeslees is their young daughter, Jill, who is 16 months old.

In his letters home, Joe refers with deep feeling to the people back home who made the gift of the tractor possible. With it, the backbreaking work of carving farmland out of the jungle is eased for the missionaries and the Indians.

The mission project is based on the belief that, with civilization encroaching on the Amazon jungle, these people will be pushed to the bottom of the social and economic ladder unless they can wrest a living from the soil. This will, in turn, make it increasingly difficult for the Indian to have a strong church and evangelize his people.

The Blakeslees have established a school for the missionary children, with a teacher who is a widow from Indiana. She has seven students in grades 3 to 6, each on a different level, a situation she considers quite a challenge. Joe is also learning—in turn teaching—the art of butchering.

MEMORIES OF HOME

About a month ago, he wrote that Gene Hawk, the mission-building foreman, had returned from a visit to Sussex County, where he spoke in Lafayette. Among the contents of the barrels he took back with him were such things as a meat slicer, grinder, and lard press which, Joe's letter said, "we used to use at home. I confess * * * I felt a little homesick."

He has also written that a film is being made showing the great spiritual strides made by the Aucas, and that a 20- to 30-minute silent film of the work at his base will soon be available. Any interested group in Sussex County may make arrangements to use the film, when it is received here, by calling Mrs. J. A. Blakeslee, DU 3-4537; Mrs. Alfred Snook, DU 3-4241, or the Reverend Carl Luthman, DU 3-4451.

The fund committee here in Sussex County met this past week to hear a report on the project. A total of $700 was received for the fund this month, leaving $3,300 still due on the note. A committee spokesman said "We hope you will remember this project when making your special thanks offering this holiday season."

## Civil Rights and the Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Center for Study of Democratic Institutions recently held its 10th anniversary convocation at the Americana Hotel in New York City. Leaders from all over the world attended and many fine analyses were presented under the subject "Challenges to Democracy in the Coming Decade." Among these was an address by the Honorable Robert F. Kennedy, entitled "Civil Rights and the Cold War." As we read his speech, I am reminded what James Baldwin has said, "Great men have done great things here and will again, and we can make America what America must become."

Under unanimous consent I insert the speech in the Appendix of the RECORD.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND THE COLD WAR BY HON. ROBERT F. KENNEDY

First, I want to congratulate President Hutchins and the Board for Directors of the Fund for the Republic for the imagination and the initiative that have gone into the preparation of this 10th anniversary program, Challenges to Democracy in the Coming Decade.

Secondly, I wish to express my appreciation for being asked to consider with you the question of individual rights and privileges in this troubled time. It is a time of hope as well as we have seen in recent months even days.

But bright as we believe the world could be, we must face it as it is, a world of nation states seeking public solutions to what are inherently personal questions. This is the dimension of the time we live in and which we call the cold war, a struggle very grand in scope but very personal in importance. For this reason an examination of those personal questions, the rights and interests of individual human beings is as timely as ever before.

Some of you may be familiar with the recent classroom scene in a Russian elementary school. A little boy, when asked to describe the United States, said, "The United States is a sad country where workers and peasants are starving under capitalist exploitation by the cynical ruling classes." "Correct," said the teacher, "and what is the major goal of the Soviet Union?"

"To catch up with the United States," was the sober reply.

Throughout our parallel histories, I believe the United States, as a whole, has lagged behind Russia in the exploitation of one class by another.

The comparison is an old one. De Toqueville concluded his treatise on America with these prophetic words:

"There are at the present time two great nations in the world which started from different points, I allude to Russia and America." "The principal instrument," of America he went on, is "freedom" and of Russia, "servitude."

"Their starting point is different and their courses are not the same; yet each of them seems marked out by the will of heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe."

In today's terms this may seem a generous oversimplification. We have only to look at the growing power of free Europe, or the snarling giant tiger that is Red China, or the awakened democracy of India, or the rising nations of Africa and Latin America, to know that there are other handholds on the globe, other forces capable of swaying its destiny. It would be quite wrong, and quite unlike a group such as the one assembled here, to become mesmerized by the present confrontation of the Soviet Union and the United States. Yet in this brief moment in time we can see some polarization of allegiance, some to the Communist way, some to the way of freedom.

This is the tug of the cold war. We should be excused if we venture the opinion we are winning. As the President said last week in his state of the Union message: Not a single 1 of the nearly 50 United Nations members to gain independence since the Second World War has succumbed to Communist control." In one case, a wall has gone up to prevent a great people from accepting the tug of freedom. History will record that while the Great Wall of Old China was built to keep barbarians out, this brooding ugliness by the Brandenburg gate was built to keep civilized people in. And men may speculate on the current Soviet proficiency in the high jump.

But overall, we are winning—Why? What is it we have that others will reach for, run for, die for? Surely, it is more than houses, cars, and dishwashers. Even communism, with some rearrangement of production priorities and a few other sacrifices by the new class, could provide these things. No, the attraction of the so-called materialist West is more a thing of mind than of matter. Why then do young foreign students become disaffected with Iron Curtain curriculums and seek out our consuls? What is it that brings tears to the eyes of new Americans as they take the oath of citizenship? What is it they sought? What is it men want? Isn't it freedom of conscience and action conditioned only by the legitimate needs of private and public security?

Our civil rights laws and actions are founded on that premise. No recitation of them should be necessary. Observance of them is entirely necessary. Encouraging lipservice is paid also in articles 124 and 125 of the Soviet Constitution to the principles of freedom of religion, speech, press, and assembly. But they have gone the way of many a New Year's resolution. The British have proved a constitution needn't be written. The Soviet have proved a constitution must be more than written.

This discussion deals primarily with the United States and the Soviet Union, not because we are the only nations involved, but because there is still some reason to believe we are the leaders respectively of the free and Communist worlds.

Our Bill of Rights, particularly in the first nine amendments, holds out a series of personal promises. The addition of the 14th amendment increased the commitment of the National Government to insure that those promises are kept. In most respects, our legislatures have followed with the greatest care the mandates implicit in the Bill of Rights and the 14th amendment. An independent judiciary has served well to correct misconstructions of those principles. And while the matters affected have ranged from freedom of speech and press to questions of search and seizure, and right to counsel, most of these protections were well established from our early times and are invoked today not at all with regard to their validity, which is certain, but to their vitality in a modern society.

But the matter which the very term "civil rights" brings most immediately to mind in our time is the position of the American Negro in American society and the treatment accorded him in all walks of life.

In this respect I would like to glance at the record.

For the headline hunter the violence at Mississippi has been the most noticeable event of the current period. The historian, however, will record the progress made, not only in the unflinching commitment of the Federal Government to civil rights, but more importantly, and more notably in the amount of voluntary compliance by southern officials and citizens in this area. For example, over the past year in voting—in 29 counties in Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana, officials have voluntarily made voting records available to us without need for court action.

In about 50 counties in the same States, discriminatory practices have been abandoned voluntarily, avoiding the need for suit.

Where voluntary action was not forthcoming, however, we have brought suit.

Under the 1957 Civil Rights Act, the Department of Justice has undertaken 32 suits and 82 voting record inspections.

In transportation: Discrimination of interstate travel has disappeared. Virtually all bus and rail terminals were desegregated in 1961 pursuant to ICC regulations sought by this administration. In 1962 we surveyed 165 airports and found 15 still segregated. All are now desegregated, 13 voluntarily and the other 2 after suit.

At present, the only such segregated facilities in the country are bus and rail terminals in Jackson, Miss., and there we took successful legal action, which is now on appeal.

In education: In 1962, 28 more southern school districts desegregated voluntarily and peacefully, many after consultation with the Department of Justice.

As Chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity in the Federal Government, Vice President JOHNSON pointed out in November that Negro employment in the Federal Government stood at 28,986 at grades GS–5 through GS–11, an increase of 18.3 percent over the previous years, although the increase in such job vacancies was only 4 percent.

In grade GS–12 through GS–18, the number of Negroes increased from 343 to 1,380—a 33.1-percent increase, as compared with a raise in the total number of such jobs of 7.8 percent. In the private sector 104 major national business firms have signed equal employment pledges under the plans for progress program.

The right to travel, to share public facilities and accommodations, together with the right to equal education, these rights have been given Federal impetus as never before, but again, more importantly, they have received wide public acceptance in a quiet, normal way that hasn't hit the headlines.

The President's order last November prohibiting discrimination in federally assisted housing, together with the actions of some 17 States and 55 cities barring discrimination in that area is a milestone on the march. And on this march the American Negro himself has walked well. Much depends on the scope and dignity of Negro leadership; and it is equal to the test.

The trail is long, we've crossed rough terrain; and there's more ahead, much more to do for the American Negro, the American Indian, the migrant worker, minorities yes, as the American people themselves a minority in this world.

