

memorializing Congress and the President of the United States to honor Revolutionary War hero Lt. Col. William Ledyard by giving his name to a new submarine being built at Groton, Conn.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LIBONATI: Senate Joint Resolution No. 18 of the 73d General Assembly of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 5500. A bill for the relief of Lt. John P. Mann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 5501. A bill for the relief of Wieslawa Marianna Borczon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 5502. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe LaVersa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 5503. A bill for the relief of Jose J. Quintero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 5504. A bill for the relief of Vittorio Danovaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5505. A bill for the relief of Stavroula G. Regakos (Regakou); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 5506. A bill to revive the office of General of the Armies of the United States and to authorize the President to appoint General of the Army Douglas MacArthur to such office; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 5507. A bill for the relief of Michal Goleniewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5508. A bill for the relief of Francesco Barone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5509. A bill for the relief of Domenico and Giuseppa Di Roma and their minor child, Catalina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 5510. A bill for the relief of Carmela Macaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 5511. A bill for the relief of Konstantin P. Veliskakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.R. 5512. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria de Jesus Umali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 5513. A bill for the relief of Fang-Tsun Kuo and his wife Agatha Mei-Tso Kuo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SENNER:

H.R. 5514. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain public lands in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 5515. A bill for the relief of Sebastiano Nicola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 5516. A bill for the relief of Leslie Freeworth (also known as Laszlo Freiworth); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Foster's Test Ban Treaty Fallacies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on April 2 Disarmament Agency Director William C. Foster directed a letter to Members of the Congress relating to the administration's test ban treaty proposals. I have sent the following letters to colleagues discussing the Foster letter. The American Security Council Washington report referred to in the first letter has been reprinted at pages 4914-4915 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 4, 1963.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: If a nuclear test ban treaty will serve to reduce the world's risks, it is only an effective treaty which will do so—one which in fact stops nuclear weapons progress equally on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

Negotiation of an ineffective treaty would surrender the benefits an effective one might achieve.

Disarmament Agency Director William C. Foster wrote you on April 2 declaring "significant Soviet advances" by cheat testing "would require a series of tests." He added that under present U.S. treaty proposals "the probability is high that any meaningful series would be discovered by seismic and intelligence means."

I respectfully differ with Mr. Foster based on scientific facts brought to light during recent hearings on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The AEC's Director of Military Applications testified that all nuclear weapons of military interest except very large super H-bombs, which the Soviets have anyway, can be developed by underground tests which create seismic signals of very small size.

The Defense Department's seismologist testified about the inherent limitations on seismic instruments to detect and identify as cheat tests signals of this very small size (10 millimicrons and less).

The net effect of this testimony was that intelligent Soviet cheating would create signals which might be detected outside the U.S.S.R., but would be too small to identify as cheat tests. This is because such signals cannot be distinguished from the seismic signal of hundreds of small earthquakes occurring annually in Soviet territory.

Therefore, there exists a big hole for cheating and clandestine development of Soviet nuclear weapons superiority under U.S. nuclear test ban treaty proposals.

This big hole can be closed, and an effective treaty achieved, only by U.S. insistence on manned seismic stations inside the U.S.S.R. Unmanned black boxes won't do the job because they are not tamper-proof.

Although Mr. Foster mentions "intelligence" as another means to spot cheating, when one recalls the difficulties even of finding out what is going on in nearby Cuba, wisdom dictates little reliance be placed on this alternative.

Sincerely,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 3, 1963.

Re nuclear test ban treaty.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Yesterday you received a letter from the Director, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, mentioning the risk of "surprise abrogation" inherent in test ban treaty.

This would be the situation if Soviet's prepared clandestinely in their laboratories for a vital testing series. This could be done over a period of years behind the secrecy of the Iron Curtain. The Soviet Union then would suddenly announce withdrawal from the treaty and capitalize on this surprise factor by conducting intensive tests.

The Director states the risk of Soviet achievement of nuclear superiority in this manner could be reduced by a U.S. policy of maintaining readiness to test in such eventuality.

However, the impossibility of keeping U.S. progress up under these circumstances was adequately stated by President Kennedy on March 2, 1962, in announcing U.S. test resumption following the breach of the then existing informal testing moratorium.

The President's words were as follows: "In actual practice, particularly in a society of free choice, we cannot keep top-flight scientists concentrating on the preparation of an experiment which may or may not take place on an uncertain date in the future. Nor can large technical laboratories be kept fully alert on a standby basis waiting for some other nation to break an agreement. This is not merely difficult or inconvenient—we have explored this alternative thoroughly and found it impossible of execution."

The Director's letter briefly mentions arguments for a test ban treaty. A more complete and fair discussion can be found at pages 3234-3236 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 28, 1963.

The subject also is covered in the American Security Council's March 18, 1963, Washington Report which accompanies this letter.

Sincerely yours,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress.

What Economy Program?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to point out that the continual expansion of Federal governmental activities and increased civilian employment by the administration are the major reasons why Federal budgets and deficits continue to grow.

Since taking office, the present administration has added 132,901 civilian em-

ployees to the Federal payroll. In addition, the President requested 36,500 new jobs in his 1964 budget.

The average annual wage of these employees is \$5,800 and this places an added burden of approximately \$1 billion per year on the budget, excluding the necessary expenditures for equipment, office space, etc.

These facts belie the administration's claim of a vigorous Federal job economy program.

Bartlesville Wins All-America Honors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, a signal honor was recently bestowed upon a community in Oklahoma's Second Congressional District when the National Municipal League and Look magazine designated the city of Bartlesville as a recipient of the annual All-America City awards.

This is a distinguished honor for which all Oklahoma is proud. Bartlesville is 1 of 11 American cities to be singled out for this outstanding recognition out of the nearly 70 applicants that were considered.

The basic criterion for selecting the award-winning cities is effective citizen action in addition to good local government.

Bartlesville well qualifies in this regard. The community leaders and citizens of Bartlesville have a fierce community pride and they work together on various projects which are greatly beneficial to the city and to the State of Oklahoma.

The junior chamber of commerce is an excellent example of the spirit and enthusiasm with which the citizens of Bartlesville tackle community projects.

The Jaycees spearheaded many projects, among them being a statewide drive that secured 220,000 signatures to a petition for reapportionment of the State legislature, thus forcing a referendum vote.

The April 23 issue of Look magazine, which highlights the All-America City winners, points up other Jaycee-community activities such as the successful 5-month campaign to raise \$612,760 for a new 52-acre city park and an adjoining 160-acre 18-hole golf course.

Bartlesville residents enthusiastically supported this drive and all funds needed for the project were collected from local contributors. This same generous response was given to the local community fund and United Health-Service Fund campaigns.

The Bartlesville Jaycees are planning a celebration on April 19 and 20 in honor of the city's recent recognition, and an outstanding program is being formulated.

I had hoped to be on hand personally for the celebration and to congratulate the residents of Bartlesville personally,

but will be unable to do so because I will be on active duty as a Naval Reserve officer and will be visiting Guantanamo and fleet and Marine units in the Cuban area at that time.

However, I know I speak for all Oklahomans in extending our sincere congratulations to the city of Bartlesville and to its citizens and leaders whose work and efforts have brought this great honor to our State.

Statement of Draper Daniels, National Export Expansion Coordinator, Before House Small Business Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, at the hearings held last week by the House Small Business Committee, of which I have the honor to serve as chairman, it was refreshing to find that the President and his administration appear to be moving forward in assisting businessmen, and particularly small businessmen to enter into an expanded program of foreign trade. Although there is much that needs to be done, it appears that definite and positive progress have been made by the administration in this direction.

Mr. Draper Daniels, the newly appointed National Export Expansion Coordinator, appeared before the House Small Business Committee and, in explaining his functions, quoted the President's memorandum to various agencies involved concerning the functions of this new post. The memorandum quoted by Mr. Daniels and which explains the scope of his office follows:

On July 12, I appointed Draper Daniels, of Illinois, National Export Expansion Coordinator.

Stationed in the Department of Commerce and reporting to Secretary Hodges, the National Coordinator functions across departmental lines.

Anything designed to facilitate the expansion of this country's export sales is his concern, and increased exports help our balance of payments which is the concern of all of us.

Specifically, he is charged with coordinating all parts of the export expansion program, regardless of origin, with keeping the program focused on major and meaningful targets, and with moving it toward specific and possible goals on a workable timetable.

All programs in being designed to aid export expansion should be reviewed with him and any new programs to be initiated should be reviewed with him.

Although Mr. Daniels has been in his post only since July of 1962, the presentation he made to our committee indicates that his office is already beginning to function effectively in coordinating activities of various agencies in relation to foreign trade. In summarizing his statement, Mr. Daniels briefly set out some of the accomplishments in this field, which I believe will be of interest

to my colleagues and others. The conclusion of his remarks follows:

This has been a long statement, Mr. Chairman, and I expect that you and the committee may be wondering, "What if anything has happened as a result of all this?"

If I may summarize quickly as a result of the combination of things I have been talking about:

One thousand one hundred and ninety-seven new exporters were introduced to international trade through Department of Commerce field offices and completed at least one successful international transaction in 1962.

Businessmen attending export seminars in 1962, 36,000.

The Department of Commerce Field Office Director estimates that 85 to 90 percent of these were small businessmen.

Of all applications for export credit insurance through FCIA 17½ percent came from firms that had never before exported.

U.S. exports increased to \$20.901 billion, an increase of 4 percent.

If this sounds good, let me assure you that it isn't nearly good enough. If we are to solve our balance-of-payments problem by increasing our exports, we need to do more than twice as well.

I do not believe that this is at all impossible.

Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable RALPH HARDING, of Idaho, is already well known for his defense of the public interest in matters involving the protection of our great natural resources. In particular, his advocacy of sound soil conservation practices marks him an expert in this field which is of such vital importance to the continued prosperity of our Nation.

On March 29 Representative HARDING appeared before the House Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee in support of additional funds for conservation activity for the coming fiscal year. In his statement he spoke not just on behalf of the farmer who works the soil, but for everyone—producer, processor, and consumer. His remarks reflect my interest in the need for adequate funds for important conservation programs. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include his statement to the subcommittee.

We cannot hope to adequately meet the demands of the future unless we take the steps needed to conserve what we already have. Representative HARDING asked that funds be provided to allow merely a realistic minimum program of conservation. I commend his statement to the attention of my colleagues.

REPRESENTATIVE RALPH HARDING TESTIMONY BEFORE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, AGRICULTURE SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, MARCH 29, 1963

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I appreciate your courtesy in granting me sufficient time to come personally before your Agriculture Subcommittee

on Appropriations to discuss with you again this year some of my concerns as I look over the funds which have been requested for conservation purposes in the fiscal 1964 budget.

First I would like to say that while I represent an agricultural State and serve on the House Agriculture Committee it is not strictly my interest in the farmers alone that brings me before your subcommittee today.

For conservation of our natural resources concerns all groups in our country, the businessman in the metropolitan area just as much as the farmer. There is no one who does not directly or indirectly benefit from the wise use of our soil and water resources.

That is why so many of us from widely divergent areas are following your actions on these appropriations so closely and hoping that adequate funds to meet the increasing needs for resource improvement and development can be provided.

My first concern this year, as last year, is over the fact that sufficient funds have not been set aside to increase the level of technical people to staff our soil conservation districts.

It is true that the fiscal 1964 budget sets aside an additional \$1,072,500 for existing soil conservation districts. But let us take a close look, if we may, at what this amount means when it is distributed on a State basis.

In my State of Idaho, where soil conservation districts number 54 and some 18,598 persons are participating in resource improvement activities, I am informed that of this amount only \$12,000 additional will be forthcoming if the total appropriation requested is approved.

And how many additional technicians can be added to these Idaho soil conservation districts where the man-years of technical assistance for each office are continually decreasing as the workload grows, not more than 1½ persons for the entire State.

Conservation district supervisors, both in my State and nationwide, report that each of these districts if adequately staffed would need 1½ additional persons or a total of 81 statewide.

Recognizing the great demands on the budget for other purposes, it was hoped by the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, as well as the Idaho association, that this staff increase of 1½ persons for each district might be accomplished over a 4-year period.

If this were the case, Idaho should have funds to employ 20 more technicians this year instead of the 1½ persons the present budget would allow.

Right here let me point out that in many ways our conservation program is an unusual one. Locally people organize themselves into conservation districts, choose unpaid leaders and then come to the Federal Government for the technical assistance they need through the Soil Conservation Service. These districts also seek financial help from local and State governments.

If adequate technicians are not available, it can only serve to stifle local initiative and progress. And I am afraid this will be the case in Idaho if we cannot soon provide our people with the aid they request and require.