Meanwhile, back in the Kremlin's shadow, what do we find? We find over 100 persons executed in the past year for economic crimes, most of them Jews. We find Christian faiths harassed and Christian peoples persecuted. We find a statement last year by Roman Rudenko, Soviet Public Prosecutor, that the very causes of crime in capitalist countries are absent in the Soviet Union. Then we find a complaint in Pravda that Muscovites removed daily without paying, 77,000 bus tickets from help-yourself dispensers. We find a law branding as treason any unauthorized departure from the country, and the unhappy story of a Jewish woman sentenced to be shot last February for "currency manipulation," after a prior 3-year sentence in Siberia for trying to escape to Israel, and long after seeing her two daughters murdered by the Nazis. And we find a 1961 commentary on lawyers in a Soviet paper as follows:

"There are two groups of lawyers—one: Modest, quiet, unobtrusive, who will acknowledge guilt (if his client is guilty) and refer to mitigating circumstances.

"The other, working with his vocal chords and elbows, even shedding some tears. His voice going through the whole courtroom, 'My client's arrest is due to a mistake.' When the case was retried at the public prosecutor's demand, the same man was found guilty when another lawyer took his defense."

Another unobtrusive lawyer no doubt. Save us from them.

What is the difficulty here? What's missing in communism's instant utopia?

An appreciation for the natural rights of man? I should think so. It suffers from an overdose of Marxism-Leninism and a deficiency of Lockism-Jeffersonism. It would benefit so much from just a little exposure to first amendment principles.

If freedom is to thrive in any corner of the world, there must be communication and a sense of law. There can be no meaningful discussion of civil rights until these concepts have been examined.

Turning first to communication, if our Constitution had followed the style of St. Paul, the first amendment might have concluded, "But the greatest of these is speech." In the darkness of tyranny, this is the key to the sunlight. If it is granted, all doors open. If it is withheld, none. But a truth unheard is as much a social force as a tree falling in the lonely forest is sound. Truly

free speech implies a guarantee of the right to listen, in passing, it was my impression that it was to prevent truth from going unrevealed that the center itself was established on Eucalyptus Hill. There's no such hill in Russia.

Those matters which a government tries to conceal from the outside world are guides to its personality, but what it would hide from its own people is a reflection of its character. Thus, the secret speech denouncing Stalin in 1956, hidden from the public, told as much about its authors as its subject. More recently, in the past year, mobs of angry people have tested the laws of many nations. We read about the Walloon-Flemish differences in Belgium, violence in Paris and Mississippi. But what did we hear of the wage and price riots in southern Russia—that left hundreds of dead and wounded, what beyond vague references to rowdiness, while during that same week both Pravda and Izvestia highlighted the following earthshaking events:

The stock market dropped in New York.

A group of New Jersey students protested U.S. atomic tests.

Two unknown persons slipped into the Soviet sector of Germany.

This is the fact of Soviet news policy. What is the doctrine? I take it we can still look to Lenin for guidance on Soviet doctrine.

In 1903 he wrote indignantly: "Until freedom of speech and of the press is declared there will not disappear the shameful Russian inquisition which persecuted profession of unofficial faith, unofficial opinions, unofficial doctrines."

Later he wrote: "The periodical and nonperiodical press and all publishing enterprises must be entirely subordinated to the Central Committee of the Party."

Thus, today's Soviet leaders have a fairly wide latitude of Leninist press policies to drawn on.

There is, of course, freedom in the U.S.S.R. to say the right thing. This was brought home to a young American visitor to Moscow who was earnestly explaining how any American could openly denounce the life and morality of the United States, even ridicule the President.

"It is the same here," said the guide. "A Soviet citizen may also denounce life and morality in the United States and ridicule your President."

Freedom of communication involves both information and expression. I have touched on information. It is crucial to a dynamic society, which communism claims to be. But expression is no less so. Thus we read with concern the Soviet party's reply last month to Russian intellectuals who had claimed that "without opportunity for different artistic directions, art is condemned to death." The reply said that the party does not tolerate experimentation in the arts, and "is determining the tasks and directions of artistic creativeness." What sad rebuff; but what a fine claim.

And we shall wait to see if and how a young Soviet poet changes a now famous poem of protest, particularly so since it concerns racial persecution.

The Soviet Government seems to have good working relations with the Soviet press. If the Soviet chief of state should take exception to the editorial policies of a paper, he needn't cancel his subscription; he just cancels the paper. But that is hardly necessary at present.

Soviet papers serve their party well, rewriting human history even as it rolls off the presses of human endeavor. As the great hand writes, and having written, moves on, the agitation that follows is a team of Soviet historians with erasers. Someone should tell them to relax.

I have tried to explain how difficult it is for me at least to picture the struggle for civil rights where there is a limit of communication.

It seems to be recognized by some Soviet authorities that terror is inefficient. The so-called Special Board of Ministry of Internal Affairs has been abolished, and with it, its function, which was to send people to labor camps without a hearing, in secret procedures without right of counsel or appeal. Confessions must now be corroborated by other evidence. And all in all there seems to be a growing appreciation for what the Soviet calls legality, and a growing awareness among the Soviet legal profession itself of the obligation of law to society, and of lawyers to the law. The outcome of this trend remains uncertain. You may recall that after a great deal of noisy pride about abolishing the death penalty, the Soviet Union in 1961, reinstated it for crimes described as economic and specifically for illegal transactions in foreign currency. Subsequently, two men were executed under an ex post facto application of the currency law.

From Harvard's expert on Soviet law, Prof. Harold Berman, I learned of a conversation he had on this incident with a leading Soviet jurist. Berman had remarked on the unusual nature of the trial and sentence and suggested it violated the 1958 Soviet Principles of Criminal Procedure. The jurist replied, "we lawyers didn't like that," a response, Berman noted, which was no less remarkable for its "we lawyers" as for its "didn't like that."

I suppose what is needed is more lawyers who don't like things.

The law's slow progress in the Soviet Union may be due, in large part, to the lack of public debate. Thus the recent "anti-Parisite" laws by which people not doing socially useful work may be exiled to remote areas for 2 to 5 years, went into effect as quietly as the falling tumblers of a combination lock.

All great questions must be raised by great voices, and the greates voice is the voice of the people, speaking out in prose, or painting, or poetry, or music, speaking out, in homes and halls, streets and farms, courts and cafes—let that voice speak and the stillness you hear will be the gratitude of mankind. Man giving thanks—Jews thanking the God of Abraham for their lives, Siberian Christians thanking the Lord for their children—people giving thanks. It is a good sound.

And the world is listening, watching, weighing, deciding.

Latin Americans listen to the stifled sounds of Cuba. Macao and Hong Kong receive the gaunt refugees of Red China and hear the unspeakable. Europeans watch what they hope is the final chapter in subjugation on that continent.

Africans can see these things, and there is much to occupy their own moralists on their own vast continent.

There is ample evidence that dictatorial conduct is not confined to societies ruled by whites. South Africa's sabotage bill, and restrictive laws on voting and free speech, are no less encouraging than the Preventive Detention Act of Ghana, which empowers the government to imprison without trial for up to 5 years all persons suspected of subversion, or Ghana's dignity-of-the-President bill passed last year which subjects presidential detractors to £500 fines or 3 years' imprisonment. (If there is a Ghanaian Vaughn Meader, he's laughing on the inside.)

Wrongs that passed as white no color can make right.

A nation, it is true, must work its own evolution in its own way and at its own pace. Time and tide have favored ours. The best hope we can have perhaps is that governments may listen to the voices of their people, American governments have tried to do that. We have found that when people find a willing ear they are more disposed to lend a willing hand. We think with Jefferson that our Government is, "The world's best hope; the only one where every man at the call of the law would fly to the standard of the law and would meet invasions of the public order as his own personal concern." This is a Virginian's answer to the demagogues of today, both foreign and domestic. It is the answer of thousands of southern citizens and of the U.S. marshals, most of them southerners, who held the line at the Lyceum in Oxford.

It is clear that the standard of law in America flies to protect the civil liberty of all American citizens from private as well as public invasions. Thus the Sherman Anti-trust and Interstate Commerce Act give protection from excesses of the business community. Other legislation guards the public and the workingman from the abuses of labor. And today we face in this country a conspiracy which could be extremely erosive of the rights and liberties of our citizens, organized crime. So when we move against these excesses, we do so on behalf of all our people, and at their call. And the agencies and bureaus of government which answer this call, with the patience and care their work requires, deserve the respect of all Americans.

Finally, we have found that man's handhold on the globe is a precarious one. But we had always believed that. We always thought that our destiny was cradled in another Hand. And when Mr. Khrushchev reported that the cosmonauts, like the Bolshevik pilots of the early twenties, reported seeing "no signs of God," we can only suggest that they aim, with the rest of mankind, a little higher. In the meantime, there is work to do here on earth, to that day when Caesars render unto man what is man's.

## Eulogy for Robert Frost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to learn of the death of Robert Frost, dean of American poets, and know that all my colleagues in this House join me in mourning his loss.

Frost was close to nature, and wrote of it as perhaps no other American poet ever has. His poetry was quiet and deep and brought the spirit of nature close. All Americans are familiar with the fields and woods of New England as Frost described them. We all know of his immortal, "Road Not Taken," in which the poet faced two imaginary roads. He took "the one less traveled." Few men indeed travel the road of art, and fewer still travel it with such success as Frost did. His poetry came to be read and loved more than that of any living poet in our country.

In an age of cynicism and helter-skelter, he provided a breath of freshness and rest.

He has now passed. But he has left behind an enormous and immortal contribution to the American spirit and culture.

## Social Security Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND**
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which, if passed, would amend our Social Security Act to permit both men and women to retire at the age of 60 and receive full benefits at that age.

It would also eliminate the age requirement for spouse's benefits—thereby permitting the payment of spouse's benefits simultaneously with that of an eligible retiree. In other words, should a man reach the legal retirement age and secure his social security pension, his wife—although she may be younger than he—would also be eligible to receive her benefits. This, too, would be true in the case of a wife becoming eligible first—the husband would then be eligible to receive benefits as her spouse, unless, of course, his own earnings would entitle him to greater benefits and he chooses to wait for benefits under his own eligibility.

It would also permit the retiree to receive a larger annual income from other sources and still be eligible for social security benefits. The present allowance is $1,200 annually, and my proposal would allow $2,000 annually.

I feel that these amendments would not only be beneficial to the recipients of our social security benefits but would also be most helpful to our general economy.

By permitting full benefits to be paid at a lower retirement age, many who are still employed would be more inclined to retire, with the possibility of job opportunities then being available to younger people. With both husband and wife receiving benefits simultaneously, and with a slightly larger outside income permitted, the consumer purchasing power of our retirees would be increased, and this—in turn—would help out the national economy.

The 1960 census disclosed the fact that we had 17 million citizens 65 years of age and older. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates that we have—each day—a net increase of 1,000 persons reaching the age of 65. In fact—by 1980—it is expected that 10 percent of our national population will be comprised of this group of 65 and older. Today it is 9.3 percent.

If we lower the retirement age to 60—this percentage would be increased.

In our present list of unemployed—we have many in the age bracket from 60 to 65—too old to be reemployed but too young to retire on full benefits. This results in ever-increasing public assistance rolls.

My amendment would remove many from public assistance—from mere existence, so to speak—and permit them to qualify under a program to which they have paid their money for many years. My amendment would reduce the amount of money the State and Federal governments must pay out of general taxation for relief, while—at the same time—assure these recipients of a better income and increase their purchasing power for consumer products.

A prospective consumer market of 15 percent of our total population would be quite an incentive for our small business people throughout the Nation, if one cares to look at this problem strictly from a monetary viewpoint.

However, from a humanitarian viewpoint the wealthiest nation in the world could well afford to permit its elder citizens in this age of rapidly advancing technology to live their remaining years with dignity and respect, especially when you stop to consider the benefits which they receive are from a program to which they have contributed since 1937.

This legislation permits the Members of this Congress to be both practical and humane and I sincerely hope it will receive the support of all.

## Father Junipero Serra

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. DON EDWARDS**
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, the date of November 24, 1963, marks the 250th anniversary of the birth of Father Junipero Serra, the Franciscan priest who was the founder of the 21 California missions. One of the most beautiful of these missions is Mission San Jose, situated amongst the vineyards in the foothills of southern Alameda County, in the Ninth Congressional District of California. We Californians are proud that a statue of Father Serra stands in Statuary Hall, here in our Capitol.

At the annual convention of the 17 Serra Clubs of northern California, held in Monterey, October 19, 1962, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

Whereas it is the custom of the U.S. Post Office to issue commemorative stamps marking significant dates and events in history; and

Whereas November 24, 1963, will be the 250th anniversary of the birth of Father Junipero Serra, founder of the California Mission; and

Whereas Father Junipero Serra is regarded by the people of California, of all denominations, as a leader, a teacher, an administrator and a perfect exemplar of the humility and spirituality of St. Francis: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the northern California districts of Serra international, in regional convention assembled, does hereby urge the Postmaster General of the United States to provide for the issuance of a commemorative stamp in 1963 in honor of the 250th anniversary of the birth of Father Junipero Serra.

Mr. Speaker, I think the request of Serra international that we honor the birth of this gentle and saintly priest in this way is entirely fitting. I am therefore today introducing a bill providing for the issuance of a commemorative stamp, and respectfully request the favorable consideration of my colleagues and the Postmaster General.

## The 20th Anniversary of the Women Marines, February 13, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. JAMES A. BURKE**
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, the proud history of the U.S. Marine Corps dates back to 1775. February 13 marks the 20th anniversary of an important part of this organization, the Marine Corps Women's Reserve, now known simply as the Women Marines.

The history of women serving in the Marine Crops, however, goes back much more than 20 years. During World War I, the Marine Corps was authorized to enlist and train women reservists in order to free men from clerical duties for combat in France. Over three hundred women thus served their country in this capacity from 1918–19.

In February 1943 the call went out once again for women to serve in the Marine Corps. This time, under the great demands of World War II, women were needed by the thousands to free combat-capable Leathernecks from scores of duties which tied them down behind the front. Thus, under provisions of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, the Marine Corps Women's Reserve was formed on February 13, 1943. By June 1944 the authorized quota of 18,000 enlisted women and 821 officers had been met, and these women were serving in their assigned duties. Over two hundred skilled categories were filled by these women, supporting Marine Corps capabilities on the ground and in the air. They served at every major Marine Corps post and station in the continental United States, and by 1945, were serving in Hawaii as well.

Following the war, the need was seen to maintain a nucleus of trained Women Marines as a mobilization base. At the same time difficulties were seen in maintaining this nucleus as nothing more than a volunteer reserve organization. These difficulties were resolved with the passage in 1948 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act.

Today, the women marines, under its Commandant, Col. Margaret M. Henderson, numbers about 150 officers and 1,600 enlisted women on active duty with the corps, throughout the United States, England, France, and Italy. These women perform important duties in aviation, personnel, administration, management, intelligence, communications, supply, transportation, disbursing, and many other fields which support the activities of the combat arm of the U.S. Marines.

Mr. Speaker, all of the women serving in our Armed Forces serve proudly, but

the women marines especially have earned the highest respect of their fellow servicemen and their fellow citizens. Therefore it gives me great pleasure to mark the 13th day of February as their 20th anniversary.

I include for the RECORD a copy of a proclamation issued by His Excellency, Gov. Endicott Peabody, of Massachusetts:

A PROCLAMATION BY HIS EXCELLENCY, ENDICOTT PEABODY, GOVERNOR, 1963

"Whereas the women marines freed thousands of men for combat during World War II, thereby aiding and assisting the Marine Corps in the achievement of their great victories in the South Pacific and elsewhere during this world conflict; and

"Whereas the women marines performed an equal service during the Korean conflict enabling thousands of marines to participate in the heroic battles which stemmed the tide of communism in the Far East; and

"Whereas the women marines have manned a host of key positions in our peacetime Marine Corps, buttressing greatly this branch of our armed service and strengthening its role as a prime deterrent against aggression; and

"Whereas the women marines have, by their diligence, ability, and patriotism served as a model for all women who wish to serve their country and community; and

"Whereas the 13th day of February 1963, marks the 20th anniversary of the women marines as part of the U.S. Marine Corps: Now, therefore, I, Endicott Peabody, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts do hereby proclaim as Women Marines Day February 13, 1963, and urge that all the citizens of the Commonwealth give every recognition to this observance."

Given at the executive chamber in Boston this 24th day of January, in the year of our Lord 1963 and of the independence of the United States, the 187th.

ENDICOTT PEABODY.

By His Excellency the Governor:

KEVIN H. WHITE,
*Secretary of the Commonwealth.*

## We Must Work Out a Truly Equitable Answer to Aid to Education Within the Framework of Our Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an address which I delivered at the closing dinner of the Catholic Youth Organization Diocesan Youth Congress, in Providence, R.I. on January 27, 1963.

The address is as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE JOHN E. FOGARTY

Your Excellency, the most reverend bishop; right reverend and very reverend monsignor; Father Charles W. McConnell, diocesan CYO director; and reverend members of the clergy; distinguished representatives of State and local governments; CYO regional officers and representatives; members and friends of our outstanding Catholic Youth Organization here in Rhode Island, in an address to a group of teachers, the late Pope Pius XII urged them to take as their ideal the training of fine young Christian men and women, who would be prepared to participate as active members of modern society. And the Pope went on to say, "By the perfect Christian we mean the Christian of today * * * a citizen and not something apart from the life led in his own country."

It seems to me that these words perfectly express the aims and objectives of the CYO, which is an organization that applies the eternal truths of religion in the daily life of young people who are learning to become the future leaders in both civic and religious activities.

And I would like to thank you for giving me the opportunity to be with you and to participate in this evening's program. As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, I have long been identified with the battle against juvenile delinquency. Consequently, I have heard a lot of testimony about what is supposed to be wrong with our youth. But I have also been impressed with the fact that in spite of the seriousness of the delinquency problem, the vast majority of our young people are doing a very fine job with the difficult task of growing up in this complicated modern world. Looking at this CYO congress tonight, I know that it represents a very important part of what is right with America's youth.

The five CYO members who have been awarded the Eagle of the Cross Medal certainly deserve special congratulations. In order to gain this honor they have had to demonstrate, not only real moral integrity, but they have had to work in apostolic activities and display true Christian leadership. As we all join in honoring them, I feel sure that their example is truly symbolic of what every CYO member believes in and works for.