States the Yellowstone Soil Conservation District in Fremont County in their annual report mailed to my office the middle of this month:

"Requests for assistance from the district are increasing quite rapidly from all phases of agriculture; irrigated, dryland, woodland, and range. The most consistent requests come from the irrigated section, because this area is within short distance of the district office. These requests alone are enough to keep the present work unit staff busy."

The Yellowstone district reports to me that they need at least two more technicians to handle their workload. And this report is typical of the workload situation in the

other conservation offices in Idaho and throughout the Nation, I know.

Adequate technical people must be supplemented by sufficient soil and water research staff and facilities. They are part of the same package. One cannot operate efficiently and progressively without the other.

Yet a look at the fiscal 1964 budget reveals that not only are funds for the construction of new research facilities being curtailed, but inadequate funds have been set aside to utilize already existing facilities.

For example, the middle of this month at the Snake River Conservation Field Station at Kimberly, Idaho, we had a dedication and cornerstone laying ceremony with great enthusiasm evident among the participants over what this facility was going to add to the State and to the agricultural industry in particular from the soil and water research planned there.

The construction of the project is well ahead of schedule, I am told, and should be ready for occupancy in July, but the funds set aside in the budget for this plant would leave it standing nearly idle for at least a year. The budget request for an increase of about \$50,000, along with other funds in the State which can be allocated for this field station, provide for only a little over \$100,000 for this research facility which will benefit not only Idaho, but also our surrounding neighbors—Wyoming, Nevada, Oregon, Montana, Utah, and California.

I urge that the increase for the coming year be \$643,300 required to complete the projected implementation instead of the \$50,000 included in the budget.

Proving that conservation does concern more than the farmer, the Twin Falls, Idaho, Chamber of Commerce joins the conservation districts in this plea for more funds for the Snake River Field Station.

"We feel there must be some error in providing funds. At the present time the level of proposed appropriation would leave the plant standing substantially idle for at least a year. This would be most difficult to explain and understand."

Then there are the research facilities at Pullman, Wash., whose assignment is to investigate water erosion control on the frozen wheatland soils of the Palouse region. Although not located in my State, Idahoans, too, have much to gain from the results of these studies.

Therefore, I again join Idaho soil conservation experts in urging that the present budget request of \$78,000 be increased by at least \$200,000 which they tell me would "provide for a sizable effort to tie in with wheatland work proposed at the Snake River station at Kimberly and the proposed soil and water research activities at Pendleton, Ore."

Last year when I appeared before the subcommittee I expressed my concern over the fact that the authorization for agricultural conservation program assistance for aiding farmers and ranchers in bearing the cost of accomplishing soil and water conservation measures had been reduced by \$100 million from the \$250 million of the previous year to \$150 million.

The current budget again carries this proposed reduction. As you know, the committee last year restored this to \$250 million. I commend you for this action and urge that this be done again.

Greater emphasis is also needed on weed control research which causes greater agricultural losses than any other pest or crop impediment.

In view of the fact that the University of Idaho is so ideally geared to research of this type, I hope that when such a facility is established it can be at this land-grant college.

Now I ask your subcommittee to look closely at the need for greater emphasis on watershed planning. As perhaps many of you

read in the national press, Idaho was hit by raging floodwaters in the early spring of 1962 and again early this year.

The areas most severely damaged are small farming areas in need of the kind of structural and land treatment assistance which can be provided under the Public Law 566 program.

I am told by Lee T. Morgan, Idaho's State conservationist, that in our State alone we need to be engaged in watershed planning at at least double the current rate and the Idaho State Association of Soil Conservation Districts assures me this is true on a nationwide basis.

The water problems in Idaho are extremely complex and frequently it is necessary for the local people to call on the services of both the Soil Conservation Service and the Corps of Army Engineers. As we all know, the corps' work is devoted to the main water stems, but their efforts need to be supplemented by work upstream on the small watersheds.

The need for greater watershed planning is no more dramatically demonstrated than looking at what happened in the little community of Bancroft, Idaho, hit twice by the floodwaters since 1962.

It is the view of the supervisors of the local soil conservation district that an adequate watershed treatment program, carried out under Public Law 566, could have reduced the amount of runoff during these two floods almost in half and saved many damaged homes and businesses in their community.

I would prefer to provide funds now for adequate watershed development than to extend our tax money on flood recovery after the precious water has been lost and taken a terrific toll of public and private property.

The current budget request of \$5½ million, which is the same amount as appropriated for fiscal year 1963, for watershed planning enables Idaho to handle only two water planning applications a year. The National Association of Soil Conservation Districts has asked that this be increased to \$7½ million.

I urge the approval of these additional funds as does the Idaho Soil Conservation Association.

But watershed planning is just the beginning. Funds spent for planning are not of value unless these plans can be carried out.

The current requests for construction under the watershed program provides for only 36 new starts for 1964 nationwide. This is less than one per State I urge, as do conservation experts, that this be increased by \$20 million.

It is noted that the budget request for conservation contains a new item—\$6,275,000 for resource conservation and development projects. These were authorized last year under Public Law 87-703. It is the hope of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service that 10 projects can be initiated in 1964.

Several soil conservation districts in my State are interested in this and busy at work with county commissioners and other local people developing applications for consideration.

While one of these initial projects may not be located in my congressional district, nevertheless I want to support this item since indirectly any work of this type does benefit my State and the Nation generally.

I also note in going over the agricultural appropriation requests that there is only \$500,000 in the budget for scabies control and eradication. While this departs somewhat from my emphasis on conservation needs, I did not want to overlook this opportunity to call your committee's attention to the need for adequate funds to eradicate this disease which attacks sheep.

My own State of Idaho has fortunately not had a scabies outbreak for many years,

but as long as it exists in other areas it does constitute a threat to our sheep industry in the Western States.

Since the States contributed over \$1 million last year to fighting scabies I would hope the Federal Government could more adequately supplement their efforts by at least matching the amount of money they are expending for eradicating this disease and eliminate the need for the amounts we spend annually for control purposes.

While I am sure your Subcommittee hears mostly requests for funds and gets few commendations on the vital decisions you must make on appropriations, I do want to take this opportunity to commend you for the action taken last year in strengthening the snow survey and water forecast phase of our program. This has proved of inestimable value in my State in that we have been able to increase the number of soil moisture stations, have added snow survey courses and currently provide our water users with the best forecasts that have ever been available.

With current reports indicating that the snow in Idaho this year is at the lowest level ever recorded, this information will enable our farmers to start immediately to use their short supply of water to the best possible advantage.

I hope you will allow me one last comment on the work on the Soil Conservation Service generally. In my travels throughout my congressional district I am continually impressed with the excellent reports I am given on the work which is being provided by these technicians and the local conservation districts. I have yet to hear one complaint which as your subcommittee members know is unusual for any program, be it Federal, State or local.

These soil conservation people are doing a tremendous job, and I hope the Congress can give them the monetary assistance they so desperately need to carry out their vital work programs.

The 41st Anniversary of Carl Follen Unit No. 103, Steuben Society of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, today, April 4, 1963, marks the 41st anniversary of the establishment of Carl Follen Unit No. 103, Steuben Society of America. This unit has its headquarters in my congressional district and most of its members reside in the Seventh Congressional District of New York.

The aims and purposes of the Steuben Society of America, in part, call upon the members to loyally support the Constitution of the United States of America by advocating the proper application of its provisions and inculcating the principles underlying true democratic government. Truly, it can be said that the Carl Follen Unit No. 103 has in every way exemplified this aim of the society. Its members are active in local, State, and National matters of importance to our citizenry. Many of them have risen to important positions in their community, State, and Nation. My predecessor in the House of Representatives, Albert H. Bosch, has been a mem-

ber of this unit since he reached the age of 21.

It gives me pleasure today to congratulate Carl Follen Unit No. 103 on its 41st anniversary and wish for the membership many long years of continued good fellowship and service.

American Agriculture in a Changing World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, recently the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] was guest speaker at the Independent Bankers Association 29th annual convention at the Roosevelt Hotel in New Orleans. While in my State addressing this meeting, he delivered an interesting message with reference to the situation of agriculture in a changing world. I thought each Member of the Senate would be very much interested in what the Senator from South Dakota had to say on this occasion and I, accordingly, ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN AGRICULTURE IN A CHANGING WORLD
(Address by Senator GEORGE McGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, at the 29th Annual Convention of the Independent Bankers Association, March 26, 1963)

In the early years of our national history, Thomas Jefferson observed that "the small landholder is the most precious part of the state."

Jefferson asserted his conviction that "those who labor in the earth are the chosen people of God, if ever He had a chosen people * * *"

Throughout our history, most Americans have shared to varying degrees Jefferson's lofty view of the importance of agriculture in American life.

It is true that for many decades the glitter of the city has held a strong attraction for American farm youth. No one has fully answered the question: "How ya gonna keep 'em down on the farm after they've seen Paree?"

But at least until recent years, agriculture has occupied a high place, not only in public opinion, but also in the Congress of the United States.

Senator ELLENDER, of Louisiana, chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, told me that when he first came to Washington 26 years ago, Senators considered agriculture and appropriations the two most desirable committee assignments open to any Senator.

Yet, this year I was the only Member of the Senate to request assignment to the Committee on Agriculture, and five Senators presently on the committee asked to get off. Only three of them were permitted to do so.

What has happened in recent years to explain this turn of events?

I suspect there are several factors.

First of all, agriculture has become an extremely complex industry afflicted with

problems that are frustrating and difficult to solve.

Secondly, the farm population which embraced 9 out of 10 Americans in Jefferson's day now comprises only 8 percent of the American people. This inevitably spells a relative decline in the political power and public appeal of agriculture.

Thirdly, there is no organization to speak for agriculture with a single voice. This not only frustrates the friends of the farmer in Congress; it means that the farmer's story is told poorly to the Nation.

I am constantly appalled by the distorted views on agriculture of my urban friends. For example, they labor under the false impression that the farm price support program results in excessively high food prices to the American housewife. Actually, consumer food costs are \$4 to \$6 billion a year less than if farm prices had increased as much as prices in other parts of the economy in the last 8 years.

Again, urban taxpayers look askance at the \$6 billion budget of the Department of Agriculture and assume that this is a gigantic subsidy to farmers. Of course, the major portion of this budget is not a farm subsidy at all. Much of it goes to finance such programs as the school lunch and special school milk program, our overseas food-for-peace program, the consumers meat-inspection program, repayable loans for rural electrification, management of our national forests, and storage fees to commercial storage companies.

Many city dwellers call for oversimplified "solutions" to the farm problem, such as eliminating the "marginal" farmer. This recommendation overlooks the fact that thousands of farmers who are now at the margin of financial failure would not be in that plight if they were receiving a fair price for their produce.

I know that the independent bankers of America are keenly aware of both the problems and the importance of agriculture. Because you are in daily association with the hopes, the anxieties, and the difficulties of our farm families, you know better than most of us the integral relationship between a healthy agriculture and a prosperous main street.

One of the most eloquent statements on the current challenge to American agriculture was delivered by one of your distinguished spokesmen, Mr. Pat DuBois, before a congressional committee a year ago. That statement refuted in unmistakable language the false notion that we can eliminate the farm problems simply by eliminating farmers.

As Mr. DuBois put it: "Move the people from the farms and you also remove the banks and other service institutions. The farmers came to the prairies before the towns and when the farmers are gone there will be no further need for the towns."

If we could assure the farmer a fair return on his products, it would be a powerful stimulus to business and industry. Prosperous farmers are the Nation's best customers for basic commodities such as steel, rubber, machinery, appliances, and a host of other items that keep the factory wheels turning. The most effective way I know to reduce unemployment, get the economy moving, and retard the exodus of young people from the rural areas to the cities is to strengthen our farm economy. In my view, if we could correct the imbalance between agriculture and the rest of the economy, it would do more to stimulate the economic life of the Nation than the President's proposed tax cut.

A strong and prosperous agriculture is essential not only for the welfare of our farm families and our domestic economy but in a broader sense because the food and fiber of America is one of our most valuable assets in today's world.

As the former director of the Nation's food-for-peace program, I came to a new appreciation of the enormous advantage this Nation has in our marvelous capacity to produce food.

Indeed, I believe that the productivity of American agriculture is coveted more by our competitors in Russia and China than any other U.S. asset.

Having traveled in most of the underdeveloped nations of the globe, I am equally convinced that the most serious barrier to the development of those nations is their backward agricultural system—inefficient production, lack of rural credit, and a decadent system of land ownership and taxation.

One of the major weaknesses of our foreign assistance program has been its overemphasis on industrial development at the expense of more urgently needed rural development. The capital investments we made in Western Europe under the Marshall plan were effective because Europe had the technical and administrative experience to use such aid efficiently. But those factors are missing in Latin America, Asia, and Africa. Basic rural and community development must come first. We take our own food production for granted, but this is the crying need in most of the rest of the world.

We have been awed by the achievements of our astronauts in outer space. But the world which these remarkable men left behind for a few hours is a world where two-thirds of the inhabitants till the soil with crude implements and primitive techniques—little changed in the past 3,000 years.

It is still the fate of most of the inhabitants of the earth to see their children suffer the listlessness of body, the dullness of mind, and the weariness of spirit that are the companions of malnutrition.

This paradox of plenty in the midst of hunger prompted Congress to enact in 1954 one of the most imaginative laws ever placed on the U.S. statute books.

Public Law 480, passed with broad bipartisan support, made American surplus food available to friendly countries who were unable to meet their needs through traditional commercial arrangements.

Since its passage in the summer of 1954, U.S. food and fiber valued at over \$11 billion have moved to more than 100 countries and territories under concessional sales arrangements or as outright grants.

In the opening hours of his administration, President Kennedy gave new force to Public Law 480 by an Executive order creating a food-for-peace office in the White House which I was privileged to head. The President called for an expanded effort to use our "agricultural abundance as a national asset to meet foreign policy objectives."

This far-reaching Executive order has given a dynamic new dimension to American food reserves. It has done much to replace the negative concept of surplus disposal with a positive view of U.S. agricultural abundance as a precious national asset. It has given the American farmer a vital stake in foreign policy. It has focused worldwide attention on the achievements of American agriculture in a world of food shortages. It has strengthened the political and moral position of the United States in international affairs.

There is, of course, a double thrust behind food for peace. It is first of all clearly in the self-interest of the American people to reduce costly storages, to protect our farm economy from price-depressing surpluses, to stimulate our shipping industry by massive food shipments, and to develop long-range commercial markets. Food for peace does all of these things.

But the other thrust behind food for peace stems from the philosophy of the scriptural admonition to "feed the hungry." No one

can doubt the genuine, humanitarian desire of the American people to see our food reserves shared with the world's hungry.

There have been two especially important breakthroughs in food for peace recently which hold exciting future prospects. The first of these is the use of food to pay the wages of workers engaged in building schools, roads, clinics, and rural improvements.

Today in a dozen countries, American cereals and other foods are financing part of the wages of workers employed on valuable public works projects. Wheat and corn and rice and milk from across the Nation are being converted into classrooms, roadways, and better communities abroad.

A second challenging breakthrough is a greatly expanded overseas school lunch program. The most precious asset of any nation is its children. Their health and education are the twin foundations of social growth.

School lunches not only give new physical energy and health to the children, they result in sharply improved school attendance and academic performance. A pilot school lunch agreement with Peru resulted in a 40-percent increase in school attendance in its first year of operation. Eight and one-half million children in Latin America are now enjoying this American assisted school lunch program. Thirty-five million school children around the world are now participating in our food-for-peace program.

In Japan where the program has been operating since the end of World War II, the Japanese have now taken over the entire responsibility. Japanese children who learned at school to enjoy American milk and wheat flour and other U.S. commodities help explain why Japan has become our best dollar customer for American farm products.

America's agricultural know-how has not only resulted in invaluable contributions of food to a hungry world; it has also enabled us to offer vitally needed technical assistance to the developing countries. Through our overseas point 4 program and our Peace Corps units, we have offered the skills of hundreds of our trained agricultural technicians. We are also cooperating in the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization and the Freedom From Hunger campaign.

When one considers that three-fourths of the people of the world are rural residents, it is clear that the amazing efficiency of the American farmer is our most appealing material asset. This is one area of competition in which we have no serious challenge from the Communist world. It is, perhaps, our greatest opportunity to lead the rural societies of Latin America, Africa, and Asia into the solid social and economic growth which makes peace and freedom possible.

I would like to think that more of our enormous reservoir of agricultural technicians, extension workers, and retired farmers might become involved for a time in pointing the rural people of the world toward higher standards of life.

There is one final challenge that I think is worthy of the careful thought of everyone concerned with the future of American agriculture—the European Common Market.

This new trading bloc composed of France, Italy, West Germany, Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg—absorbed a third of our entire overseas dollar sales of agricultural produce in 1962. Other West European countries including the United Kingdom are seeking entrance to the community and will doubtless be admitted eventually.

The burning question for U.S. agriculture turns on whether or not this huge historical outlet for our farm produce will throw up a trade wall to hold out future agricultural shipments from the United States.

Recent actions by West Germany against American poultry and some of the pronouncements of the French are genuine cause for concern on the part of the United

States. There is other solid evidence of European efforts to block imports of American farm products.

Our Government, and especially Secretary Freeman, has very properly sounded a strong note of protest against these efforts. If the United States were to lose a major part of our agricultural markets in Western Europe, it would have a disastrous impact on our farm economy and also on our balance of payments.

It is hoped that the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 will strengthen the President's bargaining power with the Common Market countries. It is imperative, however, that the President keep agriculture and industry in a package when he negotiates our arrangements with the Common Market. He must not grant trade concessions to European industrial producers who desire to sell in the United States until we are assured of favorable treatment for our normal agricultural exports to Europe.

In addition to vast economic aid to Western Europe after World War II, the American people have, for many years, financed a significant portion of the cost of Europe's defense. Our troops and weapons commitments to Berlin and the NATO forces have been most generous. These commitments have seriously affected our balance-of-payments position.

I think, therefore, that if necessary, the President should make it clear to the Common Market countries, that if they exclude our farm exports, we may find it necessary to withdraw part or all of our military forces from Europe. The defense of Europe is now primarily a European responsibility in any event, and we can permit no further deterioration of either our balance-of-payments position or our agricultural economy.

The trade negotiations ahead will not be easy, especially in view of Mr. de Gaulle's apparent desire to use French agriculture as his chief instrument in establishing a Western Europe that is much more independent of the United States.

But in the long run, if our negotiators are tough and intelligent, we can face the future in the firm knowledge that the unparalleled efficiency of American agriculture will assure us of an expanding trade.

Nearly a quarter of a century ago, the Department of Agriculture published a great yearbook entitled, "Farmers in a Changing World." In a postscript to the foreword of that 1940 publication, the editor identified the underlying theme of the book as the necessity in the modern world for constant and adequate adjustment to change.

And he added: "The fundamental problems of our agriculture are not likely to be lessened by the changing international situation. They are more likely to be intensified, and there will be more need than ever to meet them with courage and intelligence in order that we may strengthen our country to the utmost."

I can think of no more fitting words on which to conclude this consideration of the prospects facing our farmers in a changing world.

Why Shackle Cuban Freedom Fighters?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, patriotic anti-Castro Cubans—in the United States, in Latin America, in their un-

happy homeland—must harbor feelings of bewilderment, frustration, and anger after reading the stern statements of our State Department spokesman in regard to Alpha 66 raids on Cuba, and noting the extraordinary measures being taken by our Government to curb these forays.

Cubans who live for the day of their country's liberation may be able to appreciate the undesirability of open encouragement of these harassing tactics, but they must be mystified by this strong condemnation from the Government which once led them to bitter disappointment at the Bay of Pigs.

As long as Alpha 66 is going it alone, why could not our State Department spokesmen content themselves with the simple statement, "We don't know anything about it"?

Proposed Shift of the Internal Revenue Service From New York to Boston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I am strongly opposed to the proposed shift of the Internal Revenue Service office from New York to Boston, and, while I believe in more efficient Government operations, find it difficult to understand how moving operations to the area of lesser demand will save money. It appears to me that just the opposite will be the result.

The Senate Finance Committee will meet in executive session tomorrow, April 5, to study the matter, and I have made my views known to that august body, recommending that the Secretary of the Treasury be requested to reconsider this decision.

The text of my letter to Chairman BYRD is submitted for the future consideration of my colleagues:

I want to place my views and recommendations before the Senate Finance Committee for consideration at the executive session tomorrow, April 5, being held to investigate the reasons behind the removal and transfer of the New York City regional internal revenue office to Boston.

The announced reason is that a consolidation of the two district offices will save money. If this is true, I think it would also be true that more money will be saved by consolidating the much smaller district into the much larger district.

The logic of this, it is argued, is upset by the proximity of the Boston site to the Record Center. I submit that unless the proximity is such that material is under the same roof no substantial saving will be realized for this reason.

The plain fact is that the New York district is the main district, and geographically is much better located than the proposed Boston area.

I have just been informed that although it has been publicly stated that the Secretary of the Treasury is reviewing this matter, the entire transfer is proceeding without delay. New York's top officials were sent to Boston on March 15 to arrange the transfer,

and on April 3 officials from Boston will come to New York so that plans might be completed by May 1. It would appear that the Secretary's announcement may just be an instance of managed news.

I request the Senate Finance Committee to ask the Secretary of the Treasury to reconsider this decision.

Dollar Benefits of Youth Conservation Corps Work in National Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently I wrote to the Secretary of Agriculture to see if estimates could be made of the dollar benefits that would result from the work of a Youth Conservation Corps in our national forests. I found his answer to be rather startling.

A very conservative estimate by the Forest Service indicates that the direct and indirect dollar benefits of a Youth Conservation Corps would be about \$7,000 per enrollee as compared to the annual cost per enrollee of \$3,895.

I think my colleagues would be interested in reading the Forest Service's full report. Under unanimous consent, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the report along with copies of my correspondence with the Agriculture Department:

APRIL 2, 1963.

HON. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you know I have joined with other of my colleagues in sponsoring legislation to authorize a Youth Conservation Corps. While it is my own feeling that the most significant argument for this legislation is the personal benefits for the individual enrollee, I am also quite aware of the great benefits that would result in the work of conserving our natural resources.

I would very much appreciate it if the Forest Service could make estimates of the actual dollar benefits that would result from the work of YCC members in the national forests. If possible, would you also include the delayed and indirect benefits such as eventual timber sales and recreational revenues.

With continued best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

AL ULLMAN,
Member of Congress.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE,
Washington D.C., April 3, 1963.

HON. AL ULLMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ULLMAN: This acknowledges your letter of April 2 to Secretary Freeman, who has referred it to us for reply.

Attached is a statement which has been prepared showing the potential benefits from a Youth Conservation Corps program. We believe that it will serve the purpose you had in mind in your inquiry to the Secretary.

Sincerely yours,

W. S. SWINGLER,
Acting Chief.

POSSIBLE ESTIMATE OF DOLLAR BENEFITS FROM YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS WORK

There is over 300,000 man-years of development work on the national forests that is available for accomplishment by a Youth Conservation Corps.

The direct financial revenues to the Treasury from the national forests, if all of this work was accomplished, would rise to over \$200 million annually by 1972. Payments from national forest revenues for county schools and roads would increase correspondingly. The capital value of the timber, forage, and lands of the national forests would increase by about \$2 billion.

The timber stand improvement and reforestation work would contribute materially to a long-term investment resulting in timber production of 21 billion board feet of sawtimber annually by the year 2000, worth \$350 million annually in timber sales.

In addition to direct financial income to the United States as a result of national forest development, there will be both substantial secondary benefits and very real intangible benefits. Secondary benefits include such things as numbers of people employed directly on the program work and the harvesting of national forest timber and other products and the value added to those products by manufacture, distribution, and marketing.

In timber alone, it is estimated that for every dollar of national forest stumpage sold, the end products will be worth about \$20 by the time they reach the ultimate consumer. The estimated employment directly associated with the utilization of timber harvested from the national forests will amount to about 800,000 man-years annually by 1972. This will be more than twice the current level.

Development of the recreation facilities on national forests would serve the recreationists who will be putting into trade channels by 1972, \$1.5 billion for sporting equipment, transportation, licenses, lodging, and other items.

Development and improvement of the small and big game habitat and fishing waters by a Youth Conservation Corps would increase the use of many national forest areas by hunters and fishermen. It is estimated that fishermen and hunters spend about \$10 for each man-day visit to national forests. Increase of this use through improvement of the wildlife habitat would put a large share of this man-day expenditure into the local economy.

Of the reservoir of national forest work available to a Youth Conservation Corps program and the resultant total benefits, the following examples indicate possible benefits attributable to the program.

On a national average, recreationists spend about \$5.50 per person-trip day. It is estimated that national forest recreation visitors spend about half of this average, or \$2.50 per man-day. Every family recreation unit constructed by a Youth Corps on the national forests, at an approximate cost of \$1,000 per unit, would return approximately \$1,060 annual expenditures by recreationists into the local economy in a year or two. It is estimated that a Youth Corps of 15,000 enrollees could conduct at least 12,000 family recreation units annually, which would return approximately \$12 million into the local economy in a year or two.