Here is an organization in which laymen and the clergy are working together with young people to improve, not only the physical, but the spiritual and intellectual life of its members and the entire community. All of us owe a debt of gratitude particularly to the lay directors; past, present, and future; who volunteer their help in this good work.

Men and women of all faiths have been impressed and encouraged to hear of the deliberations of the Vatican Council, in which our own bishop is a participant. And we know that the Council is much concerned with the important responsibility of laymen in the field of Catholic action. Here in Rhode Island the hard-working lay directors of the CYO are certainly among those who have already shown practical proof of the good that can come when members of the laity assume their responsibilities for service to their church and their fellow citizens.

In every area of our national life today cooperation is essential if we are to defeat the drive of atheistic communism and build a better life of peace and freedom from want and fear. But in no area is cooperation more important than in matters which pertain to youth and its education. Our whole American educational system is, in fact, a great partnership. It is a vast and varied cooperative enterprise, which involves publicly and privately controlled schools. It is the responsibility of government at every level and of taxpayers who are parents, as well as taxpayers who are not. The American ideal of democracy calls for equality of educational opportunity, and we cannot rest satisfied until that goal is achieved for every American child and young person of school age, regardless of the type of school to which his parents, in the free exercise of their conscience, may decide that he should go.

It should be obvious that in the face of mounting costs and rising enrollments, we cannot achieve a national goal of equal educational opportunity without an increasing degree of cooperative effort between all concerned, especially in solving the problem of financing. Local school districts will have to be given more cooperative help from the States and the States in turn will have to be given more cooperative help by the Federal Government, without undermining either local autonomy or destroying local incentive.

Admittedly, this presents what looks like an almost insurmountable problem, to which no one has yet offered a complete solution. And the problem is complicated by the complex constitutional questions which arise when it is pointed out that our democratic goal of equality of educational opportunity must include consideration of those who exercise their free right to choose independent schools, many of which have religion as a part of their curriculum and are church related.

In this connection, I should like to point out a few facts that are revealed in the most recent Government survey of enrollment in public and nonpublic elementary and secondary schools.

Between 1950 and 1960 nonpublic school enrollment increased by an estimated 82 percent, while public school enrollment increased by 43 percent. If this trend continues, it is estimated that nonpublic school enrollment will increase from 100 to 123 percent during the period between 1960 and 1980, while public school enrollment will increase 48 to 66 percent. In 1960 there were 6,224,000 children in the grades from kindergarten through high school enrolled in nonpublic schools, but in 1980 that figure may well go over 12 million.

Today, at the precollege level, about 15 percent of the total enrollment is in nonpublic schools; but the comparative growth rate shows that this percentage will rapidly increase. At the level of higher education, where private institutions have always played a vitally important role, 40 percent of the present enrollment is in nonpublic institutions.

In the light of these facts, it would be most unrealistic to talk about educational equality of opportunity without giving consideration to the private or independently supported segment of our educational structure. We must, and will, work out a truly equitable answer within the framework of our Constitution. The best legal minds do not yet agree as to what the precise relation between Government and church-related schools ought to be under our Constitution. A study of the decisions of the Supreme Court from the Cochran Louisiana textbook case of 1930, the Everson bus case of 1947, and the Zorach released time case of 1952 does, however, point to a possible solution: Wherever aid directly benefits the pupil and his parents and is not directed to church-related institution or does not use public facilities for direct sectarian instruction, that aid can be considered to be constitutional. As time goes on and more legislation is tested, our understanding will be further clarified. I see the method of educational tax relief for parents as very desirable and I have sponsored such legislation. But we are not going to solve all the questions affecting elementary, secondary, and higher education in one law or one court decision. As is the case with civil rights, so it is with achieving real equity in the question of school aid. The constitutional process is deliberative; it is not going to be rushed. But all who believe in constitutional democracy know that this deliberation is the firm guarantee of that justice which will, in the end, be done.

And I think that considerable progress has been made under the provisions of the National Defense Education Act, with which I have been closely identified. For example, under that legislation, private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools are eligible

for loans to purchase equipment, instructional materials, and to do minor remodeling in order to improve their teaching of science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages. Such loans have already amounted to more than $2 million.

As the Supreme Court pointed out in the released-time case of *Zorach* v. *Clauson* in 1952, the first amendment "does not say that in every and all respects there shall be a separation of church and state." A rigid theory of secularism in government may fit the ideas of communism, but it does not accord with either the spirit or the history of this Nation, which has inscribed upon its coinage the motto, "In God we trust." As Dr. Robert Hutchins, the noted educator and president of the Fund for the Republic, has recently observed in an address before the University of Chicago Law School, the theory of an absolute wall of separation is an unworkable idea that is "hampering us in our search for what we need * * * a national idea of education and a national program to carry it out."

The history of America is a story of the search for the attainment of equality of opportunity, not only in education but in every aspect of our social, political, and economic life. This is in complete accord with the ideals of the great social encyclicals of the Popes, which teach that every person has a right to the opportunity to live a reasonable, moral life, and the right to social justice. Through legislation, through court decisions, through cooperation between the agencies of government, steady progress is being made in this direction. But each American also has the responsibility to rid his heart and mind from social, ethnic, and class prejudice. In this effort, the CYO spirit can and should continue to play an important part, for it is the spirit of true Christian charity and loyal citizenship. It is the spirit which can help most to make this truly "one nation, under God."

Many of the old prejudices which once divided America are disappearing. Who would have thought a generation ago that we would have a Catholic as our President or that Protestants would send official observes to a Vatican council? Here in Rhode Island the discussion of textbook aid to nonpublic schools has been conducted in an atmosphere of reason, good will, cooperation and understanding which has set an example to the whole country. In the same way, I believe, we are moving away from the habit of judging people on the basis of what country their ancestors came from. Ethnic prejudice is just another form of racial discrimination, which has not only been condemned by the Popes but also by the leaders of all our major faiths at a recent conference in Chicago. Those of us in public life who believe, as I do, that no candidate should be either elected or defeated on the basis of his ancestry look to young people like yourselves to help us in our fight to end ethnic prejudice. As Americans, and as Catholics, I know that we share the belief that God made all men equal, with a right to equal opportunity, not only for personal development but also for public responsibilities.

## Mass Transportation Compact: A Focal Point for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, earlier this session I introduced a resolution, House Joint Resolution 126, which would authorize eight eastern seaboard States and the District of Columbia to form an interstate compact and authority designed to ease the plight of the railroad commuter and the industry itself. This bipartisan measure is, in my opinion, one possible approach to the solution of one of America's most pressing problems in the area of mass transportation—the deteriorating and deficit-ridden rail commuter system.

Far from being a call for supergovernment, my proposal is an attempt to offer an alternative solution, one that is recognized in the Constitution itself, to the ever-growing centralization of authority in the Federal Government. Sooner or later this problem will have to be viewed on a wider scale than the piecemeal local-state approach. Transportation systems, like metropolitan areas, do not stop at State or city lines, and neither does the problem.

My own district contains a large number of the commuting population working in New York City, and in neighboring metropolitan communities. A significant editorial reaction to the compact proposal appeared in the January 19, 1963, edition of the Record, a daily newspaper of wide circulation in the Bergen County commuter area of New Jersey. It grasps one of the main points of importance in connection with my resolution—this is an opportunity for the States, the industry, labor, and interested citizens to express their views and needs in relation to a proposed solution, specific in nature. What better way to test the idea of an interstate compact in this area of national concern?

The editorial follows:

ONE WAY OF GETTING THE SHOW ON THE ROAD

Aside from the fact that it strangely finds Representative WIDNALL, Republican, seventh district, sponsoring something which sounds much like supergovernment, the proposal to have 8 Eastern States operate a passenger rail system sounds a great deal like more of the same except bigger.

There is one thing in its favor. It's in the grand manner. Proposed is a compact composed of New Jersey and seven other Atlantic seaboard States and the District of Columbia, to be approved by the Congress. Created would be an authority which would take over operation of eastern railroads' unprofitable passenger services, leaving the paying freight business in the hands of their present owners. Existing right of ways would for the most part be used.

The idea was proposed but failed to get off the ground last year. It's chief Senate sponsor is Senator PELL, Democrat, of Rhode Island. It requires that a presidential delegate participate in negotiations among the States and report on them to Congress and that the compact be not binding until it has been ratified by all the States and by Congress. This last provision in itself would seem to doom the idea for any immediate purposes. It took years to get New York, New Jersey, Delaware, and Pennsylvania together on the Delaware Basin project, and only 4 States were involved.

But Mr. WIDNALL does bring out and effective point in favor of the resolution:

"[It] does, however, provide one special solution to a special problem in one geographical area and its introduction, I hope, will give the States involved a focal point for comment and action."

Perhaps creating a focal point for comment will generate the chief benefit. Being asked here is an authority which would take over a gigantic deficit operation and run it, with or without a profit—more likely without. That would certainly mean some form of public subsidy, very likely switching this unattractive burden to Washington and away from the several States, all of which except New Jersey have shown a chronic distaste for doling out hard-cash financial help to passenger railroads.