Millions of acres of young growth timber stands on the national forests or of timber stands partially or completely denuded by fire, insects, diseases, or other causes will, when culturally treated, return \$5,000 or more in 10 years on a \$3,000 investment. There are nearly 30 million acres of national forests lands in need of such treatment. A 15,000 Youth Corps could accomplish about 2,000 man-years or \$7 million worth of such work annually. This would

return about \$11.7 million annually in 10 years.

Similar benefits can be indicated in wildlife habitat improvement to increase use of many national forest areas by sportsmen; watershed restoration to stabilize soil, improve streamflows, and enhance water quality; insect and disease control to prevent annual losses in timber of about \$94 million annually; and forest road and trail maintenance and construction to increase public use and access to resources.

A very conservative dollar estimate of the direct and indirect benefits of a Youth Corps is a return of about \$7,000 per enrollee or \$7,000 for a \$3,985 annual cost per enrollee.

A Voluntary Medical Care Plan for the Elderly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, one of my colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio, FRANK BOW, has had the foresight to present to this Congress a constructive program dealing with the problem of providing adequate medical care for our elderly citizens. The Bow bill is a progressive approach to the problem, meeting it head on and provides the care required by the free enterprise approach without the stigma of socialized medicine. On April 1, 1963, my distinguished colleague presented his program to the American Academy of General Practice at Chicago, Ill. In this speech he explains the merits of his bill and I am happy to include his speech in my remarks:

A VOLUNTARY MEDICAL CARE PROGRAM FOR THE ELDERLY

(Address of Representative FRANK T. BOW, of Ohio, before the American Academy of General Practice, at Chicago, Ill., April 1, 1963)

In his invitation to me, Dr. Rhoades suggested that I might be considered the middle-of-the-road member of this panel. Perhaps that is a fair description, because in almost every aspect of political philosophy I am certain I stand far to the right of Secretary Nestingen, and with respect to medical care for the elderly, I am certainly to the left of those who want to stand pat on the present laws or programs in this field.

Insofar as the provisions of my own legislation are concerned, I am neither left nor right of them but far out in front for I propose to do more and do it better than either of them.

As I said to some of you in Detroit a few weeks ago, you are entitled to an explanation of why FRANK BOW, a conservative member of the House Appropriations Committee, is here at all, for it is most unusual to find such a man sponsoring something drastically new in the field of social legislation.

GOVERNMENT CONTROL OF HEALTH CARE

Let me say, first, that I have been concerned by efforts to federalize—or nationalize or socialize, you can choose your own term—the health care of this Nation for many years. My interest was stimulated 16 years ago when I became the counsel of the Harshness Committee, a congressional committee

investigating the lobbying activities of Federal agencies. One of the worst offenders of that era was the Federal Security Agency, predecessor of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Oscar Ewing, Chief of the Agency, was engaged in a widespread lobbying campaign to place the Federal Government in control of all health services of the United States and guarantee cradle-to-the-grave security for every American, the object of his affections was the old Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. His principal agent, who has now returned to Government as a close associate of my fellow panelist, was Assistant Secretary Wilbur Cohen.

The Forand bill of several years ago, the King-Anderson bill of the 87th Congress, and the present Kennedy bill are the direct descendants of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell measure.

When it was discovered that Americans were not ready to accept Government control of all medicine, and compulsory health insurance for everyone, the approach was modified in the Forand bill to include everyone who receives social security benefits. And when the American people refused to buy that package, it was further modified to include only people over 65 who are covered by social security.

Each step of the way Mr. Forand and the other sponsors of the legislation assured their supporters that the retreat was temporary. They say that if we can get hospitalization for the aged under social security, we can get the next Congress to add doctor bills and house calls, and the next Congress to add widows and orphans, and so on, year by year, until we will cover everyone for every health need by a compulsory tax. That would be a sad day for the American people, for as I have often said, government medicine is not good medicine.

ELDERLY NEED PROTECTION

However, I find merit in the proposal to provide a special program to help retired men and women meet the cost of medical care. I am convinced that this is a serious problem and one that deserves the attention of the Federal Government. It is a problem because people who retire must live on reduced income, sometimes greatly reduced. They often lose the group health insurance benefits that protected them during their years of active work or, if they can afford it, they can continue the protection at higher individual rates. However, sadly enough, very many of our retirees cannot afford to pay the premiums necessary to obtain adequate protection.

Most of these people can get along insofar as the customary expenses of a modest or even frugal living are concerned. Their difficulty arises when they are confronted with an unusually large extra expense, such as that of a severe illness, and they simply cannot meet such additional expenses on retirement income.

As members of the medical profession, you know far better than I some of the hardships that older people encounter.

The administration proposal as presently advanced does not solve the problem. The Kerr-Mills law does not solve it, for these people are not medical indigents. They become so only after severe illness wipes out their resources.

It seemed to me that someone must develop a better plan than King-Anderson or Kerr-Mills, and that it should be a plan embodying these fundamentals:

1. It should be voluntary.
2. It should provide generous coverage to take care of major medical expenses, to the maximum possible extent.
3. It should avoid establishing a new Federal bureaucracy.
4. It should avoid Federal control or interference in health care.
5. It should cover everyone who cannot afford to take care of himself.

6. It should be supported by all of the people of the United States who pay taxes, just as almost every other national need is satisfied out of national income.

7. It should encourage family responsibility toward older people.

THE BOW BILL

The basis of the Bow bill is incentive. The incentive is found in tax credits. We state that the United States believes in medical care insurance for everyone. We believe that the special problems of retired people merit a special incentive to encourage insurance protection for them.

I would allow a tax credit up to \$150 for each individual over 65 who is covered by a comprehensive medical care policy. The credit would be equal to the actual cost of premiums up to \$150. In the income group covered by the bill, those with incomes less than \$8,000 per year per couple, there are probably at least 2 million who could take advantage of this tax credit themselves.

Among the other 12 million, many, and I think the great majority, could obtain the same protection if someone else would buy the insurance for them. My bill offers them an incentive to do so. A son for his parents, or perhaps an older man for his widowed sister-in-law, could get a tax credit up to \$150 if he provided the protection.

And finally, this, I think, is most important for the future, the tax credit would be made available to any employer who provides the protection for retired employees.

These are incentives that would work. There will always be some who cannot take advantage of these incentives. For them the bill provides that a medical care insurance certificate with a value of \$150 will be issued which may be used by the individual to enroll in an insurance plan. The certificate will be redeemed for cash by the Treasury from the insurance carrier who provides the protection.

PROTECTION AFFORDED

The entire plan would be administered insofar as the Government is concerned by the Internal Revenue Service. That service already handles the special exemptions for the aged. It handles millions of collections and refunds each year. It would be no great administrative burden to add this program.

My bill establishes the minimum benefits which must be included in a medical care insurance policy if the insured wishes to take advantage of the Government incentive or assistance.

These minimum benefits were developed with the help of experts in the insurance business. They inform me that either of the two plans spelled out in the bill could be offered for \$150, although this is close to the pure premium cost. And they assure me that if Government assistance opens up a market of 14 or 15 million people, the competition for that market will make certain even richer benefits than the bill prescribes. Approximately half of these people already have some kind of health insurance, and they will be encouraged to provide better protection for themselves. The remainder will certainly take advantage of at least the minimum \$150 package.

There are two plans, one a "first dollar" coverage which includes up to 90 days hospitalization, ancillary charges up to \$120, physicians services, convalescent home care and surgical charges on the basis of a \$300 fee schedule.

The second plan is a co-insurance plan with a deductible feature, which makes it possible to offer more comprehensive benefits.

Either plan offers the elderly person far more protection and assistance than is proposed by the administration bill.

The burden of the plan, on the Federal Government, would appear as a reduction in income rather than an added cost. And

it would not be as expensive as my critics claim. If one multiplies \$150 by some 14.5 million people the cost appears to exceed \$2 billion. We must remember, however, that the protection provided would relieve Federal, State, and local governments of a great part of their current spending for medical care of the aged, and to a large extent it would eliminate the deductions for medical care that are now taken by elderly taxpayers. These considerations bring the actual loss of revenue down to approximately \$1.25 billion. This is far more favorable than the unrealistic and far underpriced estimates of the cost of the President's program.

POLITICAL FACTS OF 1963

I regret that there are many people in this country, including many of my friends, who are willing to go along with me on tax incentives, but who draw the line when I propose taking care of those less fortunate who cannot take advantage of the tax incentives for themselves, because they have no income to be taxed, and who have no relatives or former employers able or willing to provide the insurance and take the credit. For some this appears to be too radical, and they tell me that these people can be cared for under the Kerr-Mills Act, or the excellent welfare programs of some States, or by the charity of individual physicians.

I can tell you this today just as surely as I can tell you that I enjoy sharing this fine meeting with you. We are going to do something to take care of the health problems of persons of small income over 65 on a private, voluntary, free enterprise system such as I have proposed, or we are going to have forced upon us a Federal compulsory health system with Federal control and direction of hospitals, doctors, nurses, and everything else connected with hospital care. The provisions of King-Anderson made this self-evident.

My friends who wish to stand pat on Kerr-Mills, those who each day must check nervously the attitudes of members of the House Ways and Means Committee or Senate Finance, those who rely on one or two men in one or the other of these committees to hold off socialized medicine, they are going to lose this battle unless they adopt some constructive alternative, something better.

And it must be done soon.

The Bow bill is not a perfect vehicle, but it is a vehicle around which can be built a satisfactory bill, a program that will serve its purpose, and one that will take the entire issue out of the political arena once and for all.

INADEQUACY OF PRESIDENT'S PLAN

How different would be the case if Congress were to enact the President's proposal.

As you know, he has modified it somewhat. He proposes to give an option on the kind and extent of hospital coverage an oldster can get. This is in answer to our criticism of the \$90 deductible feature. The bill last year presumed that an indigent person who needed hospitalization could pay the first \$90, and that is not true. Also, he is covering out of general revenue those old people who are not members of the social security or railroad retirement system, a concession to another point of criticism of his 1961 proposal.

The bill is admittedly inadequate. If it were enacted steps would be taken in the next Congress, as Mr. Forand has promised, to broaden the benefits and then to broaden the age group covered and these enlargements of the plan would be accepted and we would be on the way to complete Federal control of health care from the cradle to the grave. That is the alternative to something like the Bow bill.

SOCIAL SECURITY FINANCING

I would like to speak for a moment about financing the administration's proposal.

As you may know, it is supposed to be financed by an increase of one-half percent in the social security tax and an increase in the base to \$5,200. This is expected to yield \$1.3 billion per year. Social security estimates that the King-Anderson bill will cost only \$1.06 billion per year, but these figures are open to serious challenge. Experts in the health insurance industry who have experience in this field estimate the first-year cost at \$2.2 billion.

At best, social security financing is in precarious balance. If the health insurance experts are even half right, the proposed tax increase will fall far short of paying the bill. I am inclined to place my faith in the experts in this matter.

And what does that mean to the present system of social security benefits? Admittedly, the present payments are woefully inadequate and they become less adequate as this administration continues its inflationary course. The average retired woman worker receives \$62.40 in benefits, the average aged widow \$65.40, and the average retired couple \$127.10. Social security was supposed to supplement other retirement funds, but in fact it has encouraged many to put off the thought of acquiring such funds.

Also, we must remember that the people of whom we are talking reached maturity about the time of the First World War, came home from war to encounter a bad recession, weathered a 10-year depression at about the time when they should have been in their years of highest earning power. It has been very difficult for the people of that generation to lay aside a great deal for retirement.

PRESENT PROGRAMS INADEQUATE

If we are going to increase social security taxes, we should do something about the present rockbottom benefits. We should do something about the widow who at age 55, having never worked a day, finds herself left on her own without benefits until she reaches 62. We should do something about the high school student whose orphan benefits run out at his 18th birthday, while he has perhaps a year of high school remaining, and who may be forced to drop out and go to work. We should continue those benefits until he graduates from high school. What about the man who is 10 years older than his wife, who retires at 65 when she is 55, and they must struggle along on his meager benefit until the wife's benefit becomes available. There is plenty of room for improvement in the present social security system if social security taxes can be raised, and I think it is dangerous indeed to ignore these needs and jeopardize the entire program by adding this hospitalization experiment to the load.

For there is a limit to what people will pay. Social security taxation is a levy against gross income. There are no deductions. It falls most heavily on the person whose income is least, on young people raising families, working people everywhere. Present law will increase it to 9¼ percent of the first \$4,800 of gross income by 1966. Senator Ribicoff, when he was Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, predicted that people would not be willing to pay more than 10 percent. Increase the base to \$5,200 and the tax to support medicine, and we may have reached the limit on our social security program.

Perhaps I have been dwelling too much on why I believe it is important to reject the social security approach.