But the project could accomplish at least one purpose—perhaps, just by being introduced, has accomplished it. It would show that in an area of 37 million persons containing 30 percent of the Nation's manufacturing capacity our chief means of mass transportation is in such sorry straits that it needs help this big. The idea may not be the solution, but it certainly is a graphic way of posing the problem.

## Our Vanishing Surplus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I read with a great deal of interest an editorial in the Watonwan County Plaindealer, St. James, Minn., which vividly expresses a concern which I share—bigger spending, bigger deficits and bigger controls. The able editor of the Plaindealer, Leslie G. Curtis, states the case very well. I submit his editorial for inclusion in the RECORD:

OUR VANISHING SURPLUS

When President Kennedy delivered his state of the Union message to Congress just a year ago, he stated that he was "submitting for fiscal year 1963 a balanced Federal budget".

A few days later he sent Congress a budget showing there would be a $500 million surplus for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1962, and ending June 30, 1963. After the election last November Kennedy changed his estimate to an $8.8 billion deficit. And it may be more before the end of the year. Thus his original estimate was in error by only a mere $9.3 billion.

This year President Kennedy is pushing for a tax reduction with a promise that he would hold the spending to the present level. He estimated that his proposed tax reduction and holding down of domestic spending would produce a deficit for fiscal year 1963 of about $11.8 billion.

Then he submitted a budget of $99.8 billion, the largest peacetime budget in history, full of new welfare and other spending projects that have made many congressional leaders fairly gasp. If he is as far off in his estimates this year as he was last year, that $11.8 billion deficit could amount to $15 or $20 billion.

The thing that knocks any advance estimates into a cocked hat is the fact that Congress is controlled by a bunch of Democratic spenders who have no consideration for the already overburdened taxpayer. They concentrate all their efforts toward bringing more and more of our daily activities under Federal control.

Never in the history of our country has so much power and control been concentrated in Washington. Never have we had an administration that even dreamed being able to bring such a dictatorship of authority to the maze of bureaus and departments that we now have in the Federal Government.

All of this concentration of power in Washington costs money—taxpayers' money. The pressure for increased spending mounts higher and higher under the encouragement of a false philosophy of government that believes we can spend ourselves into prosperity.

We are certainly in agreement with President Kennedy that both individuals and industry need a reduction in taxes to help stimulate employment through increased investments of profits. However, we do not believe that any tax relief can be accomplished unless there is a corresponding reduction in Federal spending.

When the administration proposes to cut income taxes on the one hand and then takes it right away from us by increasing other forms of taxes, there isn't much prospect of bettering our economic condition.

A promise of tax reduction is a good propaganda piece, and will be exploited to the *n*th degree. But until there is also a reduction in Federal spending, there will be no real tax relief.

## Key West Naval Base 140 Years Old

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, 140 years ago tomorrow—February 1—naval orders were issued to the distinguished Commodore David Porter, U.S. Navy, to take command of the West Indies Squadron; to sweep away the buccaneering brethren of the coast, whose piratical domination of the seas extended from the West Indies into the Gulf of Mexico; and to establish a naval depot on Key West in the Territory of Florida to supply the vessels of the squadron.

Today, from that embryonic post—which was the first U.S. naval base in the Territory of Florida—the U.S. naval base at Key West, Fla., has evolved into an expansive and strategically significant naval complex ranging over 135 miles from Key West to Florida City, Fla.

Commodore Porter, when he first saw the area, called it the "Gibralter of the gulf" and envisioned the naval base as the place "to watch and guard our commerce passing to and from the Mississipi" as well as the "key to the commerce of Havana."

The missions carried out with high honor by the men of the Key West Naval Base since that time have paid tribute to Porter's words.

The function of the naval base from its birth until the Civil War was one of a coaling and supply depot. When the conflict between the States arose, the base fulfilled its first strategic mission as the home port for the Eastern Gulf Blockading Squadron. This naval group, operating under the commands of Flag Officers Farragut and McKean—with some 32 ships—cut off southern commerce and captured a total of 229 blockade runners and brought them to the island.

As the only Southern port in Union hands throughout the war, great quantities of contraband were amassed at Key West and it was from this naval station that the joint Army-Navy amphibious operations were launched leading to the destruction of the Confederate-held Florida salt works.

Following the war, the Key West Naval Station quickly returned to activities of peacetime progress and assisted the International Ocean Telegraph Co. in 1866 to lay the cable connecting Key West with the mainland of the United States and with Cuba. In 1881, a naval lieutenant named Robert E. Peary—who was to make history far to the North—reconstructed the Naval Wharf and further storage facilities were added in 1895.

As it was during the October days of 1962, the Key West Naval Base took on a role of major significance during the Spanish-Cuban days of the decade of the 1890's.

The battleship *Maine* departed from Key West on its death cruise and her dead and wounded were returned to this base. On April 23, 1898—reminiscent of recent days again—military observers on the Key West shores saw the first shot of the Spanish American War when the U.S.S. *Nashville*, operating out of Admiral Sampson's squadron, encountered the Spanish steamer, *Buena Ventura*, fired across her bow and took the first prize of the war.

During the crest of this struggle, the entire Atlantic Fleet operated from the Key West Naval Base as well as the entire force of correspondents who reported on the war.

By 1903 Key West was the headquarters for the newly established Seventh Naval District and a radio station marked Navy technological advance in 1906.

As the ravages of war swept across Europe in 1914, the Key West Naval Base began to take on its present day appearance with the arrival of seaplanes, submarines and blimps.

The primary mission of the base as the war raged on was then, as it is now, "supply and maintain the forces afloat." These were active years with the establishment of a seaplane training center, yachts being converted for destroyer patrol, submarines from the German patrol to be serviced, a naval magazine constructed, hospital facilities going up, and the radio operations reaching our farflung fleet in action.

With the return of the hope of peace following World War I, Key West relaxed in the magnificent Florida sun with only a single officer and 16 men operating the radio station until the Cuban revolutionary activities in 1934 brought the return of destroyers and Coast Guard craft.

Quiet returned again for a few years—civilian yachts used the submarine basin and swimmers used the military piers. The relaxation was halted with the return of war to the nations of Europe and the naval station was reactivated on November 1, 1939.

Destroyers pulled alongside the piers—the men of Patrol Wing 5 arrived—and Key West's role as an essential base for the neutrality patrol had begun.

The wartime role of the Key West command illustrated Commodore Porter's vision of the island's place in national defense. Missions were flown from the air station against German submarines in the gulf—the blimps resumed patrol—support of our submarines became a major activity—and a convoy control center effectively operated to reduce ship sinking from 107 in 1942 to only 4 in 1943.

Seventh District Headquarters returned to Key West in February 1942, and the gulf sea frontier was established in May 1942, with both commands moving to Miami in June of that year.

Following the cessation of hostilities, there was little retrenchment at Key West for the strategic importance and ideal climate for year-round operations—as recognized in 1823 by Porter—came to be recognized. The Atlantic Fleet's submarine development detachment transferred to Key West and the island was redesignated as a submarine base.

Soon came the helicopters and the jets—training and research brought expansion of land and facilities and the base acquired a tridimensional strength—on, under, and above the sea.

The eyes of the world focused on the Key West Naval Station just a few short months ago as we escalated toward the threat of nuclear war—a crisis once again involving Cuban affairs.

As we mark the 140th anniversary of the establishment of this stronghold in our defense system, I wish to join Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Kennedy in saying to the officers and men of the U.S. Navy at the Key West Naval Base: "Well done."

## Miss Norma Lindsay Picked as Birmingham, Ala.'s Ambassadress to Birmingham, England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, my hometown of Birmingham, Ala., has a unique tie with the city of Birmingham, England. For many years there have been people to people exchange programs of one kind or another. Our mayors have exchanged visits, and travelers from Birmingham make a point of visiting our sister city in England.

It was during World War II that the people of Birmingham, Ala., became so deeply impressed with the spirit and indomitable character of their English counterparts. At that time, I can remember how packages of food and clothes were sent to Birmingham, England, in those dark and storm-tossed days of World War II.

These great steel producing communities have much in common. Last fall

the people of Birmingham, England, sent us their ambassadress, a lovely English lass, Miss Shireen Dixon, to visit our city. She toured the eastern part of the United States and was treated regally everywhere.

After the visit of Miss Dixon to Birmingham, the Birmingham Advertising Club decided it would be a good idea to send our own Birmingham girl to visit in England.

Miss Norma Lindsay, of 401 Poinciana Drive, has been picked as Birmingham, Ala.'s, ambassadress to Birmingham, England. This charming young lady is the granddaughter of Mrs. Belle Leftwich, of Birmingham.

She will represent the people of Birmingham, Ala., as she travels from Magic City to Birmingham, England. Miss Lindsay was the choice of a committee of outstanding Birmingham citizens who were seeking "a typical American girl who is poised and proud of her city."

She will carry the friendship and goodwill of the people of Birmingham, Ala., to the people of Birmingham, England. She will also be carrying typical products of Alabama manufacturers as gifts to industrialists and dignitaries of the cities she will visit.