FREE ENTERPRISE SOLUTION

Let me close on a positive note. The cost of medical care is a problem of our old people. It can be solved without unnecessary Federal interference by using tax incentives and assistance and the facilities of the free enterprise health insurance carriers of the Nation. I believe this is the proposal that

must win support of all people who believe, as I do, that big government is always the enemy of freedom and must be closely controlled by a people who wish to preserve their liberties.

If you agree with that philosophy, you will join me in rejecting absolutely every suggestion for a Government program that is not clearly required in the public interest. And this carries with it the obligation to propose comprehensive and constructive solutions, in accord with our ideas about liberty, whenever new problems clearly require Government intervention. It is easy to say "No" to everything but it is not always right.

I hope that I have contributed something, from the practical political viewpoint, to your thoughts about the medicare issue. I will welcome your comments and suggestions concerning my proposal, for I know that you who are so close to the problem will have a great deal to offer those of us who are dealing with the issue in the Congress.

Congress Should Restore Allotments for Servicemen's Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 with respect to the payment of quarters allowances to enlisted members in the Armed Forces.

My bill seeks to correct a grave injustice that has been done to dependents and the immediate families of servicemen. The injustice, to be sure, was not committed intentionally, but it exists nevertheless and many of these dependents are now suffering the consequences.

On July 10, 1962, Public Law 87-531 was enacted by Congress to amend certain sections of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950. These changes went into effect on January 1, 1963. The major change is that under the new law noncommissioned officers in all branches of our Armed Forces, having 4 years of service or more, are no longer required to have a class Q allotment in effect for their dependents. In other words, the law gives the serviceman full authority for the disposition of his pay. If he so desires, he may arrange for continued direct payment to his dependents; if he chooses not to do so, he need not make such arrangements.

Since December 31, 1962, all class Q allotments have been terminated, except for certain enlisted members in the lower grades. The result is that many of the men in service failed to make the necessary arrangements for their dependents to receive the allotments they have been getting in the past. In recent weeks, I have received several complaints from the wives of servicemen who have young children and are dependent on these allotments for their subsistence.

What can such families do? In an information sheet prepared by one of the military services, we are told that the

dependent may contact the serviceman's unit commander. If the serviceman, having been counseled, refuses to furnish direct support or initiate a class E allotment, "he renders himself subject to disciplinary action, including reduction to a grade in which a class Q allotment is mandatory and may be initiated without his consent."

This creates a difficult administrative problem for the military services and much unnecessary work. But the worst part of it is that the services can only try to impress the servicemen with the need for providing assistance to their families, they can take certain disciplinary action against men who refuse to do so, but they cannot force them to provide support. This is something that only a civil court can do.

In some communities, I understand, such families are turning for help to local welfare organizations and the Red Cross. Women with small children are becoming desperate in their efforts to make ends meet, after having been deprived of support. Some of these people have told me of their plight in person, others have written to me. I should like to quote from a letter of a woman in my district, who writes:

Previous to January 1, I was receiving \$137.10 regularly on the 5th day of each month. I had been receiving a regular allotment check for the past 9 years. Since the new ruling on allotments for dependents of servicemen, which was recently passed, my checks have been discontinued.

I received an American Express check on February 5 in the amount of \$100, and at that time I wrote to my husband's commanding officer requesting him to make arrangements for a definite and regular payment. I have not received anything since February 5. I understand it is entirely up to my husband to determine how much I am to receive and that it is his responsibility to see that it is sent to me.

This seems unfair to me because, after all, I do have a small son (age 10) to support, a home to operate, and bills to pay. I must have a definite amount to plan on in order to meet my obligations. I know of several other servicemen's wives who are faced with the same problem. If our husbands do not choose to send us money, we have to worry about how we are to pay our bills.

If this situation becomes widespread, and I fear that it may, it can create great havoc in many families and lead to tragedies where the greatest victims will be the young children. This was not the intention of Congress when the law was enacted last year. Congress was simply trying to raise the quarters allowance for certain members of the Armed Forces and noncommissioned officers were given the freedom to provide voluntarily for their dependents without arbitrary action on the part of the Government. Congress meant well, but human nature being what it is, it did not work out so well for the families of these men. For reasons of their own, many of the men have terminated their assistance with the result that their families, their wives and children, are now suffering great hardship.

In view of the fact that Congress, directly or indirectly, was instrumental in bringing this situation about, I believe that immediate steps should be taken by Congress to rectify the situation.

With every day's delay the problem will grow bigger and more difficult. The old system of mandatory allotments should be restored at once before disruption sets in with many families and tragedies ensue.

It is the purpose of my bill to restore the system of mandatory allotments for dependents of military personnel as it existed prior to January 1, 1963. Congress has made a mistake and should recognize it as such and correct it. I appeal to all my colleagues to request this correction before they are deluged with letters from families telling of their hardships. I appeal to the House Armed Services Committee, to whom my bill has been referred, to consider this bill in the nature of emergency legislation and to act on it at once.

The Warsaw Ghetto Uprising of 1943— Their Struggle for Freedom Shall In- spire Mankind for Centuries To Come

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the civilized world has never ceased to marvel at the undaunted courage of poorly equipped patriots who have risen in the face of impossible odds to confront callous oppressors. The Hungarian freedom fighters of 1956 and the Tibetan insurgents of 1959 are cases in point. But with these recent episodes of heroism freshly imprinted on our minds, let us not forget one of the most heart-rending tragedies in this century; namely, the uprising of the 40,000 Jews in the Warsaw ghetto who exactly 20 years ago this month defiantly chose to confront almost singlehandedly the mighty German war machine. They announced to a startled world that they would not die meekly as hundreds of thousands of their brethren had, sacrificial victims on the altar of Nazi superracism. Instead, they elected to die as martyrs, fighting the hated enemy, gun in hand, knowing full well there was little hope their uprising would succeed or that they themselves would live through the conflagration.

It is doubtful whether even a year previous to the uprising these stalwart defenders of human dignity realized the fate that would be forced upon them. They were fully acquainted with Nazi anti-Semitism, but they, like most of the world, could not believe that any human being could stoop to the barbarity and butchery which soon became synonymous with Nazi actions.

But the Nazi noose had been slowly suffocating the hapless remainder of the more than 3 million Jews of prewar Poland, whose ranks had been swelled by the addition of their coreligionists uprooted from their homes in Western Europe. Immediately after the defeat of Poland in the fall of 1939, the Germans had promulgated special laws for the

Jews, who were all subject to forced labor and whose assets above a certain amount expropriated. Gradually other restrictions followed which curtailed their religious, economic, and personal freedom—freedoms which should be the inherent right of every human being. Jews were separated from their Aryan neighbors, being forbidden to buy or sell bread with them or doctor them. Every Jew above the age of 12 was compelled to identify himself with a Star of David on his clothing. Violators of these regulations were killed.

This policy of separation entered a new phase as the Nazi masters sought to effect their plan for mass annihilation of the despised Jews. On November 15, 1940, nearly half a million Jews in Warsaw were squeezed into a ghetto whose area of only 100 square city blocks was then sealed with brick walls 10 feet high and barbed wire fences. The Nazi masterminds sought to slowly starve their defenseless victims. Death and demoralization within the compound soon proved the effectiveness of their plan. With only a minority of the inmates employed, ration cards and thus food became exceedingly scarce, although those receiving provisions gave to their less fortunate neighbors. Besides starvation, overcrowding and the lack of sanitation facilities encouraged the spread of epidemics. Bodies were dumped into the streets to be carted away to a common grave. But the spirit of the oppressed Jews was not completely broken. A government sponsored by the Germans existed among them and social services such as schools, libraries, and even a symphony orchestra were kept alive.

This method of separation and starvation proved too slow for the Nazi killers. In the summer of 1942 they turned to more extreme ways of exterminating the inferior race. On July 22, the Germans ordered the Jewish Council to provide 5,000 Jews daily for deportation to labor camps in the east. Actually these Jews were to be sent to the extermination ovens of Treblinka and Auschwitz. Most Jews were skeptical, but some 40,000 were so demoralized that they lined up to receive the promised 7 pounds of bread and 2 pounds of marmalade with which the Germans had baited them. Of the dubious majority, those who did not succeed in escaping the trap were mercilessly beaten and dragged to the waiting railway cars if they resisted. The daily quota of Jews was raised first to 7,000 and then 10,000 per day. In October the Germans announced that henceforth only 40,000 ration books and jobs would be available instead of 120,000. The unlucky two-thirds were to join their brethren on the nightmarish journey to the dread concentration camps. By the end of that month, only about one-tenth of the original number or 50,000 Jews remained in the ghetto. The other 450,000 had either died of starvation or disease or been shipped to the east. Before the end of the year the area of the ghetto was greatly reduced, being split into two separate ghettos.

One might ask why it was that the Jews in the face of these Nazi provocations did not revolt until 1943 when

numerically they were much weaker. Let us remember that before these requisitions, the horrors and the grisly intent of the concentration camps were not fully known.

No effective machinery for resistance or arms existed. It was only when hope died, when the remaining Jews no longer feared Nazi retaliation for their acts against all, especially the weak and the old, that they armed to resist. Then they knew that no matter what course was followed, all were doomed. Retaliation meant nothing. By that time generally the younger and physically more able were left to organize and arm a resistance movement.

The necessary machinery came into being with the formation of the Jewish Fighter Organization—ZOB—which ultimately encompassed all Jewish organizations from the Zionists to the Socialists. They were soon strong enough to assassinate some hated German officials which raised morale in the ghetto. But they were not yet strong enough to openly defy the Nazi master.

This stand could only be possible if arms could be obtained. The Polish resistance movements contributed some guns and ammunition and other weapons were bought, but in the face of German military might, they were still greatly underarmed. But their spirit of choosing death embattled against their German oppressors rather than a quiet end in a gas chamber compensated for much of their material weakness.

Their opportunity to strike back came on January 18, 1943, when the Nazis, after waiting 4 months, resumed their campaign of deportation against the remaining 40,000 Jews. To their surprise, they were met with pistols, hand grenades, and homemade gasoline bombs. In 3 days they quelled, but did not subdue the disturbance. The flame of resistance still burned brightly.

Each side knew that the final encounter was yet to come. The Jews used this period of quiet to further arm and organize themselves. Underground shelters, or bunkers, arms factories, and intercommunication lines were perfected. Defensive operations were subdivided and authority meted out by the central ZOB command. Another clash in March convinced the Germans that a new plan was needed. In the middle of April a new German commander, Gen. Juergen Stroop, arrived with orders to liquidate the ghetto. The Jews were ready to face him.

The clash came on April 19. The Germans, angry that only 200 Jews responded to their order for workers for the Trawniki concentration camp, determined to strike on, ironically, the day before the Passover. The reading of the Seder gave the defiant defenders courage to repulse this new oppressor, just as they had stood up to Pharaoh thousands of years before. The blue and white flag of David was rung up alongside of the flag of Poland as the Jews prepared to defend every tenement and every alley with their last drop of blood. Every Jew had an assignment. The able-bodied were at their battle stations, while the children were ready to run

messages and the weak were guarding and distributing food.

The battle raged 12 hours. Deadly fire met and repulsed the German, Ukrainian, Polish, and Lithuanian police who had come to escort the Jews to their place of labor. The Germans retired, although some outlying buildings had fallen into their hands. Each side made preparations for the next round of fighting. Daring Jewish commandoes, dressed in captured German army uniforms, fell on Nazi arsenals to carry away badly needed ammunition. Later, again dressed in the stolen uniforms, they liberated the Polish, Jewish, and German prisoners from the Pawiak jail who then joined their benefactors to face the Nazi fire. Polish Socialists—non-Jews—crept into the ghetto to fight side by side with their Jewish compatriots.

Larger German forces now attacked the ghetto as Nazi planes swooped down to seek out the bunkers of the well entrenched defenders. Tanks rumbled forward, many to be blown up by Jewish suicide squads, clothed in the captured German uniforms, who crawled under them with hand grenades blowing themselves up along with the hated war machines. The Germans began to realize that the determined defenders could only be snuffed out with more systematic, coldblooded methods. A new battle would have to be fought for every block and bunker.

Since they cared little for saving the beleaguered survivors or the rows of houses, the Germans embarked on a policy of leveling the ghetto. Artillery was mounted outside the ghetto and heavy machineguns were installed on roofs of buildings near the Jewish quarter. Their bombardment was complemented by flamethrowers and incendiary bombs and hand grenades. The ghetto was a sea of flames. Victims fleeing the burning buildings were cut down. Blocks of houses were mined and blown up so that they could not become refuges for Jewish snipers. All persons found within shelters were massacred, sometimes with poison gas. During the day, the Germans invaded the ghetto, but at night, when the Jews often executed sorties against them, they left.

With ammunition running low, the Jews were forced to retreat turning from organized military maneuvers to guerrilla tactics. From the rubble of their buildings, they shot at the approaching Germans and emerged to lead forays against the enemy. On May 8, after a 2-hour battle, the Germans blew up the main operational bunker of the ZOB. All 200 defenders, including the main leaders, either died in the blast or were killed or committed suicide. A week later on May 16, the Germans dynamited the great Jewish synagogue. The Nazi General Stroop could report to his superiors in Berlin that there was no longer a Jewish quarter in Warsaw. However, this statement was not entirely correct. Although by the end of May only a flicker of resistance remained among the few remaining Jews who eked out a shadowy existence amongst the rubble, the last guerrillas were not wiped out until the end of September.

As to the survivors of this worst of all Nazi atrocities, the Germans gave no quarter. The sick in Jewish hospitals were shot in their beds. Except for the few that managed to escape and join the partisan forces, the remainder were shipped to the dreaded death camps. The city itself suffered greater destruction than in 1939 when the Germans conquered Poland. In the ghetto itself, only eight buildings remained standing—and these were not intact. But the price was not small. For the thousands of Jewish martyrs dead, the Germans had lost hundreds dead and a thousand wounded besides countless war material.

But more important, the true nature of Nazi savagery was starkly revealed to the world by this handful of doomed Jews who knew that they would lose. Under Nazi oppression, the Jews had turned the other cheek more than 70 times 7 times. But when their only choice was that between which kind of death, the Jews of the Warsaw ghetto did not hesitate. They scorned the passive death of the gas chambers or ovens of the Nazi concentration camps which were the reward for those Jews who managed to survive the inhuman train ride there, packed in railway cars for days. This method of destruction was the one chosen for them by a victor who, in typical Nazi fashion, showed a sadistic contempt for human values. Instead, these heroic Jews of Warsaw elected the death of martyrs, upholding not only their own pride and dignity, but that of the whole human race.

Mr. Speaker, the heroic struggle of these Jewish martyrs during the Warsaw ghetto uprising shall serve as a monument to the courage of the Jewish people for centuries to come. As we pay tribute this month to their tremendous sacrifice in the cause of human dignity, let us resolve that the free world shall never again permit such genocide against any people because of their race, religion, or ethnic background. If this can be done, then their tragic death was not in vain but instead shall serve forever as a beacon, reminding mankind of its responsibility toward its fellow man.

A Plan Needed for Liberation of Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the deterioration of our relations with the Cuban exiles and the apparent inability to cope with the Cuban situation stems from the apparent lack of any concrete plan by President Kennedy. In his usual manner of dealing with problems he confounds everyone by a series of conflicting statements emanating from the White House and through his brother, the Attorney General.

Since the Bay of Pigs disaster we have been told by the President, by his spokesmen, and by the Attorney General that

we did promise air cover for the invasion, that we did not promise air cover, that we would support the freedom fighters in their struggle to liberate their homeland, that we would arrest any of them that tried it.

In a brave and heroic speech to the world a few days before the election last fall, the President demanded the removal from Cuba of Russian missiles and troops. The quarantine he called for turned out to be no quarantine nor blockade indeed. We never halted any ships and even allowed the first Russian vessel to proceed even though its cargo was oil, the most vital commodity necessary to the Castro economy. No on-site inspections were ever made to assure that the missiles had actually been removed. Months later we are still trying to get the Russian troops out of Cuba by appealing to Khrushchev to honor his pledges and accepting his word that they are being removed in spite of the fact that he has never been known to honor his word or any agreement.

At this point I would like to include an editorial from the Wall Street Journal pointing out the risks of the Kennedy inaction, and that the President must formulate and execute a plan of action to reimpose the Monroe Doctrine:

THE RISKS OF INACTION

President Kennedy is perfectly correct when he observes that it's pointless for people to just say we've got to "do something" about Cuba. And he is equally right in noting that a good deal has been done since October in terms of restricting trade and maintaining surveillance of the Communist island.

But these are not the issues which bother so many people. The causes of concern are an uneasy feeling that the administration is not telling all it safely could about Cuba, the unhappy spectacle of the U.S. Government bitterly fighting with the Cuban foes of Castro and, above all, the continued presence of Soviet troops with no apparent American plan for getting rid of them once and for all.

As former Vice President Nixon put it the other day, whether there are 12,000 or 17,000 Soviet troops in Cuba, Khrushchev's position "is firmer today than a year ago." Senator KEATING also says the precise number is somewhat beside the point; one Red soldier is too many. What matters is not Castro, who by himself would be just another pipsqueak dictator. Rather, the threat to all the Americas is Khrushchev in Cuba.

The New York Senator does, however, insist there has been practically no net reduction in the number since November, because the troops that have left have been replaced. Government officials retort in effect that it's easy to make such charges without documentation, and especially easy for political critics of the administration.

Unfortunately for that answer, the charges are coming from nonpolitical sources as well. For a notable example, from the New York Times' Ruby Hart Phillips, who spent 25 years in Cuba before being expelled by Castro in 1961 and who still remains in close touch as head of the Times' Miami bureau.

According to Mrs. Phillips' information, the Russian troops are being rotated, not taken out. Moreover, she declared flatly in a speech the other day that the missiles still remain in Cuba. "And I have not a doubt that they have a good submarine base and extensive submarine pens."

Such assertions, whether right or wrong, deserve more than an official brush-off. They could hardly be more serious; in Mrs. Phillips' view, unless Cuba is taken out of the Communist camp, all of Latin America is going

to fall, country by country. Or, in Mr. Nixon's words, Khrushchev didn't spend a billion dollars merely for the purpose of acquiring Cuba; he has far bigger game in mind.

Nor do all those who are disturbed by administration policy take refuge in the "do something" generality. Mrs. Phillips is forthright enough; she says only force of arms will get communism out of Cuba. Many disagree, but it is a possibility that cannot be ruled out for all time.

Meantime Mr. KEATING, among others, advocates a number of further economic, diplomatic and military moves short of invasion. Certainly it does seem that, after facing up to Khrushchev last fall, it ought to be possible to demand the withdrawal of troops and weapons. It is hard to believe that it was necessary to lose October's initiative and move to the extreme of protecting Khrushchev's men from attacks by Cuban exiles.

Mr. Nixon may, perhaps, be charged with vagueness when he says the United States must make "a command decision to do whatever is necessary to force the removal of the Soviet beachhead." But his real point is that without such a decision, the problem can only get worse for us.

Will the risks of action, he asks, "be less in 6 months, 1 year, 2 years? If we allow Cuba to remain an example for Communist takeovers in other Latin American countries, the risks are certain to grow."

The issue is not, it seems to us, whether we should dispatch the Marines this minute. The deeply disquieting thing is the seeming absence of any real plan. Or if there has been any decision, for all the American people can tell, it is to accept an intolerable coexistence with Soviet conquest in our hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to emphasize the points made in this editorial: First, the administration is not telling all it safely could about Cuba. Second, it is not Castro, it is Khrushchev. Khrushchev's position is firmer today in Cuba than it was a year ago. Third, there has been no significant decrease in Russian troops in Cuba. The Russian troops are being rotated, not taken out. Fourth, there is substantial evidence that missiles remain in Cuba and a good submarine base and submarine pens are in existence. Fifth, there is increasing evidence that other Latin American countries are in danger of being subverted by Khrushchev-Castro directed Communists. Sixth, and, in my opinion, most important, the seeming absence of any real plan by the Kennedy administration for freeing Cuba and getting the Russian aggressors out of this hemisphere.

The President, in his news conference today, complained that his critics have not come up with any concrete plan. A look at the RECORD any day of the week will disclose that many of us have been advocating a number of measures, short of military action, which can and must be taken. I would suggest as a starter that the United States recognize a Cuban Government-in-exile. Contrary to the President's disavowal of the importance of exile governments in today's press conference, we have only to point to the important role such governments played in rallying underground forces in occupied countries in World War II to remind him that once again he is wrong or does not understand history.

Another phase of a positive program which we could enact now is to support

a massive propaganda effort to encourage the Cubans, within and without that country, to throw off their dictators. Support internal uprisings of the Cuban people and let them know that we will not fail them if they do accept our promise to support their efforts to win freedom. We should institute an effective blockade. From all available information it is apparent that if we were to cut off only the oil supplied to Cuba from Russia, the Castro government would be in immediate danger of collapse.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, Cuba can be freed and the Russian menace to the United States and this hemisphere can be eliminated if the President will quit the doubletalk and replace his high-sounding words with deeds and action. We can again take the initiative in winning the war in which Communist Russia is engaging us if the President will face the issue with courage and will trust the American people with the facts. He can electrify all those who believe in freedom and can reinspire the Cuban people to renew their fight for liberty if he will immediately impose the Monroe Doctrine and in no uncertain terms notify Khrushchev that all Russian troops and all Russian equipment and all Russian subversion must be removed from this area without further delay.

The people are ready to back you up, Mr. President. Are you ready to lead the Nation?

Of course the distasteful truth is that no action that President Kennedy initiates will be successful, if the President does not understand the need and reasons for it. The President disregards the dangers of Khrushchev controlling Cuba, the military buildup, the base for subversion of other nations, the submarines bases, and the continuing violation of the Monroe Doctrine and the sound reasons underlying this doctrine.

To be successful what is needed is a sound, consistent, firmly stated worldwide foreign policy of toughness and self-interest, then a consistent hemispheric policy and then consistent actions directed to freeing Cuba. Isolated single shot actions like the quarantine are worse than any action without a continuing, consistent, tough understandable policy.

The Kennedy policy of indecision, vacillation, inconsistency, appeasement, and accommodation is no basis on which to launch any new Cuban action.

The President's inability to see a clear course of action does not mean that such actions are not possible or are not seen by others.

Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial of

the Washington Post regarding the proposed repeal of the Silver Purchase Act and a letter I sent regarding the editorial:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 21, 1963]

THE SILVER DOLLAR

We have come a long way since William Jennings Bryan used to orate about the "cross of gold" and demand the acceptance of silver as basic to our monetary system on a ratio of 16-to-1 with gold. Now Secretary of the Treasury Dillon has made a recommendation that, if approved by Congress, will diminish the importance of silver by switching from silver certificates to Federal reserve notes thus freeing 1.3 billion ounces of silver required by law to maintain \$1 silver certificates in circulation. The recommendation is eminently sensible. Mr. Dillon points out that the Government's supply of silver for coinage will run out in 1965 unless it can free for use by the Government's mints some of the 1.3 billion ounces now lying useless in vaults. When the Government's supply runs out, it may have to buy silver in foreign markets, for the domestic production of silver is not sufficient to meet all demands.

Some of the silver producing States have long maintained a sentimental interest in silver dollars, along with a powerful bloc in Congress that prevented any modernization of our silver laws. The silver dollar is about as obsolete as the arguments of the silver bloc, and sentiment is strong for a revision of our laws concerned with silver in its relation to the monetary system. If something is not done, Mr. Dillon suggested even graver threats to silver coinage ahead. If the Government has to diminish its gold reserve still further by purchasing silver abroad, we may be faced with a common European expedient of using other cheaper metals. The silver bloc would hate the thin jingle of aluminum dimes and quarters. To forestall that hazard, let the silver laws be revised.

MARCH 21, 1963.

EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST,
1515 L Street NW.,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It was a great pleasure for me to return to Washington and have the benefit of the generally fine editorial policy of the Post. However, the traditional aspirations for spring's first day turned to ashes this morning upon reading the editorial entitled, "The Silver Dollar."

I am sure that if more research had been spent on the proposed demonetization of silver, more than half the truth would have appeared in the editorial. Even a few minutes of reflection would have cleared up the confusion of silver dollars with silver certificates. Perhaps some study of the silver situation would have given the author of this unfortunate editorial some arguments, other than the ad hominem references to William Jennings Bryan and the bogeyman silver bloc, for the Treasury bill to replace silver certificates with Federal Reserve notes.

At the risk of being labeled the sole surviving representative of the powerful silver bloc in Congress, I would like to briefly point out some of the rational arguments against the Treasury Department's proposal in H.R. 4413. Silver has traditionally been, in this country, and in almost every other civilized nation, a monetary metal. The present drive to substitute currency that has 100 percent silver backing with notes which will have but 25 percent gold backing is aimed at complete demonetization of gold as well as silver. The recent spectacular rise in the price of silver has given a lever to the proponents of a completely managed currency system. However, I am disappointed that our Treasury's reaction is only one of panic, rather than reason.