I am inserting herewith an article from the Birmingham News concerning this program, which I believe all of the Members will be interested in:

FLASHING-EYED BRUNETTE WINS BIRMINGHAM, ENGLAND, TRIP

A lovely, flashing-eyed 20-year-old brunette accepted the delightful task Saturday night of carrying the friendship and goodwill of the Magic City to our sister city, Birmingham, England.

Norma Lee Lindsay, of 410 Poinciana Drive, was chosen from 20 finalists at the Ambassadress Ball sponsored by the Jaycees in the Terrace Ballroom of the Dinkler-Tutwiler Hotel.

First alternate to the ambassadress is Nancy Carolyn James, 23-year-old youth director for the Birmingham Baptist Association, and second alternate is Martha Lackey, 21, a senior at the University of Alabama.

Birmingham's ambassadress is a tall, willowy, 5-foot-6 native of Birmingham who sings in the choir at the First Presbyterian Church. She lives with her grandmother, Mrs. Belle Leftwich.

As the representative of the people of Birmingham, she will put to use valuable acting experience gained with Actor's Theater and the Jewish Community Center Players.

Sponsors for the event who will present her a dazzling 9-day trip to Washington, D.C., New York City, Birmingham, and London, England, are WBRC–TV, the Birmingham Ad Club, and TransWorld Airlines.

Local industries and manufacturers in Alabama have been asked to send some of their typical products along for the Ambassadress to present to industrialists and dignitaries of the cities she will visit.

Her first appearance will be this morning at 9:30 when she and the alternates are presented on Harry Mabry's "Sunday Morning Show" over channel 6.

Monday night she will be presented by Robert T. Schlinkert, general manager of channel 6, and Jim Crim, president of the Ad Club, at the annual banquet of the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce in the Tutwiler Hotel.

Tuesday, she will choose her wardrobe for the trip at Taylor's of Eastwood Mall, accompanied by Mrs. Alyce B. Walker, associate editor of the Birmingham News, and will receive a matched set of luggage from the Birmingham Trunk Factory.

Tuesday afternoon she will meet Gov. George Wallace and tour state offices in Montgomery.

She will be a guest at the Birmingham Ad Club luncheon at the Thomas Jefferson Hotel Friday.

She will leave Birmingham February 10 for Washington, where she will meet Senators LISTER HILL and JOHN SPARKMAN, and Representative GEORGE HUDDLESTON.

February 11 she will go to New York City for a night and a day of interviews and touring. She will stay at the beautiful Belmont-Plaza Hotel.

The next night she will leave for London via TWA's royal ambassador jet service. She wil be met in London by a committee from Birmingham, England.

Awaiting her are appearances on the British Broadcasting Co. radio and TV stations, press interviews, and appearances and interviews in all the cities that she visits.

## Thelma King Wants Republic of Panama Opening of Bridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on October 12, 1962, the new bridge across the Panama Canal at Balboa, designated by act of Congress as the Thatcher Ferry Bridge, was inaugurated with impressive ceremonies, which were marred by radical demonstrations of communistic inspiration.

This bridge and its approaches lie wholly within the Canal Zone territory and the cost of its construction was borne by the taxpayers of the United States.

Despite these facts, a bill to rename the bridge and to provide for its inauguration by authorities of Panama was introduced in the National Assembly of that country by Assemblywoman Thelma King, an outspoken sympathizer of Soviet Cuba. A news story in the November 16, 1962, issue of a Panamanian newspaper, giving the text of the bill and other details follows:

Under unanimous consent I insert the article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THELMA KING WANTS REPUBLIC OF PANAMA OPENING OF BRIDGE, BUT TIME RUNS SHORT

A bill which would require Panamian authorities to carry out the official inauguration of the new bridge over the Panama Canal on November 28 was introduced in the National Assembly yesterday by Assemblywoman Thelma King.

Miss King is an outspoken nationalist and sympathizer of Fidel Castro.

Assembly sources pointed out that, apart from other considerations, there is hardly time available to complete the legislative process required for enactment of the bill into law prior to November 28.

A bill upon presentation is referred to a committee, in this case the Foreign Relations Committee, which calls for hearings on it. The law allows 10 days for this purpose. The days are working days, not calendar days.

If the bill is reported on favorably by the committee, it remains in the office of the clerk of the Assembly for 2 days before it can be included in the agenda for the Assembly's daily sessions.

Once it is posted on the agenda, the measure is required to pass two additional readings on separate days and once this has been done then it goes to the President for signature or veto. The law gives the Chief Executive so many days, depending upon the length of the bill, to act upon legislation requiring his signature.

If he elects not to sign the bill, but does not veto it outright, the measure then is returned to the National Assembly for signature by the president of the Assembly.

But even after it has been signed, a law requires publication in the Official Gazette before it can be enforced.

There are 8 working days left between today and November 28, which itself is a national holiday in commemoration of Panama's independence from Spain.

Miss King's bill reads:

"The National Assembly,

"Whereas the 28th instant marks another anniversary of our independence from Spain;

"Whereas, last October 12 a project known as the Thatcher Ferry Bridge was inaugurated, which project the National Assembly named the Bridge of the Americas;

"Whereas the project has not yet been inaugurated by the National Government, which has sole right to do so,

"Decrees:

"ARTICLE 1. The Bridge of the Americas will be inaugurated, officially, by the authorities of the Republic of Panama on November 28 next.

"ART. 2. The Protocol Office of the Ministry of Foreign Relations will issue the invitations to the national authorities, the diplomatic corps and any others whom it deems convenient."

The formal inauguration of the new $20 million bridge on October 12 was attended by President Robert F. Chiari and other high Panamanian dignitaries and by U.S. Under Secretary of State George Ball and local Canal Zone officials.

The bridge was built by the United States to fulfill a treaty commitment with Panama. It lies in the Canal Zone, which is under U.S. jurisdiction.

## Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, water, its adequacy both in quantity and quality, continues to be without question the most significant consideration confronting the Nation in the entire resource conservation field. These two water aspects, quantity and quality, are inseparably linked together in our concern. We have only to recall the plight of the ancient mariner to remind us that water supplies are less than useless when they lack the necessary quality for the specific uses they are called on to fill.

The measures authorized in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as

amended, encompassed the preservation and maintenance of water quality adequate for all legitimate uses, public water supplies, propagation of fish and aquatic life and wildlife, recreational purposes, and agricultural, industrial, and other legitimate uses as well as the protection of the public health. Water pollution control is not, therefore, any longer solely a health problem. Its impact extends to all water resource considerations. The 1961 amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, Public Law 87–88, stressed the significance of this wide sweep of Federal interest and responsibility by vesting in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare the former responsibilities of the Surgeon General for administering the act's provisions. It was fully anticipated and intended that in this manner the upgrading within the Department of the Federal water pollution control program required for the effective achievement of its purposes would be satisfactorily resolved. Only one of the desired effects has resulted. Overseeing responsibility has been assigned to an able and conscientious Assitant Secretary additionally burdened with other Department affairs. At the same time, however, the operating program, itself, remains submerged in its long occupied basement within the Public Health Service.

The bill, which I introduce today, would establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration as an independent operating agency within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It would he headed by a Commissioner acting under the supervision and direction of the Secretary and an Assistant Secretary. My proposal in no way impugns the Public Health Service but the realities involved point to this action as the best means of securing effective administration of all of the act's provisions.

In accord with the emerging necessities for keeping our waters clean for the future, my bill states the purpose of the act in establishing a positive national policy in this regard as opposed to the irresponsible policy of using our streams for waste assimilation to the limits of their capacity.

Major concentrations of our population reside in our larger cities. Provision by these cities of treatment facilities to service the needs of their inhabitants demands the expenditures of proportionately great amounts. To remedy the ratio of inequality that obtains in regard to the provision of construction grants funds as concerns these larger municipalities, and to provide a more adequate degree of inducement toward their construction of needed treatment plants, the dollar ceiling limitation presently authorized in the act are proposed to be increased from $600,000 to $1 million for a single project and from $2,400,000 to $4 million for a joint project.

Municipal and industrial wastes are admittedly the major contributory sources of this pollution. Accordingly, the predominant share of our current water pollution control effort is focused on these two major contributors. The stimulatory grants-in-aid to municipalities for construction of waste treatment works provided by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act have been greatly successful in this respect, so much so that the Congress in enacting the 1961 amendments authorized a continuation of this program at twice its previous rate.

Little if any regard has been given, however, to the outmoded waste collection systems in many of our older cities that in themselves serve to greatly reduce the benefits to be expected from the installation of new treatment plants. This is because, on an annual average, 10 percent of the municipality's sanitary sewage never reaches the treatment plant. This amount of the city's raw wastes is carried off by storm overflow directly into the nearest waters. The fact that many cities collect the wastes from their industries in their municipal sewers to receive treatment at the central plant adds to the gravity of the situation.

Many municipalities at the turn of the century constructed a system of combined sewers to carry their sanitary wastes and to collect the runoff from their streets after a rainfall. At that time, this was an economic course for the cities to take. The sanitary wastes from their smaller populations used only a small portion of the combined sewer capacity. The portion of this sanitary sewage that was carried off by storm overflows into the receiving wastes was readily diluted by the proportionately larger street runoff collected by the sewers.