Silver production now has but a 12 to 1 ratio with gold. The monetary price of silver at \$1.29 per ounce represents an approximate ratio to gold of 27 to 1. Rather than irretrievably retire silver certificates, a more sensible approach would be to place the monetary value of silver in a more realistic relation to gold. I have suggested to the Banking and Currency Committee that a monetary value of \$1.38 for silver would be a sound move at this time. This would involve no mechanical problems at all, since the monetary price of the silver in our coins is \$1.38.

To replace \$2 billion in silver certificates with Federal Reserve notes would cost the American taxpayer more than \$50 million per year, since 75 percent of the backing for Federal Reserve notes is in the form of collateral, upon which the United States pays interest. It costs the taxpayer nothing to keep silver certificates in circulation; rather the Treasury has realized an economic profit on them every year since the enactment of the Silver Purchase Act.

The history of silver legislation is clouded with too much emotion. I believe it is time that the Congress approach the problem rationally and that is why I would like to see the Post apply its policy of thoroughness and objectivity to this legislation.

Sincerely,

COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.,
Member of Congress.

Action Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, the time is now for immediate and drastic executive action, for accelerated legal procedures by the Attorney General, for positive congressional action to strengthen and extend the law by giving to the Attorney General the legal authority to protect the rights of the Negroes of Mississippi, as well as the rights of minorities everywhere in the United States, to the limit.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to solicit the aid of every Member of the Congress of the United States to join me now in protesting and denouncing the illegal actions on the part of the authorities of Mississippi and elsewhere insofar as the actions of those authorities in anyway hamper the constitutional rights of Negro citizens.

I call the attention of my colleagues to a long series of outrages suffered by Negroes of Mississippi and I emphatically state that these crimes cry out for positive and courageous action, not tomorrow, but now.

CHRONOLOGY OF VIOLENCE AND INTIMIDATION IN MISSISSIPPI SINCE 1961

1961

January 1, Greenville, Washington County: Two young white men rode a motorbike through a residential area and, according to the local police chief, fired a volley of shots into a group of Negroes. George Mayfield, 18, was seriously wounded in both legs; Percy Lee Simmons, 19, was shot in the right leg.

March 30, Jackson, Hinds County: Club-swinging police and 2 police dogs chased more than 100 Negroes from a courthouse where 9 Negro students were convicted for staging a sit-in demonstration. Several were struck by the clubs and at least one person was bitten by the dogs.

May 7, Jackson, Hinds County: Several white youths, riding in an open convertible, lassoed 9-year-old Negro Gloria Laverne Floyd with a wire and dragged her along the street. The girl suffered a deep gash in her head that required three stitches, cheek bruises, a laceration of her right shoulder, and burn marks on her neck. Police made arrests.

August 15, Amite County: Robert Moses, Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee—SNCC—registration worker, and three Negroes who had tried unsuccessfully to register in Liberty, were driving toward McComb when a county officer stopped them. He asked if Moses was the man "who's been trying to register our niggers." All were taken to court and Moses was arrested for "impeding an officer in the discharge of his duties," fined \$50 and spent 2 days in jail.

August 22, Amite County: Robert Moses went to Liberty with three Negroes, who made an unsuccessful attempt to register. A block from the courthouse, Moses was attacked and beaten by Billy Jack Caston, the sheriff's first cousin. Eight stitches were required to close a wound in Moses' head. Caston was acquitted of assault charges by an all-white jury before a justice of the peace.

August 26, McComb, Pike County: Hollis Watkins, 20, and Elmer Hayes, 20, SNCC workers, were arrested while staging a sit-in at the F. W. Woolworth store and charged with breach of the peace. They spent 36 days in jail.

August 27 and 29, McComb, Pike County: Five Negro students from a local high school were convicted of breach of the peace following a sit-in at a variety store and bus terminal. They were sentenced to a \$400 fine each and 8 months in jail. One of these students, a girl of 15, was turned over to juvenile authorities, released, subsequently rearrested, and sentenced to 12 months in a State school for delinquents.

August 29, McComb, Pike County: Two Negro leaders were arrested in McComb as an aftermath of the sit-in protest march on city hall, charged with contributing to the delinquency of minors. They were Curtis C. Bryant, of McComb, an official of the NAACP, and Cordelle Reagan, of SNCC. Each arrest was made on an affidavit signed by Police Chief George Guy, who said he had information that the two "were behind some of this racial trouble."

August 30, McComb, Pike County: SNCC Workers Brenda Travis, 16, Robert Talbert, 19, and Isaac Lewis, 20, staged a sit-in in the McComb terminal of the Greyhound buslines. They were arrested on charges of breach of the peace and failure to obey a policeman's order to move on. They spent 30 days in jail.

September 5, Liberty, Amite County: Travis Britt, SNCC registration worker,

was attacked and beaten by whites on the courthouse lawn. Britt was accompanied at the time by Robert Moses. Britt said one man hit him more than 20 times. The attackers drove away in a truck.

September 7, Tylertown, Walthall County: John Hardy, SNCC registration worker, took two Negroes to the county courthouse to register. The registrar told them he "wasn't registering voters" that day. When the three turned to leave, Registrar John Q. Wood took a pistol from his desk and struck Hardy over the head from behind. Hardy was arrested and charged with disturbing the peace.

September 13, Jackson, Hinds County: 15 Episcopal ministers—among them three Negroes—were arrested for asking to be served at the lunch counter of the Greyhound bus terminal. They were charged with inviting a breach of the peace. They were found not guilty of the charge on May 21, 1962, by County Judge Russell Moore.

September 25, Liberty, Amite County: Herbert Lee, a Negro who had been active in voter registration, was shot and killed by white State representative E. H. Hurst in downtown Liberty. No prosecution was undertaken, the authorities explaining that the representative had shot in self-defense.

October 4, McComb, Pike County: The five students who were arrested as a result of the August 29 sit-in in McComb returned to school, but were refused admittance. At that, 116 students walked out and paraded downtown to the city hall in protest. Police arrested the entire crowd, but later released all but 19, all of whom were 18 years old or older. They were charged with breach of the peace and contributing to the delinquency of minors and allowed to go free on bail totaling \$3,700. At the trial on October 31, Judge Brumfield, finding the students guilty, and sentencing each to a \$500 fine and 6 months in jail, said:

Some of you are local residents, some of you are outsiders. Those of you who are local residents are like sheep being led to the slaughter. If you continue to follow the advice of outside agitators, you will be like sheep and be slaughtered.

October 5, McComb, Pike County: Charles Sherrod was arrested on the street, thrown into a police car, and charged with resisting arrest. Cordelle Reagan was also arrested and charged with contributing to the delinquency of a minor. Both were fieldworkers for SNCC.

October 11, McComb, Pike County: Paul Potter of Philadelphia, a vice president of the National Student Association, and Tom Hayden of Atlanta, both white, were dragged from their car and beaten as they drove alongside a group of Negroes making an antisegregation march. When the two slowed their car for a traffic light, a heavy-set white man opened the door and dragged the driver out and hit him several times. He then walked around to the other side of the car, opened the door and knocked the second man to the street. The incident occurred in the business section of the city.

October 13, McComb, Pike County: Police Officer B. F. Elmore shot and killed a Negro motorist. Police Chief George Guy said that Elmore said he had stopped Eli Brumfield at 4 a.m. for speeding. Brumfield allegedly jumped from his car with a pocket knife in his hand and attacked Elmore. A coroner's jury ruled Elmore fired in self-defense.

October 22, Jackson, Hinds County: Dion Diamond, a SNCC worker, was arrested for "running a stop sign" after being followed all day. In court the next day, the arresting officer told the judge:

"He is a Freedom Rider. Throw the book at him."

Diamond was refused legal counsel and fined \$168.

November 9, McComb, Pike County: Jerome Smith, 22, Congress of Racial Equality—CORE—field man, and four companions, Dorothy Smith, 18; Alice Thompson, 22; Thomas Valentine, 23; and George Raymond, 18, were attacked by a mob of 30 to 40 whites when they sought service at the lunch counter of the Greyhound bus terminal in McComb. Smith, who suffered head injuries when he was slugged with brass knuckles during the attack, said FBI agents were present at the time of the attack, but did "nothing but take notes" while the mob kicked and beat his companions. The victims were rescued from the mob by a Negro truck driver and Negro cab drivers.

November 10, Jackson, Hinds County: Jessie Divens, 12-year-old, was arrested for refusing to move to the rear of a city bus. Judge Carl Guernsey released the girl to the custody of Rev. G. R. Horton, chaplain of Campbell College where she attended classes. Judge Guernsey continued the case until November 17:

With the understanding that the Reverend Mr. Horton and the child come back with a workable plan which would cause the child's mind to be concerned with education rather than social reformation.

November 18, McComb, Pike County: Persons unknown fired a shotgun blast into the bedroom of Dion Diamond and John Hardy at 702 Wall Street. Investigating officer Frank Williams found shotgun pellets embedded in the window frame.

December 1, McComb, Pike County: Four white men attacked three newsmen on the street, sending one crashing into a plate glass window of a store. The newsmen were Tom Uhrborck and Don Underwood, Life magazine, and Simmons Fentress, Time magazine.

December 2, McComb, Pike County: Police broke up an attempt by white attackers to drag three Freedom Riders from an automobile at the Greyhound bus terminal. Four men kicked at the locked car and beat upon the windows in an attempt to reach the young Negroes and their driver, Thomas Gaither, field secretary of CORE. The police, who were standing by when the riders arrived aboard a bus from Jackson, pulled the men away from the car, but made no arrests.

December 26, Jackson, Hinds County: Rafford Johnson, Negro, was severely beaten by two law officers after being involved in a minor collision with a car

driven by a white woman. Johnson underwent surgery for skull injuries.

1962

February 6, 1962, Clarksdale, Coahoma County: Miss Bessie Turner, 19, a Negro, was walking with a young man down a Clarksdale street when Clarksdale police officers stopped them and accused Miss Turner of having been involved in a theft. Miss Turner said the officers took her to the jail, forced her to undeclothe and to lie on her back. She said one of the policemen then beat her between the legs with his belt. A few minutes later, Miss Turner said, the other officer beat her across her naked breasts. Miss Turner filed Federal charges against the officers.

March 15, 1962, Shelby, Bolivar County: Aaron Henry, State president of the NAACP, was convicted in Justice of Peace court on charges of making perverse advances on a white teenage hitchhiker. Henry stated that the charges were a complete fabrication, and presented an alibi supported by sworn witnesses. The conviction has been appealed. When he later stated in a press conference that the prosecutor and the police chief, who figured in the trial, had conspired to frame him, Henry was sued by the two for defamation. A Mississippi white jury awarded the prosecutor \$25,000 and the police chief \$15,000.

April 12, 1962, Taylorsville, Smith County: Cpl. Roman Ducksworth, Jr., U.S. Army, a Negro, was shot and killed by Policeman Bill Kelly, when, according to an NAACP news release, Duckworth "insisted on his right to sit where he chose on an interstate bus." Policeman Kelly claimed that Ducksworth was drunk and started fighting. No charges were brought against Kelly. Ducksworth was en route from Camp Ritchie, Md., to see his wife who was ill in a Laurel, Miss., hospital.

April 1962, Lucedale, George County: Mrs. Ernestine Denham Talbert, who lives in George County but teaches in Green County, was notified by the Green County School Board that her teaching contract would not be renewed. Mrs. Talbert had tried in January to register to vote but had been refused.

May 17, 1962, Rankin County: The Negro editor, of the Mississippi Free Press, said he and a companion were beaten by Rankin County officers and a highway patrolman. Lawrence Hudson, Jr., of Jackson, said the beating occurred after he was stopped en route from Jackson to Forest to check on a rumor that a Negro man had been killed by a white man. He was jailed, refused permission to phone a lawyer, tried the next day on several charges and fined \$151.

June 21, 1962, Clarksdale, Coahoma County: A white lawyer from Jackson and four college students were jailed in Clarksdale for 20 hours without outside communication. One of the students was a Negro. William Higgs, the lawyer, and the students were jailed on a Sunday night by county officers and were released the following day, without charges being filed against them.

July 5, 1962, Jackson, Hinds County: Jesse Harris, 20, and Luvaghn Brown,

17, SNCC workers, charged that they were beaten and threatened with death while serving a 30-day sentence in the county jail for contempt of court. The young Negroes had refused to move from a court bench customarily occupied by whites while they were attending the trial of Mrs. Diane Nash Bevel. The young men said that, in the courthouse elevator, a deputy sheriff called Harris "a damned nigger" and beat him about the head with his fist. At the county farm, they were singled out as freedom riders and wore striped uniforms. Both were beaten by guards. Harris was beaten by a guard named Keith while other prisoners held him. Keith beat him across the back with a length of hose threatening:

Nigger, I'll kill you.

August 16, 1962, Greenwood, Leflore County: Samuel Block, 23, SNCC field secretary, said three white men accosted him in a parking lot and "started beating me with their fists." He said they threatened him and then beat him for about 5 minutes.

There is no use reporting it to local authorities—

He said.

August 17, 1962, Greenwood, Leflore County: SNCC workers Samuel Block, Luvaghn Brown, and Lawrence Guyot were forced to flee from the second story window of their voter registration office. They said armed white men invaded the premises intent upon doing them harm.

August 17, 1962, Ruleville, Sunflower County: Mayor Charles Durrough asked Mr. Leonard Davis, a Negro employed by the city, what he knew about the registration school being conducted at a Negro church. Mr. Davis replied that he did not know anything at all about the school, and did not attend any of the classes. The mayor then told him that he, the mayor, knew what kind of school they were having. The mayor said he knew it—presumably, civil rights for the Negro—was coming, and he was not going to allow it to be forced on them. The mayor said that anyone attending the school would be given a one-way ticket out of town, and if that would not do it, they would use whatever they had available. See entry below for September 3, 1962.

August 1962, Greenwood, Leflore County: Welton McSwine, Jr., 14-year-old Negro, was arrested by police after a white woman's house had been broken into. When police got the youth to the station an officer said:

All right, nigger, you know why you are here, and we want to know who broke into that white woman's house.

McSwine told them he knew nothing of the incident, saying that he spent all his time in the cottonfield, and suggesting that his mother could corroborate this. McSwine said officers then took him to a cell and beat him, first hitting him in the head with a blackjack; then one of the policemen beat him in the face with his fist while another hit him in the stomach with his club; then the officers made him lie naked on the floor on his side while they beat him with a

whip. McSwine was released after intercession of his father's white employer.

August 21, 1962, Liberty, Amite County: Sam Wells and Tommy Weathersby went to the courthouse to register. While they were waiting to get into the registrar's office, they stood on the front porch of the courthouse. Deputy Sheriff Daniel Jones told them:

Get your ——— off the front porch, and don't come back on.

Weathersby and Wells got off the porch. A few moments later, rain began, and the two wanted to take shelter in the courthouse, but Deputy Sheriff Jones would not permit it.

August 21, Liberty, Amite County: Dewey Greene, Jr., Mississippi Free Press reporter, was taking pictures of Negroes waiting to register at the courthouse. An unidentified young man working in the office down the hall from the registrar's office snatched Greene's camera away, and refused to return it. Greene was told to leave town by three white men, one of whom was flourishing a length of lead pipe. He left.

August 29, 1962, Clarksdale, Coahoma County: Seven Negroes were arrested after attending a voter registration meeting. David Dennis, CORE field secretary, was charged with failure to yield right-of-way after a police officer had forced him to submit to a long harangue of threats and abuse. Samuel Block, John Hodges, J. L. Harris, Richard T. Gray, and Albert Garrar, SNCC field workers, and Dewey Greene, Jr., reporter for the Mississippi Free Press, were forced by Clarksdale police to alight from their car, and were charged with loitering in violation of the city curfew.

August 30, 1962, Indianola, Sunflower County: SNCC workers C. R. McLauren, Albert Garner, J. O. Hodges, Samuel Block, and Robert Moses were arrested by Indianola police on a charge of distributing literature without a permit. The registration workers had been taking leaflets announcing a registration mass meeting door-to-door in the Negro community. Lafayette Surney, 17, another SNCC worker, was arrested and then released to Rev. James Bevel, of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference—SCLC.

August 31, Indianola, Sunflower County: During the trial of Samuel Block on charges of distributing literature without a permit, the Municipal Judge informed Block that he could cross-examine the arresting officer. Block asked the officer:

Did you actually see me hand out a leaflet?

The judge turned to the officer and said:

He can ask you anything he wants to, but you don't have to answer.

The judge told Lafayette Surney if he was caught in Indianola agitating again, he would be sent to the penal farm.

September 3, 1962, Ruleville, Sunflower County: Because of registration activity, two Negro-owned dry cleaning establishments were closed—allegedly for violating city ordinances.

September 3, 1962, Ruleville, Sunflower County: Lenard Davis, 49, sanitation de-

partment worker, was told by Mayor Charles M. Durrough:

We're going to let you go. Your wife's been attending that school.

He referred to a registration school conducted by SNCC workers in Ruleville.

September 3, 1962, Ruleville, Sunflower County: Fred Hicks, 40, who drove field-workers to the plantations, was told he could no longer use a bus without a commercial license. Hicks said the bus owner told him that, because Hicks' mother had registered to vote:

We gonna see how tight we can make it—gonna make it just as tight as we can. Gonna be rougher and rougher than you think it is.

September 3, 1962, Ruleville, Sunflower County: Moses and Amzie Moore, a local Negro leader, were walking down the street. A white man in a pickup truck drew up alongside and asked if they were the "folks getting the people to register." Moses and Moore answered yes, they were. The man asked if they could come out to his plantation to register people. The two answered, yes, they could come. The man said then:

I've got a shotgun waiting for you, double barrel.

September 3, Ruleville, Sunflower County: A letter from Mayor Durrough notified the Williams Chapel Missionary Baptist Church that tax exemption and free water were being cut off because the property was being used for "purposes other than worship services." The church was a meeting place for voter registration workers.

September 10, Ruleville, Sunflower County: Marylene Burkes, 20, and Vivian Hillet, 19, were severely wounded when an unidentified assailant fired through the window of Miss Hillet's grandparents' home. The grandparents had been active in voter registration work.

October 3, Biloxi, Harrison County: A Negro frame residence and a gasoline station were targets for two "Molotov cocktails" which caused more than \$4,000 damage. One of the bombs struck the home of Dr. Gilbert Mason, a Negro physician, who is active in integration efforts. The other crashed through the window of a service station operated by Emmett Clark, a Negro.

October 5, Harmony, Leake County: Night riders fired shotguns into eight Negro homes and a Negro store. An elderly Negro said he was struck in the knee by squirrel shot while he and his 9-year-old grandson were sleeping. He said he was not seriously hurt. Harmony Negroes had recently petitioned authorities for school desegregation.

October 10, Columbus, Lowndes County: A "Molotov cocktail" was tossed from a speeding car into the home of Dr. James L. Allen of Columbus, vice chairman of the Mississippi Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

October 29, Clarksdale, Coahoma County: Charles McLaurin, SNCC registration worker, was stopped by police as he was walking a group home from the courthouse. The group had tried to register to vote. The officer asked to see

McLaurin's driver's license. McLaurin showed it. The officer asked McLaurin what he was doing there. McLaurin told him he worked in voter registration. Then, accompanied by obscene remarks, the officer said:

Nigger, do you know the way out of town?

McLaurin replied:

Yes.

The officer said, with more obscenity:

Nigger. Can't you say "Yes, sir?"

The officer's partner asked the officer what charge should be put on the tickets. The officer said:

Charge the — \$26 on both charges. Nigger, you got \$52?

McLaurin replied:

No.

The officer said:

Then you're going to jail.

At the jail, McLaurin learned that the officer was Clarksdale Police Chief Ben Collins. McLaurin was in jail a few minutes when his companions posted bond for him in the amount of \$103. They decided to forfeit bond rather than run the risk of a higher fine or incur the legal expense of an appeal.

October 31, Jackson, Hinds County: Thomas E. Johnson, a white minister, and a member of the Mississippi Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, saw a group of neighbors dumping garbage on his lawn. Johnson had just returned from taking his car to a safe place because of threats by neighbors to damage it. Johnson sought a peace bond against the man whom he had observed leading the garbage-dumping operations of his neighbors. The man presented 11 witnesses who swore that he had been in their presence at all times on the evening in question. The justice of the peace accepted their testimony and refused the bond. Then the Hinds County Grand Jury indicted Johnson and his wife on perjury charges, because of their testimony at the peace bond hearing.

November 6, 1962, Greenville, Washington County: Two WAF's and two airmen—all white—from the Greenville Air Force Base were fined \$55 and given 30-day suspended sentences on charges of creating a disturbance by entering a restaurant and seeking service with two Negro voter registration workers.

December 26, 1962, Clarksdale, Coahoma County: Ivanhoe Donaldson and Benjamin Taylor, students from De-

troit, brought a truckload of food, clothing and medicines for distribution to the Delta's needy families who had been cut off from Federal surplus commodities. The medicines had been donated by a physician in Louisville, and were consigned to Aaron Henry, a licensed pharmacist. They were arrested by Clarksdale police and held for investigation. After police searched the truck on December 27, and found what they described as a drug used to ease the pain of middle-aged women, Donaldson and Taylor were charged with possession of narcotics and bond was set at \$15,000. Bond was later reduced to \$1,500.

1963

January 17, Canton, Madison County: The castrated and mutilated body of Sylvester Maxwell, 24-year-old Negro, was found by his brother-in-law less than 500 yards from the home of a white family. Mississippi NAACP Field Secretary Medger Evers termed the slaying a "probable lynching."

February 2, Greenwood, Leflore County: Willie Peacock, SNCC registration worker, complained to the Justice Department that officials had refused to register him on two occasions, and had rejected his poll tax payment for this year.

February 20, Greenwood, Leflore County: Four Negro businesses on the same street as the SNCC voter registration office were burned to the ground. Mrs. Nancy Brand, a worker in the SNCC office, reported an anonymous telephone call in which a man's voice asked her if she ever came to the office. When she said "yes", the voice said:

You won't be going down there anymore, that's been taken care of.

The burned businesses were Jackson's Garage, George's Cafe, Porter's Pressing Shop, and the Esquire Club. The pressing shop is next door to the SNCC office, and SNCC workers believed the businesses were burned by mistake. Sam Block, SNCC field secretary, was arrested 2 days later for suggesting there was some connection between the burnings and the registration efforts of SNCC. He was charged with circulating statements calculated to create a breach of the peace.

February 28, Greenwood, Leflore County: Three registration workers were attacked with gunfire on U.S. Highway 82 just outside Greenwood. The shots were fired from a 1962 white Buick. The car in which the workers were riding

was punctured by 11 bullets. One worker, James Travis of SNCC, was wounded in the neck and shoulder.

March 4, Clarksdale, Coahoma County: The show windows in the Fourth Street drugstore were smashed, as they have been several times in the past. The proprietor of the store, Aaron Henry, found the damage when he returned from speaking at a mass meeting in Leflore County in connection with the voter registration drive there.

March 6, Greenwood, Leflore County: Samuel Block and three others were fired on from a station wagon which pulled up beside their car as they were parked in front of the SNCC voter registration office. Both front windows were shattered. Police later found the wadding from a shotgun shell buried in the headliner of Block's car, and several pellets in the wall of the building in front of which the car had been parked.

March 12, Greenwood, Leflore County: A 12-year-old Negro girl was attacked by an egg-throwing truckload of white teenaged boys. The girl suffered facial bruises.

March 20, 1963, Jackson, Hinds County: Three shots were fired through the windshield of a car belonging to Mrs. Mattie Dennis while it was parked in front of the home of Mrs. Dennis' cousin, whom she was visiting. Mrs. Dennis is the wife of David Dennis, CORE field secretary for Mississippi. Both have been active in voter registration.

March 24, 1963, Greenwood, Leflore County: Fire destroyed partially the interior of the voter registration office at 115 East McLaurin Street, making the office unusable and necessitating a search for new headquarters. Witnesses said they saw two white men fleeing the scene shortly before the fire was discovered.

March 26, 1963, Greenwood, Leflore County: A shotgun blast ripped into the home of Dewey Greene, Sr., father of the latest Negro applicant to the University of Mississippi. Another of Mr. Greene's sons and a daughter have been active in the Leflore County registration project. Greenwood police said they were investigating.

March 27, 1963, Greenwood, Leflore County: James Forman, executive secretary of SNCC, Bob Moses, and about 10 other registration workers were arrested and taken from a group en route to the courthouse to register after the police dispersed a group of more than 100 Negroes with the use of police dogs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 8, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 72: 19: *Blessed be His glorious name forever; and let the whole earth be filled with His glory.*

Almighty God, we have entered upon Holy Week, commemorating events and experiences in the life of our blessed

Lord whose sacred meaning our finite minds can only faintly comprehend.

Grant that during these days we may be filled with penitence and humility, with praise and thanksgiving as we turn our minds and hearts to the cross to meditate upon the sufferings and death of the great High Priest, who on Good Friday laid upon the altar the acceptable sacrifice of His own life for the sins of the world.

May we accept and submit ourselves to His claims and commands and have

the faith and the courage to believe that someday all mankind shall be lifted to higher levels of character and conduct through the transforming and conquering power of His sacrificial love.

Hear us in our Saviour's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 4, 1963, was read and approved.