As a result of the vast population increase, the huge centers like New York, Chicago, Detroit, Philadelphia, Washington, D.C., and others find that their combined sewers are sufficient only to handle the sanitary sewage with little or no capacity remaining to cope with storm runoff. With these combined sewers filled to capacity with sanitary wastes, the runoff resulting even from a short summer afternoon rainfall causes the sewers to overflow at spillways necessarily provided for this purpose directly to the stream. It is conservatively estimated that as much as 35 percent of the sanitary sewage bypasses the treatment plant and is carried directly into the watercourse after a heavy rainfall fills the sewers and pours out of the convenient spillways.

In the opinion of experts it is this factor which is directly responsible for the serious interference with recreational and other legitimate uses of the waters that are adjacent to our larger communities. For example, the city of New York administers conscientious treatment of its sanitary waste discharges. Its bathing beaches, however, are to a great extent posted as unsafe due to the unusually high coliform count samples obtained there. This situation is attributed in large degree to the storm overflow from its combined sewers, carrying a large amount of raw sanitary sewage. Similarly, the closed beaches at Milwaukee, now an annual affair, are also traceable to storm overflow. The pollution of the Potomac River caused by storm overflow from the combined sewers in the Nation's Capital was recognized and cited as a principal cause of the shameful condition of this stream in the Federal enforcement action begun in 1957 to restore the quality of these waters. The conferees recommended as one of the absolutely necessary remedial measures that pollution from storm sewer overflows be substantially alleviated by the end of 1966.

Our programs of municipal treatment works construction should be accompanied by the construction of separate storm and sanitary sewers in our metropolitan areas. This is necessary and imperative to assure the efficiency of the treatment plants themselves, which are designed to handle sanitary sewage without the complicating factor of intermixture with storm runoff. And, more importantly, the deleterious discharge of raw sewage will be effectively halted—allowing our streams to recover without the necessity of experiencing periodic heavy doses of the pollutants that have so long plagued them.

In order to alleviate this problem my bill includes provisions for a program of grants assistance to municipalities in separating their combined systems. For these purposes, outlays of $1 million annually are proposed, from which grants in the amount of 30 percent of the estimated reasonable costs of combined sewer systems projects would be made.

The impairment of the growth and well-being of our urban centers must not be permitted to result from the injudicious use of Federal funds no matter how well-intentioned. In order to assure that grant-assisted projects conform with metropolitan area plans for their regulated development, an additional 10 percent of the grant amount would be authorized to be made in the case of projects so certified by an official State, metropolitan, or regional planning agency.

Pollution control and prevention guideposts are increasingly sought and requested by conscientious water users mindful of their responsibility for preserving water quality. Equally, the furnishing of such guideposts would greatly facilitate taking enforcement measures against those who perform acts in disregard of officially promulgated regulations. To this end, my bill would require the issuance of regulations by the Secretary setting forth standards of quality applicable to interstate or navigable waters and the type, volume, or strength of matter which may be safely discharged into these waters. The regulations are to be based on consideration of the present and future uses of interstate or navigable waters for all legitimate uses. Violation of the regulations is declared a public nuisance and made subject to abatement under the act's enforcement provisions.

Our efforts to control and prevent water pollution must be fully and aggressively responsive to the challenge before us. In order that we may not fail through any lack of sufficient powers and resources, I ask for the early consideration and enactment of my bill.

## Gaitskell: A Leader in Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. JEFFERY COHELAN**
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 10, 1963*

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune to meet and know the late leader of the British Labor Party, Hugh Gaitskell, during my stay in England almost 10 years ago. Although a Londoner, he represented the Leeds constituency where I lived for some time with my family. He was a man of brilliance, dedication, and courage. The United States and the free world have lost a great and true friend.

As Max Freedman stated so well in his Washington Post editorial of January 21:

The death of Mr. Hugh Gaitskell, leader of the British Labor Party, has done much more than to change the balance in British politics. It has robbed many honorable causes of a voice of reason that has often filled the world * * *. Other leaders will come, but he will be remembered with affection and gratitude.

Mr. Speaker, the Freedman article is a fitting tribute to a great citizen of the Western World, and I commend it to our colleagues' attention:

MR. GAITSKELL IN PERSPECTIVE

(By Max Freedman)

The death of Mr. Hugh Gaitskell, leader of the British Labor Party, has done much more than change the balance in British politics. It has robbed many honorable causes of a voice of reason that has often filled the world. For his friends, there will be personal grief at the knowledge that the sword at last has worn out the scabbard. There will be other battles, but his flashing spirit no longer will point the way. Other leaders will come, but he will be remembered with affection and with gratitude.

In these last few days we have seen a dramatic example of the way the fortunes of free nations have become entangled. We have all known that in the course of time the political period associated with aged leaders like Adenauer, De Gaulle, Nehru, and Chiang Kai-shek must end. Mr. Gaitskell, measured in these terms, was still young, and was out of power. We had the right to expect that long years of service awaited him. Now our vigil on the medical bulletins has ended in sadness.

Mr. Gaitskell followed his own path of leadership. It was said of the first great leader of the labor party, Keir Hardie, that he hated the palace because he remembered the pit. He was almost as eager to tear down the rich as he was to raise up the poor. This passion for social justice, never tumultuous in Ramsay MacDonald, thinned out in the latter days to little more than a timid advocacy of tentative reform.

An interlude of pacifism marked the party's history as it followed the brief leadership of George Lansbury, who mistook the mandates of his conscience for the facts of life. The labor party reached its glory under the guidance of Clement Attlee, whose threadbare personality concealed a mind of surprising power and dexterity.

Poverty never cradled Mr. Gaitskell into socialism nor did trade unionism give him its rewards. He was an intellectual, and the slovenly waste of the British economic system irritated his precise mind even more than the curse of injustice outraged his conscience. For many years he was the respected spokesman of the Labor Party in the age of the welfare state. Neither a pioneer nor a prophet, he brought into the British debate an instructed conscience without which public controversy would more easily have fallen into a mere argument over managerial techniques.

He stirred Englishmen to think anew of the perils as well as the hopes of an equal society. In the process he persuaded British socialism to disenthrall itself of many ancient dogmas. He was a liberator even more than a leader, for the verdict in national elections went against him.

Inside the Labor Party, he never lacked rivals and opponents. Aneurin Bevan, who was born, like Lloyd George, with a silver tongue in his cheek, once derided Mr. Gaitskell as a dessicated adding machine. The gibe was a victory of invective over accuracy. Mr. Gaitskell's offense consisted in being far more interested in the rights of Englishmen than in the wrongs of man. It is a small offense, and for it his friends need offer no prolonged atonement.

Always in British politics the Liberal or progressive party has wavered between two distince groups. Gladstone as liberal leader had to remember the protests of John Bright and the campaigns of the young Joseph Chamberlain. In a later period, Rosebery suffered under the more imperious spirit of Harcourt, and Asquith bowed to the mercurial genius of Lloyd George.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find the Labor Party, in our day, divided by quarrels and quivering with antagonisms. Mr. Gaitskell managed to compose these disagreements even though he never could end them. His departure has raised many anxious questions about the future of the Labor Party.

During the Suez crisis of 1956 Mr. Gaitskell never hesitated to denounce British policy even while British troops were moving into action. This conduct is more consistent with British than with American experience. The tradition here calls for the closing of ranks in an emergency, to be followed by a loud and painful postmortem when it can do very little good. The British people are no strangers to national unity. But they respect the voice of conscience amid the crash of arms. Mr. Gaitskell convinced few voters that he was right about Suez. But even his critics honored his independence, and his refusal to be stampeded by organized appeals to national emotion.

In the last period a shadow crept across Mr. Gaitskell's career. He had every right to be critical of British entry into the Common Market. But his tone was wrong. He was querulous and bitter where he should have been sedate and constructive. He winced from the embrace of Europe. The friend of the Commonwealth was reluctant to go on the new pilgrimage.

Walter Bagehot said the House of Commons has more brains than everyone in it. It has a corporate judgment and sense of honor more sensitive and profound than the qualities of all its members. Soon the Labor Party must find a new leader. One hopes he will be as good a friend of this country as Mr. Gaitskell was at every stage of his career. Meanwhile there is a lonesome place in Parliament, and a burden of sadness in the hearts of many Americans who never had the privilege of his friendship.

## If Depletion Laws Are Changed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. RICHARD (DICK) ICHORD**
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 31, 1963*

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, Missourians interested in the oil industry and new mining developments in Missouri are greatly concerned about any proposed changes in the percentage depletion tax laws.

A very informative feature story containing statements of the feelings of Gov. John Dalton, Dr. Thomas Beveridge, State geologist, and Laurence Schneider, director of Missouri's division of commerce and industrial development toward depletion tax and the effect of such changes upon Missouri's economy changes, appeared in the Sunday News and Tribune of Jefferson City, Mo.

Under unanimous consent I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD.

MISSOURI'S ECONOMIC GROWTH WILL BE RETARDED—MANY JOBS WILL BE LOST SHOULD CONGRESS ALTER MINERAL, OIL PROVISIONS

If exploration for oil, iron, lead, zinc, and other minerals suddenly came to an end, this Nation's economy would suffer a near fatal blow.

Sound fantastic?

It could happen if some groups succeed in their efforts to remove or alter provisions in the law that are essential to bring out risk capital for such ventures.

Early in its experience with the income tax amendment, Congress adopted a provision to cover depletion of discovered reserves in oil and other mineral industries. After experimenting with an arrangement based on discovery value of a well or mine, Congress in 1926 adopted the percentage depletion law.

The rates of this provision vary according to the nature and characteristics of the affected minerals. For example, oil and gas being the most difficult and expensive to hunt for and find, the depletion rate for these minerals is 27.5 percent. This takes into account the special problems involved in discovering and developing replacements for depleting reserves.

Sulfur, uranium, bauxite, lead, zinc, nickel, and tungsten are part of a long list of minerals receiving a 23-percent depletion rate.

MORE THAN 100 MINERALS

A 15-percent rate applies to all metal mines and many other minerals; a 10-percent rate to such resources as iron, coal, sodium chloride, and lignite.

Persons who locate brick and tile clay are entitled to a 5-percent rate.

Altogether, more than 100 minerals are now included under the precentage depletion tax provision.

These rates have been examined repeatedly over the years by committees of Congress and other official groups.

In the face of these recurring inspections, the rate for oil and gas has remained unchanged, rates for some other minerals have been increased, and new minerals of strategic or economic importance have been added to the list.

MISINFORMED

Why is the subject now being agitated again? Because some people are uninformed and others misinformed about the nature of the mineral industries and the problems involved in mineral exploration and development.

Without bothering to study the situation deeply enough to understand it, they advocate their own rigid ideas of what the Nation's economic policy should be. They say their proposals would stimulate the economy. But the fact is any tampering with percentage depletion could only have adverse effects in a nation that depends upon the energy supplied by oil, gas and coal to run most of its machines.

If opponents explored the subject with open minds, they would find the depletion provision is a break for the general public. In the case of oil and gas, it is the key to the low-cost energy readily available in the United States.

POSITIVE FORCE

This law has also been a positive force in encouraging the development of other industries vital to a modern America, helping to spark the exploration for and development of iron, lead, zinc, coal, sulfur and many other minerals important to the economy and to defense.

An illustration from the oil industry shows what the producer is up against and why he needs to have the depletion factor recognized in the law. Of every 100 wells drilled in the search for new fields, only 3 find enough oil or gas to be commercially successful. Besides losses on ventures that do not measure up commercially, the oil producing industry pours about $1 billion annually down dry holes, wells that do not produce a drop of oil or gas.

Without the depletion law, risk capital for ventures as chancy as wildcatting would be almost impossible to find. Rising production costs and depressed crude oil prices provide enough financial problems for the oil industry now without the added handicap of laws that fail to recognize or that recognize inadequately the depletion factor.

CONSEQUENCES

Contrary to some widely held misconceptions, the depletion provision applies only to the production of oil and gas.

It is not available for such other petroleum industry operations as refining, transportation or marketing. If this law should be changed, the consequences would include:

Ultimate increases, probably quite drastic, in the price of gasoline and other petroleum products.

Retardation of the economy of the entire United States and of Missouri as a State.

Losses of jobs in many communities directly or indirectly affected by mineral enterprises.

Suspension or curtailment of the development of many domestic resources, thus impairing America's defense.

Losses of Federal and State revenue resulting from the decline in mineral industry operations.

---

ANY DEPLETION LAW CHANGE "CONCERNS" MISSOURI'S GOVERNOR

Gov. John M. Dalton said he is "concerned" over reports that Congress may be asked to reduce the depletion law as it affects oil, gas, and possibly other minerals.

A reduction in the oil depletion rate could possibly cause higher prices for Missourians for gasoline and discourage consumption, he said. The Governor explained that any drop in gasoline consumption "could have bad consequences for Missouri, which now collects about $85 million from its gasoline tax each year."

Governor Dalton added: "Any change in the depletion tax laws could affect the economy of Missouri. I am concerned that any material change could halt or seriously retard searches for oil, iron ore, lead and other minerals."

---

STATE'S TOP DEVELOPMENT LEADERS BACK PRESENT LAW

Missouri's top economic and development leaders oppose any change in the depletion law. Here is what they say:

Thomas R. Beveridge, State geologist: "The present mineral situation in Missouri is most encouraging. If Congress wipes out depletion rates or cuts them, the picture will change to a dim outlook. Neither Missouri nor the Nation can afford such economic inhibitors. In cases of our mineral industries in the past, we have seen properties close because of a drop of less than 1 cent in prices."

Lawrence Schneider, director of Missouri's Commerce and Industrial Development Division: "At least 16 major metal mining companies are spending millions of dollars annually in the State on exploration. These are tremendous risks yet provide hundreds of jobs. Such explorations led to the huge Pea Ridge iron mining project and the lead plant at Viburnum. Without percentage depletion at present rates, neither may have become a reality. Missouri and the Nation must continue these provisions to provide job opportunities and an increased standard of living."

A photograph of the Pea Ridge mine project was captioned as follows:

The huge Pea Ridge iron mining project near Sullivan, Mo., has a big stake in any congressional attack on percentage depletion rates. The $40 million project was a gamble by the St. Joseph Lead Co. and Bethlehem Steel Co. It is estimated to contain between 50 and 100 million tons of high-grade iron ore.

Another mining development at Viburnum, Mo., also illustrated, was captioned:

Intensive exploration since 1955 resulted in this $17 million lead producing project in Missouri's Ozarks. A new industrial plant and the town of Viburnum developed from another gamble of the St. Joseph Lead Co. Lead, like iron ore, oil and some 100 other minerals, depends upon the depletion provision to help make possible the financing of such explorations.

The caption for an illustration of Missouri's oil industry was:

Missouri's only oil refinery is located at Sugar Creek near Kansas City. It has a daily capacity of 55,100 barrels of crude oil. Nine counties in Missouri produce oil or gas and there are six petrochemical plants in the State. Almost 22,000 persons are employed in some phase of the petroleum industry in Missouri. State motor fuel taxes provide Missouri with nearly 14 percent of its tax revenue.

## LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

---

## GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

---

## RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

---

## CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

---

## CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

# *Daily Digest*

## HIGHLIGHTS

**Both Houses received President's farm message.**

**Senate voted 53–42 to table question of its right to terminate debate at beginning of new Congress and to proceed to vote on rule change despite the rules.**

**See Congressional Program Ahead.**

# Senate

## *Chamber Action*

***Routine Proceedings, pages 1353–1414***

**Bills Introduced:** 47 bills and 1 resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 603–649; and S. Res. 79.

Pages 1355–1356

Reports were made as follows: Written report on S. Res. 62 (reported without written report on January 24), authorizing Committee on the Judiciary to spend $360,000 for investigation of administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act (S. Rept. 5). Page 1355

**President's Message—Agriculture:** Message from President transmitting his legislative recommendations on farm program was received—referred to Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Page 1382

**U.N. Conference:** Senator Young, of Ohio, was appointed to U.N. Cultural and Scientific Technological Conference to be held at Geneva February 4–20, 1963.

Page 1353

**Cloture:** By 53 yeas to 42 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Senate voted to table the question submitted to it on January 28 by the Vice President, namely, "Does a majority of the Senate have the right, under the Constitution, to terminate debate at the beginning of a session and proceed to an immediate vote on a rule change notwithstanding the provision of the existing Senate rules?"

The question now recurs on the Anderson motion of January 16 to resume consideration of S. Res. 9, providing for amendment of rule XXII so as to provide that cloture may be invoked by affirmative vote of three-fifths of Senators present and voting.

Pages 1414–1420, 1423–1444

**Authority To Report:** Committee on Government Operations was granted a 60-day extension for filing report under S. Res. 359 of the 87th Congress (Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations).

Authority was granted for extension of time until February 8, 1963, for filing of report under S. Res. 238 of the 87th Congress (Special Committee on Aging).

Pages 1382, 1456

**Authority To Meet:** Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration was authorized to meet on Monday, February 4, while Senate is in session. Page 1447

**Nominations:** The following nominations were received: Frank Kowalski, of Connecticut, to be member of the Subversive Activities Control Board; Kenneth A. Cox, of Washington, to be member of Federal Communications Commission; Ronald R. Renne, of Montana, to be member of Board of Directors, Commodity Credit Corporation; Richard H. Holton, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce; Sigurd S. Larmon, of New York, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information; two Navy in the rank of admiral; and six Air Force in the rank of general. Page 1457

**Quorum Calls:** Two quorum calls were taken today.

Pages 1414, 1443

**Record Vote:** One record vote was taken today.

Pages 1443–1444

**Program for Monday:** Senate met at noon and recessed at 5:40 p.m. until 10 a.m. Monday, February 4, when it will continue to debate Anderson motion to resume consideration of S. Res. 9, providing that cloture may be invoked by three-fifths vote of Senators present and voting. Pages 1444, 1457

## *Committee Meetings*

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

NOMINATIONS

*Committee on Commerce:* Committee held hearings on the nominations of Kenneth A. Cox, of Washington, to